OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SIXTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

6-7 GEORGE V, 1916

VOL. CXXII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWELFTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1916, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA

PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1916

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SIXTH SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1916

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

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker ..... Hon. ALBERT SEVIGNY.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees... EDGAR N. RHODES.

Clerk of the House..... THOS. B. FLINT, M.A., LL.B., D.C.L.
Sergeant-at-Arms..... Lieut.-Col. HENRY R. SMITH, C.M.G., I.S.O., A.D.C.

Editor of Debates..... ALBERT HORTON.
Associate Editor of Debates..... THOS. P. OWENS.

Official Reporters of Debates :—
English : A. C. Campbell, George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, C. S. Blue, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver.
French : J. O. Marceau, Alphonse Desjardins.

Select Committee on Official Report of Debates.

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

Chairman : Jas. D. Taylor.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SIXTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

1916

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—Maisonneuve.

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SIXTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

1916

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

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

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

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

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

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

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

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

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—REVISED EDITION

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. ALBERT SÉVIGNY.

Wednesday, January 12, 1916.

This being the day on which Parliament is convoked by proclamation of the Governor General for the despatch of business, and the members of the House being assembled:

The Clerk read to the House a letter from the Governor General's Secretary informing him that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber this day at 3 p.m. to open the session.

A message was delivered by Lieut.-Col. Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

The Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber, when the Speaker of the Senate said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have it in command to let you know that His Royal Highness the Governor General does not see fit to declare the causes of his summoning the present Parliament of Canada until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law; but to-morrow, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, His Royal Highness will declare the causes of his calling this Parliament.

VACANCIES.

The Clerk of the House, standing on the lower step below the Speaker's chair, said: I have the honour to inform the House that, during the recess, the following notifications of vacancies in the representation have been received:

Of the Electoral District of Kings, N.S., by the resignation of Arthur De Witt Foster, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Carleton, Ontario, by the resignation of William F. Garland, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Hamilton East, by the death of the Hon. Samuel Barker.

Of the Electoral District of Lisgar, by the resignation of William H. Sharpe, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Brandon, by the resignation of Sir James A. M. Aikins, Kt.

Of the Electoral District of Prince, P.E.I., by the death of James W. Richards, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Hochelaga, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown of the Hon. Louis Coderre.

Of the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Grey, by the Hon. Thomas S. Sproule having been summoned to the Senate.

Of the Electoral District of Restigouche, by the death of James Reid, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Lincoln, by the death of Edward Arthur Lancaster, Esq.

NEW MEMBER.

The Clerk said: I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Hon. Esioff L. Patenaude for the Electoral District of Hochelaga.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Dr. Flint, we have just been informed of the vacancy that has occurred in the Speaker's office, and the reasons therefor. I am now, I believe, one of the two oldest sitting members of the House—not in point of age—I am not alluding to that—but in point of service. With the exception, I think, of my right hon. friend opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I am the oldest. I have had the pleasure of sitting and working in this House under the

guidance and direction of eight different Speakers, four of them belonging to one political party, and four having their origin in another political party. Our system of Speakership here is different from that which obtains in Great Britain; each has its advantages, and, perhaps, each has some disadvantages. I made allusion to my own experience simply to follow it with the remark that it gives me great pleasure to say that during thirty-four years of service under eight different Speakers I have found that these Speakers have worthily upheld the traditions which cluster around the Speaker's Chair; that, under their guidance and direction, the balances have been fairly held as between the two political parties, and that equal justice has been dealt out to both. If disadvantages and difficulties have existed in connection with the Speaker's tenure of office it may be said to their credit that they have overcome them, and that they have maintained the dignity of the office according to its traditions.

To-day I have the honour to submit the name of Albert Sévigny, Esq., member for the county of Dorchester, as Speaker of this House. Dr. Sévigny, who, comparatively speaking, is one of the youngest of our members, has, during the short period of his service in this House, by his pleasant personality, by his culture, by his affability and capacity, won for himself the respect and esteem of gentlemen on both sides of the House. I have every hope and confidence, and not the least doubt, that the hon. gentleman who is soon, I hope, to take his place in the Speaker's Chair, will uphold the honour, dignity and traditions of that important office. I beg to move, therefore, seconded by the Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain:

That Albert Sévigny, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Dorchester, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Dr. Flint, to those who followed closely the labours of the House last session, it became evident that the health of the then Speaker was failing him, and would no longer enable him to fulfil the arduous duties of the Chair. We were not surprised, therefore, to learn that the hon. gentleman had been summoned to that higher sphere, the Upper Chamber. Since Confederation, it has been the privilege of the Administration in office to select the member of the House who should be the presiding officer, and to make that selection from among the most prominent and most devoted of its followers. It has been stated by the hon. gentleman who leads the House in the absence of the Prime Minister—who, we hope, will soon recover from his illness and again take his place in the House—that our system of appointing the Speaker is different from the British system. In some respects it is. I am not sure that our system is not inferior to the British system; in any case, I agree with all that my hon. friend has said as to the character and ability of those of our colleagues who have in years past had the honour of being Speakers of the Canadian House of Commons. My hon. friend has spoken of his having had the privilege of sitting in this House under eight different Speakers. I am a little older than he—not only in point of years, but in point of service as well—a privilege of which I am not at all proud; in fact, I would, if possible, pass it over to him. At any rate, it has been my privilege to serve under eight or nine different Speakers, and I can bear out all that my hon. friend has said as to the manner in which they have upheld the dignity of the office. Whether they have been of one political party or of another, they have performed their duties to their own credit, to the great advantage of the House of Commons, and to the honour of the Canadian people.

As has been stated by my hon. friend, our first duty to-day is to select a new presiding officer for the House of Commons. My hon. friend has told us that the Government's choice has fallen on the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sévigny). Considering the circumstances of his coming into this House, I think it is a fit sequence that he should be elected to the higher office of Speaker. When Dr. Sproule took the Speaker's Chair he was an ardent Tory; the hon. member for Dorchester when he came to this House was an ardent Nationalist. As extremes always meet, it seems to be fitting that Mr. Speaker Sévigny should follow Mr. Speaker Sproule. And what an evolution this is since the year 1911! If, in the year 1911, the Nationalist candidate in the county of Dorchester, now the Conservative member for the same county, had heard the prediction that he would accept an office, either high or low, from a Conservative Government presided over by Sir Robert Borden, I am sure that the hon. gentleman would have been the very first to protest

against such an idea. I am not sure that he would not have taken it even as an insult, because those of us who come from the province of Quebec know that my hon. friend carried on a campaign of sulphur and brimstone, not only against the Liberal party, but, in equal measure, against the Conservative party. My hon. friend denounced the nefarious policy of Laurier—which was a matter of course with him—and also the nefarious policy of Borden just as vigorously, perhaps even more vigorously. He assailed without measure the navy, and I think he was pledged to the repeal of the Naval Service Act. I understand that he also opposed every form of participation by Canada in the affairs of Great Britain. He entered this House still breathing heavily, threatening still. But when once in this House he took his seat behind the Treasury benches—and behind the Treasury benches things which he had condemned took with him another shape. No one heard him in this House denounce the nefarious policy of Borden. I think he ceased to denounce the navy. Certainly he acquiesced in the participation of Canada in the war. He became a repentant sinner, and I never saw a sinner—and I have met some sinners in my time—who derived so much comfort out of repentance. My hon. friend never did penance in sackcloth and ashes. He was within the rays of the ministerial sun; he luxuriated in the tall and fat grasses of ministerial pasture; he was the recipient of some marked ministerial favours. I do not say this by way of complaining of his conversion—far be it from me to do so. If I have any fault to find with him it is that his conversion did not go far enough, because I am not aware that he ever, in the County of Dorchester, confessed his sins to his electors and begged pardon for having so led them astray in 1911.

But this is a matter which more concerns gentlemen on the other side of the House than those on our side. To-day my hon. friend is to be elected by this House to the chief office which is in its power. He has all the abilities and talents to perform the duties well—I give him this credit. It has been my privilege to know him for some time, even before he entered this House, and it is a pleasure to me to believe—indeed, to be sure—that he will discharge the duties of the office with credit and in the manner of his predecessors. However we may have differed from him in the past, the moment he assumes this Chair he becomes Speaker of the House of Commons, and entitled to all honour and all respect; and, so far as this side of the House is concerned, it will be our duty—nay, it will be our pleasure—to do what His Majesty's Opposition always have done so long as I have been in this House—we shall deem it our duty to give him every assistance to maintain the dignity and traditions of his office, and as well to maintain the dignities and privileges and rights of the House of Commons.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House declared the motion carried in the affirmative, nemine contradicente, and Albert Sévigny, Esquire, member for the electoral division of Dorchester, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Sévigny was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Sir George Foster and Hon. T. Chase Casgrain.

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT: Allow me to thank you for having raised me to the honourable position of Speaker of this House. While I appreciate more than I can express the distinction conferred upon me, I am fully aware of the responsibilities and the difficulties that are attached thereto.

With your kind indulgence and advice, the task which I am called upon to assume will be made lighter; and, for my part, I will endeavour to be worthy of the goodwill you have manifested towards me in electing me unanimously to the Chair; it will be also my aim to justify the confidence you have reposed in me.

My predecessor had the advantage of many years of experience in this House, which was of great benefit to us all. His decisions, as well as those of the other distinguished legislators who have occupied the position of Speaker of this honourable House, will assist me in maintaining the dignity of this office, and in presiding, with justice and impartiality, over your deliberations, as well as in preserving the integrity and honour of the House of Commons.

The Sergeant-at-Arms then laid the Mace upon the Table of the House.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Esioff Leon Patenaude, member-elect for the electoral district of Hochelaga, by Hon. T. Chase Casgrain and Hon. Sir George Foster.

REPORT.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1915 (English and French versions).—Hon. T. Chase Casgrain.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not think that the presentation of a report at this stage is in order, but we will not raise the point: we will commend the hon. gentleman for his diligence.

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

Thursday, January 13, 1916.

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

OPENING OF THE SESSION.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's Secretary announcing that His Royal Highness would proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3 p.m. on this day for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Albert Sévigny, Speaker-elect, said:

May it please Your Royal Highness:

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. —If in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am.

The Honourable the Speaker of the Senate then said:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Royal Highness the Governor General to assure you that your words and actions will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

Then His Royal Highness the Governor General was pleased to open Parliament by a Speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

[Mr. Speaker.]

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

Since I last addressed you the war in which we are engaged has been continued with unabated vigour and varying fortunes.

The Empire's part therein has been amply maintained at sea by the inspiring achievements of the Navy, and on land by the distinguished valour of the great armies which have enrolled themselves in all parts of His Majesty's Dominions for the common defence of our liberties.

In a spirit of splendid loyalty and unfaltering devotion, India and the Overseas Dominions have vied with each other in co-operating with the Mother Country to achieve this great purpose.

The call to service has evoked a widespread and notable response in Canada. Already 120,000 men have crossed the seas, an equal number is now being actively trained and equipped for service abroad, and a call extending the authorized enlistment to half a million men has been received with warm enthusiasm.

At the front our gallant soldiers have met the enemy in repeated contests, and by their pre-eminent courage and heroic endurance have shed lustre upon their country and upheld its highest traditions.

Equally praiseworthy and impressive has been the self-sacrificing and loyal spirit shown by all the Canadian people who have freely dedicated their manhood and substance to the common defence of the Empire.

The life of the present Parliament expires in the autumn of this year, and, under existing legislation a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

That purpose can only be effected through the medium of legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. A resolution authorizing and requesting the enactment of such legislation as will extend the life of this Parliament

for the period of one year will be presented to you.

Measures will be submitted for your consideration to further the effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire and in the maintenance of this war waged for liberty and lasting peace.

It is a matter for profound thankfulness that Providence has blessed the labours of our husbandmen during the past with the most bountiful harvest in the history of Canada.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the last, and the estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted to you without delay, and you will be asked to make the necessary financial provision for the effective conduct of the war.

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

The high courage, the splendid heroism, and the unalterable determination which have marked the united efforts of all portions of His Majesty's Dominions, during a year of unprecedented strain and effort, justify our supreme confidence in the triumph of our cause and in lasting affirmation of the principles of liberty and justice throughout the world. I commend to your earnest consideration the measures which will be submitted to you for aiding in the great purpose, and I pray that the Divine blessing may rest upon your counsels.

On motion of Sir George Foster, it was ordered that the speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Monday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills until disposed of.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I beg leave to move:

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

Motion agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

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

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, Part I, for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Sir George Foster.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. Robert Rogers.

Report of the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Naval Service for the year ended March 31, 1915 (English and French versions).—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Department of Naval Service for the year ended March 31, 1915 (English and French versions).—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries (Marine) for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. W. J. Roche.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 3.50 p.m. until Monday next.

Monday, January 17, 1916.

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

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Address to be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General, I would like to take the opportunity of thanking the Government for according to me this honour, an honour intended, I take it, not so much a personal one as an honour to the constituency which I have the privilege of representing, the farthest north and the farthest west constituency in this great Canada of ours. In common with my predecessors who have been appointed to this

office, I would invoke the grace and charity of the members in respect to my very imperfect address.

Before proceeding further, Sir, permit me to congratulate you upon your elevation to the high office which you at present hold. You are successor to a long line of distinguished men, who have presided over this House with dignity and conducted the affairs with decorum. I was very much pleased the other day to hear the distinguished leader of the Opposition, and the no less distinguished Minister of Trade and Commerce, pay their tribute to those who had held the office which you now fill. They are two of our oldest statesmen, and their testimony as to the manner in which the debates in this House have been presided over by the various Speakers is a tribute indeed to our system of government. I congratulate you, Sir, as the first commoner of Canada.

The proceedings connected with the opening of this House have always interested me. In the routine which we go through, there are many forms which have long since outlived their substance. For instance, that highly ornate and picturesque insignia which is indispensable to the opening of our proceedings, the mace, has evidently, indeed obviously, its prototype in the chieftain's club; and our genial and amiable Sergeant-at-arms is, I have no doubt, the lineal descendant of the armour-bearer. Moving the address itself has always struck me as having something of the dramatic about it. I think it smacks of the stage. In fact, the function I am about to perform is very much a prelude to our national drama; it smacks of a curtain-raiser, if you will. The stage is set, the actors are all in their places, and our great national drama is about to begin once again. And what actors, Mr. Speaker, have appeared on this our national stage since our national life began! What voices have these walls re-echoed, as the destiny of our country has been written by the various men who have sat on the treasury benches from time to time! I fancy that every inflection of the human voice has been heard within these walls during our national history. All honour to the men who have occupied these prominent positions, and all honour to-day to the two leaders of our national parties who are devoting their lives to the work of benefiting their country. These gentlemen do not always see eye to eye, but I believe, and I think the House believes, that each one follows what he believes to be right, and acts according to the light as he sees it. The historian of the future will give each of these distinguished men his proper place in our temple of fame.

I think it is particularly fortunate at this time we have the Duke of Connaught, the warrior statesman, as Governor General at Rideau Hall. He brings to his office the experience gained during a lifetime in the courts of Europe, in the military camps of the Empire, and at the council tables in Britain, in India, in Ireland, and for several years in Canada. His term of office here has been characterized by that prudence, foresight, and judgment which we all admire in our Governor General.

The legislative programme for this session, judging from the speech from the Throne, is rather brief; but although brief it is none the less important. The chief matter which we have to consider is the extension of our parliamentary term. For the first time since Confederation we have decided to pass an address asking the Imperial Parliament to extend the term of our Parliament. I hardly think, Sir, that the proposal needs any defence from any member of the Government, or from any one in this House. The logic of events during the past year and a half is in itself sufficient to warrant our asking the Imperial Parliament to extend our term. The winning of the war, this great world-shaking war, is the overshadowing issue to-day in Canada, as well as in every other part of the British Empire; and, that being so, this Ministry must have an eye single to this great contest; they must be able to devote their energies to this great issue; and it is for the purpose of removing the possibility of an election in the interim between this and the next session of Parliament that an extension of our parliamentary term is desired. I say that this war is such an overshadowing and overwhelming issue that nothing else must be permitted to stand in the way. The Ministry must feel that they have the confidence of the people, and while I believe they have, and they believe they have, I think the time is opportune to give them an extension of their term. If there is any doubt in the mind of any member of the House, or any doubt in the minds of the Ministers, I think that doubt should be removed. In a word, I think they should have absolute freedom of action in order to consecrate their energies to this great question of the war. The load which the Prime Minister and his colleagues have been carrying for the last year and a half has been a huge

load, and the people of Canada are looking to him and his colleagues to continue the carrying of that load until the great victory is won.

According to the consensus of opinion, this is going to be a war of attrition involving a gradual reduction of men, resources, and money. It may be interesting to observe in passing how Canada has stood the awful strain. It is particularly interesting to notice that in almost every department of industry in our country there has been an improvement during the first year of the war. We have had the greatest cereal crop in our history, so great that some people have called it a freak crop. In 1914, the year in which the war broke out, we produced 561,000,000 bushels of cereals, and in 1915 we produced 926,000,000 bushels, or an increase of 364,000,000 bushels of cereals in the first year of the war.

Now, take the value of our cereal, root and fodder crops. In 1914 we produced $638,000,000 worth, whereas the total value of our roots, cereal and fodder crops in 1915 was $845,000,000, an increase of $207,000,000. We have good prices, we have good markets, and our grain is moving to these markets as it never did before. The north Atlantic is freed from the German raiders, British ships are carrying our grain to British ports, and the result is that the Canadian people are doing their full share to support our soldiers at the front and the British people at home.

Our mineral production increased somewhat in 1915 over 1914. The lumber trade in the east was a good deal better in 1915 than in 1914, and it is improving in the West. The only reason why it is not better there to-day than we find it is because dealers cannot get the means of transportation. The conditions surrounding our steel and iron trade are better than they were a year ago, orders are booked ahead, and altogether that important branch of our national industries is in a very thriving condition. Our fisheries have had a good year, so good that the catch has not been equalled, I am informed, for many years. Altogether the wealth which comes from our great national resources seems to have come to us during the past year in an almost unprecedented superabundance.

Added to this, our national revenues are responding to the magic touch of good times. Our domestic expenditures have been cut down without injuring our investments in our great public works. We have to-day throughout Canada comparatively few idle men. Our finances are in excellent shape. Institutions with very large sums invested in mortgage securities report that interest payments are better than they have been for some years past and because of the absence of a normal demand for funds there is a considerable accumulation of ready money.

Recently statements have been issued by the presidents of our leading banks, and in one and all we find a note of optimism. Our deposits are increasing, our circulation is up to its normal level, our railway earnings are going up, and the great investments which we have made in our national railways are bearing fruit. Credits which have been advanced to them by the federal and provincial Governments are being justified by results. The president of the Royal Bank, in addressing the shareholders the other day, made this important announcement:

> The highly creditable way in which Canada has stood the shock and strain of the war for seventeen months has justified the confidence expressed at our last meeting in her ability to weather the crisis. No better demonstration of her resourcefulness and economic stability could be offered to the world. The moratorium acts in some provinces and the suspension of specie payments for bank and dominion notes were the only departures from sound finance, and the latter was a purely precautionary measure. It is truly wonderful to record during such a period of world upheaval that this country has experienced no financial disturbance, a very small increase in failures, and with one exception no permanent default by municipalities; furthermore, that the loan companies report comparatively few arrears of interest on mortgage loans. As a result, the anxiety felt at the beginning of the war has been replaced by a spirit of relief and confidence.

He further says:

> Having turned from a debtor to a creditor nation under the force of urgent necessity, we should strive to make the turning permanent. We now know that we possess the essentials. The question is one of maintaining and increasing our exports by increasing production, and curtailing imports by economy in consumption. The Federal Economic Commission appointed to study these and kindred questions should receive every possible assistance.

He closes with this remarkable statement:

> After three years of liquidation and readjustment, our economic condition is basically sound, and we should try to keep it so.

The Bank of Commerce, the Bank of Ottawa, and many of our other banks have issued similar statements, and altogether the financial aspect of our country, judging from the utterances of the presidents of these institutions, who are eminently in a

position to give us authoritative information upon this subject, seems to be most encouraging, and it is apparent that we have reached the point at which it becomes apparent that good times are coming again. But perhaps a better test than even that is that we have converted a debit balance into a credit balance, that we have become a creditor nation instead of a debtor nation. In the year ended November 1, we sold $153,000,000 worth more than we bought, which I think is a startling fact in our economic history and development. Who would have thought a year ago that we would have been able to finance a domestic loan? Yet during the year our Government decided to make the attempt, and they ventured to ask for a $50,000,000 loan. There was some doubt expressed in the financial world as to whether the people of Canada would subscribe to a loan of that kind, but this doubt was set at rest very early, because, instead of $50,000,000 being subscribed, in a very few weeks the Government were in possession of $100,000,000 of Canadian money for our Government loan. That struck me as a remarkable incident in our economic development.

You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that when the war broke out, this country was borrowing at the rate of $1,000,000 a day, and these borrowings were cut off just as if a tree had been cut off with the axe at its root. The stock exchanges of the world were closed down and no one knew what the collateral was, not even our bank men themselves. But Canada was fortunate in having a Minister of Finance who had the foresight and the courage of the present occupant of that high office to tide us over the financial difficulties of that time. The Government suspended gold payments, a risky thing to do; but they took the risk and they were justified in the results. They did more than that. They used the Government treasury as a rediscount bank for bank paper, and they were justified in the results. On that occasion you remember, Sir, and we all remember, that the financial superstructure of the whole world rocked upon its base, and we had a feeling at that time that Canada, a young country, in the early stages of its economic development, would suffer more than any other country as a result of that dire catastrophe, the declaration of war and its consequences, but in less than a year, Canada righted herself, confidence was restored, credit returned, and our trade balance was reversed. We raised $100,000,000 from our own people for the great war fund in addition to large sums for other patriotic funds. I consider it a magnificent record for Canada at this stage in our development.

To apply the financial and economic test beyond the borders of Canada, let us see how Great Britain has stood the test of this great war, notwithstanding the fact that she is to-day financing so many of the smaller nations of the world. You may issue a currency that will pass when it is restricted within the confines of the country itself, but offer that currency beyond the borders of the country and you will immediately find out what its value is. Apply that test first to the value of the British pound as against the German mark on the New York Stock Exchange. The British pound has gradually increased until now it is very nearly at par value, while for many weeks the German mark has gradually decreased, and in a few weeks' time, if the decrease continues, the German mark on the New York Exchange will be worth just about fifty per cent of what its face value calls for, so that, taking the financial test, whether in Canada or in Great Britain, I feel that at the present time we have stood the test well. This war is a tremendous strain, the greatest strain this Empire has ever been called upon to bear, and I suppose the greatest strain it ever will be called upon to bear, but it is pleasing to note, after a year and a half of this contest, that our financial condition is so splendid.

All this, Mr. Speaker, has been brought about because of this world-wide war, the greatest in the history of the world; but we all like to think in connection with it that we have done our little share; and, taking, not what our own people say we have done, but what others outside of this country say we have done, we need not be ashamed. Our Canadian boys in Flanders have carved out for themselves names in the halls of immortality by their bravery, and their dash, and their intelligent initiative. They have made the name of Canada immortal, as well by laying down their lives and making the supreme sacrifice for the great principles for which we are fighting. We little thought that we could raise such an army as we have done in so short a time, and it is a source of great pride to me, as I know it must be to every member of this House, to feel that the boys from the factories, and the banks, and the farms, and the forests, and the fisheries, after only a very few months of training, went to the very front rank of

the battle line and stood shoulder to shoulder with the Allied veterans and fought victoriously against the veteran legions of Germany and her confederates. The record of St. Julien and Neuve Chapelle and Loos, and many another stricken field will always be to the credit of Canada and her soldiers. I never see the boys passing through Ottawa after being reviewed by the Governor General or the Minister of Militia but I feel that the name of Canada is safe on ever shoulder that bears it.

From a country of peace we suddenly became a country of war; from a country without an army we suddenly raised an army of thirty thousand men. This army was increased to fifty thousand, then to a hundred thousand, and then to a hundred and fifty thousand. We authorized the raising of a quarter of a million men, and another quarter of a million is about to be raised, a wonderful exploit for such a country as Canada.

Comparisons between what one province has done and what another province has done are odious; I do not wish to follow the statistics in regard to that. I just want to say, in a general way, that I am particularly proud of the western provinces between the lakes and the mountains, because they have furnished so many splendid regiments to fight alongside of their brothers from the eastern provinces in this great cause. I feel that the faith of our fathers in that vast country is well justified by the results of to-day, when we consider that a few short years ago, while we had the eastern provinces as the basis of Confederation, the plains west of the lakes were barren, the home of the buffalo and the Indian, with only a few white people beyond the mountain ranges on the Pacific coast. The buffalo trail has given place to the railway, the Indian wigwam to the home of the settler, and to-day great commonwealths have been carved out of those prairies. As a result, when the empire called for assistance, those prairie provinces sent forth their sons in great numbers to fight in this great cause. The province of British Columbia, which a few short years ago was, as someone said, a sea of mountains without enough white people to raise a regiment, has raised a division. The territory I represent, although its population is small, has done its little share; and as time goes on more men will be sent on from there and from the western provinces. The whole of Canada has done well and will do better as time goes on and more men are needed, because our boys are all fighting for the cause we believe in; they are all fighting that the flag which flies above this building shall continue to wave over this vast country of ours.

In regard to the fortunes of the war, we have had our setbacks and disappointments as well as our victories. If we have had Gallipoli, we have also had the Marne. If we have lost Serbia, we have saved the old capital of the Thessalonians, and Saloniki is to-day a great fortress on the Aegean sea, which we trust will yet be of some use in carrying on this war. If we have failed at Bagdad, we have saved Calais, the Gibraltar of the North sea. A ring of steel surrounds our enemy on land and sea, from the Baltic to the Black sea, and from Dixmude to Switzerland. The allied fleet keeps watch and ward from the Skagerrack to the Persian gulf. The Black sea, the Mediterranean sea, the North sea, all the inland seas of Europe, are in the hands of the Allies, except a small portion of the Baltic. More than that, the oceans of the earth are open to us but not to our enemies.

We have had misfortunes in this war, but let us not be discouraged. History tells us that we have had misfortunes in other wars. When the great Duke of Marlborough was in the very midst of his glorious career, he was menaced behind his back by hostile intrigues due to dynastic and party politics; yet he fought great battles and won great victories for the empire. Sir John Moore was attacked for his retreat on Corunna; yet his advance as well as his retreat disarranged Napoleon's plans. The embarkation at Corunna did not end in our defeat in the Peninsular war, nor will the evacuation of Gallipoli end in our defeat in this war. During this war many generals have been changed, but in other wars other generals were changed. Wellington himself at the battle of Vimeiro was superseded by two British generals; He was forced to sign the convention of Cintra, and he was afterwards tried before a parliamentary committee. Yet Wellington fought the marshals of the great Napoleon one after the other and was finally successful over Napoleon himself at Waterloo. Every one knows what a muddle the Crimean war was; even the Boer war was notable for many unfortunate events; but we were not dismayed. We are not dismayed now. History gives us warnings; but it gives us encouragement as well, and we shall be lacking in the wisdom which comes from experience

if we do not take advantage of both. Let us not be dismayed: this war has not been won yet; but the empire remains solid, and our armies are undaunted, and we will fight on until victory is ours.

In this war we are fighting because it is a war of principles, and we believe in the principles that the Allies are fighting for. There are two principles which underlie our Government which are very dear to the people who live under this flag. One is that the primary sovereign power of the state lies in the people, and the second is that no tax shall be taken from any section of these people without the consent of the people themselves. Mr. Speaker, neither of these principles has been lightly won; they have cost much blood and much treasure. It took centuries to bring them to their fulfilment under our governmental institutions. But they are ours. It is only within the last one hundred and fifty years that the second of these principles was firmly planted as a part of the British constitution. It was only after the thirteen New England colonies had become the United States of America that the principle "No taxation without representation" became a part of the British constitution. Search the records of mankind, from the caves of prehistoric man to the pyramids and obelisks of Egypt, down through the centuries, and you will find in these records one continuous story of government by one man or by a few men, but never do you find a record of government by the whole people. The British people were the first among the peoples of the earth to evolve the idea that the power of the state resided in the people themselves. We had republics in ancient times: the cities of Greece were republics, but they were not democracies. Rome was a republic, but not a democracy. And Rome, at Caesar's death, became an empire. And all the countries that are warring to-day in Europe were within that empire, except parts of Russia. The Roman Empire became so great that it required two emperors and two capitals, one at Rome and one at Constantinople. After a varied history both these capitals fell and the Roman Empire was dissolved; and from the fragments of that great empire were erected the world-states of Europe. But of all those world-states, the British people were the one people to evolve the idea of representative governmental institutions. They planted colonies, and the colonists took the same idea with them. To-day, belting this globe, are the colonies and dominions of Great Britain, and the underlying principle in the government of each: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, is, that the people are supreme. We are fighting for this principle; we are fighting because we believe that right is more powerful than might, that the moral sense of a nation is but the aggregate of the moral sense of the individuals of that nation, and that the same moral law which our state expects its citizens to observe shall not be transgressed by the state itself, that there is the same law for the state that there is for the citizen. We do not subscribe to the doctrine that the state is a law unto itself.

Why are we fighting? Because we are a part of the British Empire, and because the Empire as a whole is threatened. Do the people of Canada realize what would happen if the British navy were defeated to-night? Do they realize that they would have to think and think quickly? One of the Roman Emperors, when Rome was at its zenith, said that the people who drank of the Orontes and the Rhone were the same people both belonging to the Roman Empire. The distance between the St. John and the Yukon is vastly greater than the distance between the Orontes and the Rhone, yet we are still the same people. The possibilities of this part of our Empire are wonderful. I was travelling once with Sir Charles Tupper, of revered memory, and I asked him what he thought of our western provinces, and he answered, "My boy, I believe they are to be the home of the race." Bryce, in The American Commonwealth, says that the quadrangle bounded by Hudson's Bay, the Gulf of Mexico, the Alleghenies and the Rocky Mountains is to be the future home of the race. And, judging by the intensive way in which farming is carried on in the older states of Europe, the possibilities of these western provinces of ours as the home of the people of the future, are enormous, for, with our wealth of forest, farm, fisheries and mines, it is possible for a huge population to live within this great Canada of ours.

We are fighting not only for these principles which I have enunciated, but also because we abhor the method of warfare which our enemies pursue. Their philosophers and historians have taught them to make war more terrible by the torch, the gibbet and the misuse of the sword. Our civilization abhors that. I was much struck by the speech recently made by

Mr. Masterman, a member of the British Government at the time of the outbreak of hostilities, as to the reason why Britain is now at war. He said:

> I do not suppose that any body of men ever passed through six such days as we did, sitting continuously with telegrams pouring in from every capital in Europe, and with the clock ticking out the hours, not the days, which remained if peace and civilization were to be continued in the world. During every one of those days there was no thought in the mind of any one of us but that of endeavouring to preserve the peace of the world. We tried this and that, we offered conditions, we asked for conferences, and we pleaded for time, but everything was refused us until finally we were left with this choice—the security or the destruction of the honour of our country. . . . It is not the interest of England that led us into this war, it was the honour of England.

That is why we are fighting to-day; and that is why we shall fight to-morrow, and fight on until, as the Prime Minister has said:

> Belgium has received all and more than all for what she has suffered and all the world will know for all future time that when England makes a promise she keeps it.

Why are we fighting to-day? We have four million men raised by voluntary enlistment in the British Isles; Canada with two hundred thousand under arms, fifty thousand more getting ready to go, and two hundred and fifty thousand more to be enlisted, and every province, city, town, hamlet and countryside contributing its quota. From Cape Breton to the Yukon men have answered the call, and men will come as men are needed. From the island continent of Australia and from New Zealand, what a magnificent response. It is not the fault of our Australasian brothers that the Gallipoli invasion failed. They fought like heroes and the legend of Suvla Bay and Anzac will be emblazoned on their banners for their children to see as synonyms of personal bravery. Is it not an inspiring sight to see the various races coming from the different countries in ships that plough all the seven seas converging upon the home of the Aryan race in Europe to settle this great question of principles? There must be some underlying reason for this magnificent spectacle of the people of England, of Ireland, of Scotland, of South Africa, of New Zealand, of Australia of Canada fighting side by side in this war. The Maoris of New Zealand, the Indians of our own country, the natives of India, the Soudanese, all take their part. Was there ever such a unanimity of will in any nation or empire in the world's history? Never. Why do all religious denominations join with united voices in support of this war? The Mahommedans, the Hindus, the Sikhs, the Parsees, the Buddhists, join with the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Anglicans, the Baptists, the Roman Catholics, the Greek Catholics, and all other Christian communities. Why did the head of the Methodist church telegraph our Prime Minister congratulating him on offering to raise another quarter of a million men? I will answer that question by quoting the words of the head of the Roman Catholic church in Montreal, Archbishop Bruchesi. Speaking to the students of Laval, the Archbishop said:

> Canada being a part of the British Empire, it is the sacred duty of the Canadian people to assist Great Britain in her heroic defence of liberty. . . . It is the solemn duty of every Canadian citizen to the utmost limit of his force, to stand side by side with the motherland in her heroic effort to crush the tyrant who wishes to trample small nations and states beneath his iron heel. What fate would be ours if the Germans obtained a foothold here? Were Great Britain defeated, Germany would secure domination on the St. Lawrence. I, for one, do not want to be a German citizen.

Why is it that this vast concourse of men of so many different races, religions, and climes are going to the front to take part in this struggle and are willing to make, and are making the supreme sacrifice? Why? Because they live under the flag that floats over Parliament Hill. And they have found that wherever that flag waves, there you will find liberty for the individual, security for his life, and safety for his property; there you will find freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press; there you will find the greatest possible freedom compatible with security of the state. And there you will find a state based upon the eternal principles of freedom, justice, and toleration.

Mr. EUGENE PAQUET (L'Islet) (translation): Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to second the motion which has been put before you so eloquently by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson). The honour redounds especially to the electors of the beautiful county of l'Islet, and my most heartfelt thanks go to the right honourable the Prime Minister.

In seconding the motion for an Address in reply to the speech of His Royal Highness, it is my object to rise above partisan considerations, and let myself be prompted by the truly Canadian sentiment of rallying

every member of this House, every citizen of this country, every race, every effort and every sacrifice, to the sacred cause of the safeguarding our national existence.

At the front, our gallant boys are upholding that sacred cause and giving up everything for their country's safety. We, ourselves, must be guided by the same ideals in the consideration of the measures to be laid before us with a view to secure the participation of Canada in the defence of the Empire.

On the floor of this House my hon. friend from the Yukon has expressed himself in his native tongue. I am fortunate in being able to address you in the language of ancestors who lived in the fields and sunny hillsides of France. In so calling your attention to that fact, I wish to point out one of the remarkable qualities of the magnificent Empire which is ours, and acknowledge the freedom we are privileged to enjoy. His Royal Highness has stated:

> Measures will be submitted for your consideration to further the effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire and in the maintenance of this war waged for liberty and lasting peace.

The response my fellow-members will make, and that, I doubt not, of the Canadian people, must be summarized in the following words of Canada's Prime Minister:

> (Text.) More than a twelve month ago our Empire consecrated all its powers and its supreme endeavor to a great purpose which concerns the liberties of the world and the destinies of all the nations.
>
> In the dawn of another year our hearts are more resolute than ever to accomplish that task, however formidable it may prove. By the greatness of the need our future efforts must be measured.
>
> Nowhere is the Canadian spirit more firm and unwavering than among the men who hold the trenches and those who will shortly stand by their side; nowhere is it more undaunted than in the hospitals and convalescent homes.
>
> Already we have learned the full meaning of sacrifice. To all Canadian homes that have been saddened, to all Canadian hearts that have been stricken by the tragedy of this war, we pray that Divine blessing may bring consolation and healing.
>
> Much had to be learned during the past fifteen months because we had not prepared for this war. The strongest assurance of ultimate victory lies in the fact that we were not crushed in learning that hard lesson. Those who forced this war upon as may be assured by the traditions of our past that the lesson will be thoroughly learned to the end that there shall be enduring peace. The very character and greatness of the ideals for which we are fighting forbid us to pause until their triumph is fully assured."

[Mr. Paquet.]

In Canada, as in all allied countries, there is apparently a determination to hold fast, to suffer and to win. Sir William White, the Minister of Finance, who has just been knighted by His Majesty, will urge upon the Canadians new sacrifices for the cause of civilization and freedom, for humanity and our country's sake.

Our desire and determination to win must be persisted in. Otherwise the sufferings of our dead and our wounded would have been in vain. To allow ourselves to hesitate a single instant would amount to ingratitude towards our dead soldiers and treason against our descendants.

In 1912 and 1913, members of the House and certain newspapers scoffed at the idea of a German menace, and ridiculed those who dared mention it. On the 5th of December, 1912, the Prime Minister of Canada, after studying the situation in England with three of his colleagues, and after having been put in possession of state secrets he could not divulge, exclaimed in the House of Commons: "The need is urgent."

The Prime Minister heard then the rumbling of the distant thunder and saw the lightning flashes above the horizon. Sir R. L. Borden further declared:

> The burden is so great that the day has come when either the existence of this Empire will be imperilled or the young and mighty dominions must join with the Motherland to make secure the common safety and the common heritage of all."

With the German peril so clearly shown by Canada's Prime Minister, my only duty lay in giving my support to a Government who took means to secure the safety of the Motherland, while at the same time safeguarding our country's autonomy.

In view of the German atrocities, as I learned about the shooting of priests and the burning and destruction of churches, and shuddered at the awful blood orgies and the most inhuman crimes, will I be blamed for having listened to the Prime Minister's call, as he pointed out the danger?

It would have been treasonable on my part to refuse my support to the Government when it requested of me sacrifices to help maintain peace between the civilized nations.

I have always claimed that it was Canada's duty to defend its own territory and its own liberties. Since the beginning of the war, the country's integrity is imperilled. Shall we wait to see the enemy on our shores? Shall we wait to see the Germans tread Canadian soil?

Before taking up arms would you wait to see the Prussian slaughter your children, ravish your mothers and shoot down your priests? Treason it would be, and I refuse to be a traitor to my country.

It has been left to these times to witness a whole nation, a huge nation, stand up to Heaven and exclaim: I alone, I alone; I am above all nations.

Though Belgium's land, in shameful violation of that country's neutrality, William's army had invaded French soil and in forced marches was pushing towards Paris, its objective. Convinced of their invincible superiority, their hordes hurled themselves against the allied forces with a supreme confidence born of the recollections of Sadowa and Sedan. But the battle of the Marne checked, and repulsed the onset of the German army. Not England it was that desired war. His Majesty George V and his ministers made the most worthy efforts to preserve peace, but they could not agree to the dishonourable proposals of William II, who was violating Belgium's neutrality, spurning thereby the treaty obligations entered into by his predecessor. The Motherland has engaged in the most terrible war the world has ever seen for the purpose of avenging Belgium, of maintaining solemn obligations and in defence of the world's liberties.

The Prussian incentive is a determination to dominate the whole world and crush it under an economical and political tyranny not to be soon shaken off. To that end, the Prussian barons are determined to use the force of arms without being deterred by formal obligations, solemn treaties and by international principles observed through centuries. Their victory would mean the defeat of civilization and the triumph of cynical brutality. Should Germany come out of this conflict victorious, how could she be prevented from putting under her tyrannous domination our own country, the most brilliant jewel in the British crown.

What would become of Canada with Germany master of the world and in a position to dictate her own terms? What of Canada's future unless France and our Motherland did raise over Germany the sword of justice?

Who can say?

Listen to the words uttered at Vancouver on the 15th of August, 1915, by the honourable the Postmaster-General:

(Text.) It is a war in which we are deeply interested. It is as much Canada's war as England's war. It is your fight, it is my fight, it is the fight of every free citizen of this country, and let me again repeat that, speaking to you as one of the Ministers of the Crown, I have this message to give to you: We will leave no effort untried, no resource untouched, no nerve unstrained, before we have done the very utmost in this struggle in which the life of the Empire and the liberty and free institions of Canada are at stake. Then only will our task be accomplished.

(Text.) It is our duty, more pressing upon us than all other duties, at once, on this first day of this extraordinary session of the Canadian Parliament, to let Great Britain know, and to let the friends and foes of Great Britain know, that there is in Canada but one mind and one heart, and that all Canadians stand behind the mother country, conscious and proud that she has engaged in this war, not from any selfish motive, for any purpose of aggrandisement, but to maintain untarnished the honour of her name, to fulfil her obligations to her allies, to maintain her treaty obligations, and to save civilization from the unbridled lust of conquest and domination.

The Canadian people have been consulted in the most solemn manner. The call to the colours has assembled from the Atlantic to the Pacific 240,000 sons of Canada, full of patriotism and firmly convinced that they were fulfilling a national duty.

Without compulsion, our brethren take part in the conflict in order to ensure its victorious issue, and to secure the maintenance and unity of the British Empire, which Empire they feel sure shelters and safeguards Canada's autonomy.

With all of you, I pay my tribute to our fallen heroes. The Canadians who were killed on the battlefields of Saint-Eloi, Langemark and Festubert have won undying fame. They have given their blood to become our saviours.

In the province of Quebec, church and state are united in their support of the Allies' cause. We have heard the noble words uttered by the political leaders of French origin. You have all witnessed the noteworthy stand taken by our bishops. They assembled and prepared a most cordial endorsation of the attitude of England and France.

Hear now what says the episcopacy of the province of Quebec:

It cannot be ignored that this conflict, one of the most terrible it has ever been given the world to witness, cannot fail to have its repercussion in our own country. Great Britain is involved and who can deny that the fate of all parts of the Empire is bound in the issue of its struggle?

Rightly Great Britain looks to our help and that help, we are glad to say, has been generously offered in both men and money.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the hon. member for the Yukon translated in his own language an extract from an address delivered on the 7th of January last at Laval University, in Montreal, by Mgr. Bruchesi, Archbishop of Montreal, touching certain events in the province of Quebec. I believe it is my duty, also, to quote those words in my native language:

Nous sommes une colonie de l'Angleterre et dès lors, si l'Angleterre était défaite, la première proie de l'Allemagne serait le Canada. Or, nous ne voulons pas être allemandes. C'est pourquoi nous devons faire notre possible, puisque le sort du Canada est lié aux armes anglaises.

We are a British colony and hence, should Great Britain be defeated, Germany's first prey would be Canada. But we have no desire to become Germans. Wherefore we must do our utmost, since Canada's fate depends upon the success of the British arms.

At the beginning of the war the bishops made a study of the situation. No dogma or morals were under consideration, but a guidance had to be given.

That guidance the bishops of the Province of Quebec have indicated. In a letter published throughout the country, they have stated that Canada's duty was to help Great Britain and have congratulated the Canadians on the sacrifices already made. The bishops have not since altered their views.

In this war, Canada is not directly attacked, but it is so indirectly. The country is threatened and we must see to its defence. Nor have we failed in our duty. The Minister of Militia bears witness to the fact. Our young men have come forward in large numbers voluntarily. There has been no conscription and I hope the question will never be mooted in this country.

Our youth are enthusiastic. They are ready to shed their blood in the service of two causes: papacy and humanity. At this juncture, it is humanity that calls for defenders, and our brave children have rushed to the defence of liberty. Such was their motive in coming forward and such is to-day the inspiration that keeps them in the trenches over in France.

The Province of Quebec, and the French-Canadians, fully realizing the importance of the gigantic struggle and its meaning, have done their duty. The French-Canadians have recruited and are still recruiting regiments which will ever march where honour leads.

Among those who are taking a glorious part in the war are to be found descendants of some of our heroes. The recent address of Sir Sam Hughes at Toronto vindicates us from many calumnies. He is aware of the untiring ardour of my gallant fellow-people, and has given our race its due, and I must thank him for it.

On many solemn occasions, the Quebec members of the Canadian Parliament have asked the majority of this house and the majority of the citizens of this country to give recognition to the most sacred rights of the French-Canadian minority.

We, French-Canadians, know and appreciate the value and the sacredness of minority rights. So it is with a feeling of pride that I see my compatriots respond, nobly to the call of the flag and to the help of England and France who are now fighting together for the defence of the rights of minorities and of lesser nations.

The thrilling ardour with which our sons march forward to the battlefront is inspired by their wish to keep intact the right to their language, their faith, their institutions and the heritage of their forefathers. To my French-Canadian compatriots belonging to the minority I appeal. I ask them to answer with loyalty the call of His Royal Highness and rush to the front because the Motherland is fighting for the freedom and independence of nations; for the respect of treaties and the sacredness of international obligations, for the defence of smaller peoples, and of minorities, for international loyalty and the upholding of the noblest sentiments that distinguish mankind.

The Government is in duty bound to take immediately extraordinary measures for the defence of Canada. His Royal Highness states:

The life of the present Parliament expires in the autumn of this year, and, under existing legislation, a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

That purpose can only be effected through the medium of legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. A resolution authorizing and requesting the enactment of such legislation as will extend the life of this Parliament for the period of one year will be presented to you.

As a French Canadian, belonging to the minority, I realize fully how careful we must be before asking for any alteration, even temporary, of the British North America Act.

Only on account of the exraordinary circumstances created by this terrible war do

I feel justified in replying favourably to the wishes of His Royal Highness.

The Government's aim is to safeguard the rights of Canadian democracy. Moreover all patriotic Canadians of different political parties declare that they are closely at one with the aims of the Dominion Government. The statesmen who wield the destinies of Canada have reason to fear the turmoil and confusion which a general election might bring about. Order and peace reign in the country. In order that the nation's spirit may be kept sufficiently alert to cope with present events, that discord may disappear and dissensions be forgotten, that all hearts become as a single heart, there is need for the constant and sacred union of all Canada's sons in the one love of the Motherland. On the 4th day of August, 1914, all resolves have been blended into one resolve. In the soul of every true Canadian, there remained nothing of the fierce feuds of former days. Would it be wise by calling a general election to once more stir up those quarrels while there still lasts the terrible struggle which requires so strenuous sacrifices? One result of elections might be to diminish the amount of the war contributions, which have been flowing until now with such a magnificent generosity.

The different patriotic funds raised with the generous help of the Federal Government, the provincial governments, the municipalities and benevolent citizens, might be sorely affected.

For those reasons, and with a view to the unity and greatness of my country, and in order to help our oppressed fellowmen to maintain or regain their freedom and independence, I willingly and heartily give my support to the proposed legislation, the principle of which seems to me to be admitted in the Motherland.

Throughout the world this European war has brought about a financial stringency almost without precedent; but in Canada special circumstances have so far relieved the situation.

Our financial institutions, thanks to a prudent, skilful and enlightened direction, have avoided economic disasters. If it be just to admit the wise management of our captains of industry, so must we grant the Government the legitimate part they may claim to have had in the prudent administration of the country. The Government deserves congratulations for successfully negotiating the war loan of fifty millions ($50,000,000). The ready response of the public, who subscribed over a hundred millions, is significant of our prosperity.

This national loan is a remarkable turning point in the economic history of Canada. Our most perspicuous men of finance face the situation with a notable optimism.

The extraordinary expansion of our export trade and the decrease of our foreign purchases have turned in our favour the balance of external commerce, which we heretofore had to liquidate with loans amounting to several millions a year.

War industries are giving Canadian trade an unexpected boom and a greater value to our natural resources.

Commercial victory must crown the victory of our glorious soldiers.

The Dominion Government is concentrating its best efforts on the productive capacity of the soil. A year ago the Department of Agriculture appealed to the citizens of Canada to devote all their energies and efforts to the great cause so as to supply the needs of the war. This same department has organized in the Province of Quebec a campaign of patriotic endeavour and increased production.

The success of this campaign may, in a large measure, be attributed to the enlightened co-operation of the clergymen of our province. Heaven smiled on our efforts and we were blessed with the most abundant crop this country has ever produced.

The Government took an important step when it established, in October, 1915, a commission of enquiry concerning our agricultural resources. While our boys are bringing us honour on the firing line, our duty is to unite in order to develop our natural resources, increase our production, seek new markets for our products, and secure the markets which the enemy have lost, so as to assure the prosperity of Canada.

In concluding, I wish to express the regret we feel at the decease of several of the members of this House. All honour to the members of Parliament who have enlisted for active service.

Our colleagues in the field of hostilities, or in the prisons of Germany, are fighting for our liberties and deserve our admiration.

Let us also pay a tribute to the British sailors, who have borne themselves with bravery, upholding the ancient and noble traditions of England's navy.

In clearing the seas of the enemy they have rendered an immense service to Canada, to the Empire, and to humanity.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to second the motion in favour of the address.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, all those present in this Chamber must certainly have appreciated the tone and style of the addresses to which it has been their pleasure to listen this afternoon. The speech of my hon. friend from Yukon (Mr. Thompson) certainly reached a high level of patriotic eloquence. The matter contained in those addresses, if I may say so without being invidious, calls for some observations, which, however, I shall forego for the present, as they may be dealt with more fittingly when we come to discuss the two or three measures which are announced in the speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General.

I wish, at the outset, to emphasize the thanks and gratitude we owe to Providence for the bountiful harvest with which we have been blessed this year. The farmer, like all other workers, has to depend chiefly upon his own exertions; but, more than any other worker, has he to depend upon the elements. A little more rain or a little less rain, a little more sunshine or a little less sunshine, may to him mean the difference between disaster and success. This year it would seem that the elements have been particularly favourable; it would seem that the farmer held the key to the winds and the clouds, and obtained exactly the measure that he desired. It would seem, too, as if kind Providence, in order to atone for man's inhumanity to man, designed to compensate the farmer for that loss which he has had to suffer through being denied that profitable market which he has long sought in vain from this Government.

The bountiful harvest has been an offset for sore disappointment in every direction. We meet again under the shadow of the disastrous war in which we have been engaged for something like eighteen months —a shadow which seems to be darker now than it was in the month of April last, when Parliament prorogued. At that time our souls were full of hope that the campaign just then opening would see the advance of the allied forces upon the territory of the enemy. No one expected that in the year 1915 we would see the end of the war, but all expected that we would see the beginning of the end. All these hopes were doomed to disappointment; we are bound to say that our expectations, high as they were, have been sadly unfulfilled. On the western front the conditions are exactly the same as they were in the month of April last. Though we may say with pride that the allied forces have won notable victories—victories in which our Canadian boys, young as they were, fought like veterans—on some occasions saved the day —and filled Canadian hearts with legitimate pride; still we must admit—and we know only too well that it is true—that the Allies have failed to pierce the line of the enemy and to commence their march towards the Rhine. On the eastern fronts our disappointments have been greater. There our Russian allies have lost positions which they at first attained. They have lost Galicia and Poland; their soil was invaded by the enemy, and similar fears were held for Petrograd as were held in the early stages of the war for Paris. In the Balkans there was a noble resistance to the advance of the enemy, but no victory. Though in these circumstances there are causes for disappointment, there is no cause for alarm or discouragement, for this reason: the successes and victories of the German army have never been complete victories; they have been merely Pyrrhic victories, and there are signs not a few that both in morale and numbers the strength of the German forces, as compared with that of the allied forces, is decreasing day by day, and that in the not distant future the Allies shall at last be able to assume the offensive.

The only complete victory which has been won during the war has been won by the British navy. It is true that there has been no general engagement; but as regards what has been accomplished and is being accomplished every day by the British navy, I recall the words of the soldiers of Napoleon in the campaign of 1805, who used to say that their Emperor won battles without fighting and simply by marches and counter-marches. In the same way Admiral Jellicoe has been able to accomplish victories without any engagement and simply by patrols and by watches he has succeeded in keeping the German fleet isolated, impotent, imprisoned in its own waters; just as useless for the German cause as if it had been sent to the bottom of the sea. The British navy has kept the sea open to the trade of the Allies almost as effectively as in the times of peace. If, as is suggested in the speech from the Throne, more sacrifices will be required in order that we may reach complete and final victory, it may be well that we should assert again, at the opening of this session, the attitude which

we on both sides of the House have maintained and the attitude which we on this side of the House do intend to maintain. When the war broke out, both parties in this House agreed that it was the duty of the Canadian people to participate in the war to the fulness of our resources. That decision, made on the floor of this Parliament by both sides of the House, was unanimously ratified by the Canadian people. No, I must make an exception to that. The ratification was not unanimous. There has been a minority which has always protested against our attitude, and that minority is the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, who took the position from the start that it was a crime for the Canadian people to participate in this war. Not only did they use that strong language, but again and again in the Nationalist press they have asserted, and still assert, that we have taken our present position simply because we bow, servilely bow to the imperious dictation of the British authorities.

Sir, I hold no brief for the Government; but I have been fifteen years in office and I know the nature of the relations between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian authorities, and I say that there is no foundation for such an assertion—and I know whereof I speak. I know that I speak the truth. I know that I speak nothing but what is common intelligence to any man who knows the institutions under which we live when I say that there was on the part of the British authorities no command, no demand, no request. The offer of the Government was spontaneous, the ratification of the Parliament of Canada was deliberate. What we have done we have done in the full power of our legislative independence under the constitution which we hold from the British Parliament. What we have done we have done deliberately, voluntarily, not from any sentiment of compulsion, but because we thought that, as British subjects, as men who had been enjoying and still enjoyed, the benefit of British freedom, we owed it to ourselves to make sacrifice of our treasure, and of our blood, in order to maintain British institutions and freedom in the world. Such is the spirit of British institutions, such is the lofty character of the constitution under which we live, that not even the King of England, not even the Parliament of England has the right to order a single soldier to go out of Canada, or to take a dollar from the treasury of Canada. We are a free people, and I am sure that I express the sentiments of all Canadians worthy of the name when I say, that it is as free men that we have gone into this conflict and are continuing in it. It is not, however, to be supposed, that in coming to this conclusion on the floor of this Parliament, we were all impelled by the same motives.

Seldom, if ever, in any deliberate assembly, when a decision has to be reached upon any important question, is the problem approached from the same point of view by all the members of that assembly and a decision reached from the same standard. On this very question of our participation in the wars of Great Britain there has been between my right hon. friend on the other side and myself a line of cleavage. My right hon. friend has often asserted that the moment Great Britain was at war it was the duty of the Canadian people not only to defend their territory if attacked —and that goes without saying—but to send our forces wherever Britain was called upon to fight; whereas I have always taken the position that in such circumstances it was for the Canadian Parliament to decide whether or not Canada would participate and the extent of her participation. I have claimed for the Canadian Parliament the same rights absolutely as those which exist in the Parliament of the Motherland. If to-day I recall this line of cleavage it is not for the purpose of resurrecting a discussion on it—this is not the time nor the occasion for that, although the time and the occasion may come when the Canadian Parliament may have to decide that question one way or the other—but Sir, if to-day I recall this line of cleavage it is to show the inanity of the reproach of servility which is levelled at us in my own native province. Servility is a big word, it is a loud sounding expression; but there may be servility and servility. There may be and often is servility to a master; there may be and there is servility to passion and prejudice. And if to-day there is servility anywhere it is not with those who have taken the attitude which we have maintained, and will maintain in this House, but it is with those who, blinded by passion and prejudice, would deny us the liberty of being humane and generous, would deny us the liberty of following the instincts and the promptings of our minds, and our hearts, and our consciences; would deny us the liberty, when we see France threatened with dismemberment, when we

see Belgium actually under the foot of the conqueror, of helping in the defence of France and of Belgium. It is not because they hate France, it is not because they hate Belgium, but because we cannot in this way help France or help Belgium without at the same time helping England. Sir, the case of France and the case of Belgium is the case of England. The case of England is the case of Belgium and of France. Away with such sophistry. It is nothing but an attempt to conceal the aridity of empty hearts. But, that is not all. These men also tell us that we may be fighting for an idea, as they say, and we may be fighting for the fate of the Empire, as they say, but that Canada has no direct or material interest in this war. And, every day we read in their press that if Germany were to triumph it would be of no material injury to Canada, that Canada would remain just in the position that Canada is in to-day. Canada, no interest in this war! Sir, I take a very different attitude; I take issue with that statement, and I not only assert that Canada has a direct interest in this war, but I go much further and I say that there is not to-day a civilized nation in the world which has not an interest in this war. Should Germany triumph there would be nations that would rue the day of their indifference and supineness. After all, what is Germany fighting for? For what has she deluged with blood the continent of Europe? Is it not, as has often been stated, for the purpose of world domination? The book published by the French Government on this point some months ago is most instructive. It contains a memorandum of the German staff of date March, 1913, in which it is avowed in so many words that the object of Germany is to dominate the whole civilized world. I may not quote at length, but let me quote just this one sentence which I translate from the French:

> Neither the ridiculous howlings of the French Chauvinists for revenge nor the gnashing of teeth of the English nor the feverish antics of the Slavs shall deter us from our aim which is to fortify and extend Deutschsthum (which means German domination) over the whole world.

And on top of that there is in the book another despatch from the French Ambassador at Berlin, M. Cambon, which further illustrates what I have just stated. M. Cambon, on November 13, writes to his Government in these words:

> I have from an absolutely reliable source the tenor of a conversation which the Emperor had with the King of Belgium in presence of the chief of staff, General Moltke, about two weeks ago, a conversation which as it would seem vividly struck King Albert.
>
> Nor am I surprised at his impression for it corresponds to that which has been for some time forcing itself on me, viz., hostility against us is becoming more deeply accentuated and the Emperor has ceased to be favourable to peace.
>
> The interlocuter of the Emperor of Germany, as everybody else, up to that time had believed that William II, whose personal influence had at several critical periods, been thrown on the side of peace was still of the same mind. This time he found him completely changed.
>
> In the course of that conversation the Emperor seemed nervous and irritable.
>
> The weight of advancing years is commencing to tell upon William II, and the traditions of his family, the retrograde sentiments of the Court, and above all the restlessness of the militarists, more deeply affect his mind.
>
> Perhaps also he frets at the growing popularity of his son, who caters to the passions of the pan-Germanists, and does believe that the situation of the empire in the world is not equal to its power.
>
> If I were to conclude I would say that we must be prepared for this new fact, that the Emperor is being reconciled to a conception of things which was previously repugnant to him.

There is the origin of the war. The military party at last prevailed upon the Emperor, and thus the world was plunged into that awful catastrophe. What would be the consequences of a German defeat? If the Germans are defeated the world may look for an era of peace, or disarmament, and of an approach to the ideal condition, the brotherhood of man. But what if Germany were to win? Germany cannot have a complete victory—as to that, it seems to me there cannot be a shadow of doubt. To triumph, Germany has to crush England, to crush France, to crush Russia and to crush Italy, and that is an impossible task. The only problem in my mind is as to the extent of our victory. If we had only half a victory, then Germany would be humiliated, but would still be defiant. She would continue her armaments, and then the other nations would have to follow suit. She would be preparing and arming, and even on this continent, Sir, we would not escape the vortex of European militarism. This, therefore, is our interest in the war; this is the justification of our course. Our action has not been based upon the sophistry which we have heard in the Nationalist press; our action has been based upon the primary condition that we must be free, or that we must lose our freedom. Upon that our choice has been made.

The speech from the Throne announces that we shall have measures to enable the Government to carry on the war. My right

hon. friend the Prime Minister has the first day of this year issued a statement that he was prepared to offer 500,000 men. I shall not to-day discuss whether or not the premature statement of my right hon. friend was exactly on the lines of parliamentary government. I put aside all these questions on such a day as this. I understand that we shall have a statement made upon the offer of 500,000 men, which it seems to me is a large contract, but, again, upon this I pass no judgment. I shall be prepared, and my friends around me will be prepared to listen to, and to discuss in the spirit in which all such propositions should be discussed, the proposition which the Government deems essential to carry on the fight in which we are engaged. But let me say—and I believe that upon this we should have an expression of opinion—that we must repel at once the impression which has been sought to be created that this offer is a preliminary step to conscription. There is to be no conscription in Canada. Sir, there has been an attempt made for many years to frighten the people with the spectre of conscription. There are some men in this House, as you know, who in the elections of 1911 stated that the enactment of the naval law was a prelude to conscription. There are men in the province of Quebec who have been asserting that the moment conscription was adopted in Great Britain, conscription would be adopted or proposed in Canada. The naval law has been for six years on the statute book. It is still there; it has not been repealed, as many members in this House were pledged to repeal it. It is there, and there is yet no conscription. Conscription has come in England, but conscription is not to come in Canada. So far as conscription in England is concerned, it would be in bad taste, nay, it would be impertinent for us to attempt to pass any remarks, either of approval or of disapproval with regard to it. For my own part I am free to say that I expected that Great Britain would be able to carry on this stupendous war under her old system of voluntary enlistment. The British Government have thought otherwise; they have thought that the magnitude, the stupendous magnitude of the war we have to face, compelled them to resort to conscription, and the step taken by the government seems to meet with the approval of the great majority of the English people. But, Sir, the conditions are not the same in Canada as in Great Britain. The reasons why there can be no conscription in Canada are obvious. Apart from any other, one paramount reason, which is on top of all the others, is that we could not adopt conscription in Canada without giving a severe blow to our policy of immigration. If we are to pass successfully through the period which is to follow the war, and face the enormous debt which we are accumulating, the enormous expenditure which we are assuming, the best way to do it is to have a wise and broad policy of immigration so as to develop our resources. But if it were to be known that conscription existed in Canada, it would, I repeat, deal a severe blow to our hopes in that respect. Why, the very thought of conscription has had a detrimental effect on our settlements in the Northwest.

My attention has been called to a letter published in the New York American of December 26, in which the following statement from a correspondent in Omaha appears:

> Five or six years ago a hundred thousand of Iowa and Nebraska's finest young farmers broke away from their homes and went into Western Canada to take up homesteads and make their fortunes.
>
> And now these same young men are simply falling over themselves to get back to the old farms in the American west. Hundreds of them are passing through Omaha every week. Some walked across the border—sneaked their way across, in fact, because they feared they would not be permitted to leave Canada.
>
> Others purchased round-trip railroad tickets and showed the return portion as proof that they were going into the "States" on a visit only. Some had a little cash when the time came for them to get out of the Dominion, but others were forced to write back to the "old folks" for money with which to pay their way back to the old farm. They are all fleeing from threatened conscription.

When I read that I took some measures to obtain confirmation or information regarding it. I must say that my information, while not complete, has satisfied me that the statement is very much exaggerated. That there is some foundation for it I believe, but I do not think the movement has assumed such proportions as are here indicated. At all events, there is enough to show that it is important that we should have at once from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister an authoritative statement upon this point.

But, Sir, while the bogey of conscription can be easily disposed of, the same cannot be said of the financial consequences which

must follow this war. We are piling up expenditures and debts which would be alarming were it not for the wonderful resources of this country. Wonderful and varied as the resources of this country are, there is still every necessity for the wisest and most rigid economy in every branch of the service, and in this connection I have some fault to find with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) for the estimates which he brought down last year. I say to him to-day that in my judgment he should have cut off from these estimates $20,000,000 to $30,000,000, and I think he could have done it with perfect ease. On public works, chargeable to income, there is provision for an expenditure of $22,000,000, and if we analyse these figures we will find that the expenditure is for post offices, public buildings, postal stations, drill halls and armories, all expenditures of a kind for buildings which are in the nature of luxuries. Such expenditures, in time of peace, are perfectly allowable if the revenue is adequate, but in time of war I say to my hon. friend that all sorts of expenditure ought to be rigidly cut off, and that the budget should be limited to the barest necessities, and to the ability of the treasury to carry on the government.

I am sorry that in the speech of His Royal Highness no mention is made of any intention of cutting down expenditure to the greatest possible degree. I have been in office myself and I know the importunities that are put upon ministers for this kind of expenditure—post offices, postal buildings, drill halls, armories, and so on. Every member is anxious to favor in that way the constituency which he represents. I repeat that in time of peace such expenditures are allowable, but in time of war we must preach to the Canadian people the necessity of economy, not only in the public service, but in respect to private expenditures also. Upon this point we might well take a leaf out of the book of the British authorities, who have, since the beginning of the war, never ceased to represent to the British people the necessity of cutting off all luxuries and keeping expenditures to the bare necessities of life so long as we are at war. That is one of the sacrifices which we have to make in order to attain the great object we have in view. It is not yet too late, and I hope that when my hon. friend presents his estimates this year we will find that he has been preparing for us a pleasant surprise.

I was also disappointed when I saw no mention in the speech from the Throne of a transaction which took place during the recess, a transaction which was abnormal, and which, because it was abnormal, should have been brought to the attention of the House. I refer to the incident which occurred on the 27th November last, when the Government took forcible possession, by forced sale, of all the wheat which was in the elevators at the head of lake Superior and eastward. In times of war the Government has a right for military necessity to exercise such an abnormal power. That power has been exercised during this war—in France, I believe, if nowhere else—but certainly in France. But upon every occasion when such an abnormal power has been exercised it has always been with the sole object, where there was scarcity of a commodity, of keeping that commodity for the people and to prevent it from being exported abroad, thereby enhancing the price. But that is not the reason in this case. If the Government had commandeered the wheat which was in the elevators at the head of lake Superior, when they took some 17,000,000 bushels, such action was not taken on account of any scarcity. As was announced in the speech from the Throne, we never have had such a crop as we had last harvest. We are told, and correctly told, that the wheat crop last year amounted to 330,000,000 bushels. Out of 330,000,000 bushels the Government have resorted to this extraordinary measure of commandeering 17,000,000 bushels. For what reason? The reasons were given two days afterwards. The commandeering took place on the 27th November, and on the 29th November all the press published the following:

Official Government Statement.

Ottawa, November 28.—The following official statement was issued by the government to-night:

'The phenomenal crop of wheat in the Canadian west has brought upon the government the duty of assisting to the farthest extent possible in its marketing. The supply of wheat the world over is known to have been abundant, and the importance of taking advantage of every opportunity to provide for the disposing of our grain is on that account the greater. For many months the government has been in touch with the British authorities with a view to procuring orders from the United Kingdom and the allied governments in order that the utmost share of the consuming demand in those countries may be turned towards our Canadian surplus. As a consequence of this, the British Government has requested the Canadian Government to provide within a short time a very large supply of No. 1, No. 2 and No 3 Canadian northern wheat.'

The reason given is that the Government were so acting at the request of the British authorities. Now, the day following, strange to say, the press had an announcement from Great Britain to the effect that there had been no such demand from the British authorities. The following appeared in the press of Canada on the 30th November:

'The official press bureau made the following statement yesterday:

'With reference to the announcement from Ottawa on November 28, that the Canadian Government had commandeered 16,000,000 bushels of wheat at the request of the British Government, the Board of Agriculture state that the British Government have made no such request, and that at present they have no information on the subject.'

There is something extraordinary in this, and it is a most surprising fact that from the 30th November to the present day no attempt has been made to explain this discrepancy. I have seen statements in the press—not official, however, because the Government has not made them—to the effect that the wheat has been commandeered for the allied nations. Which nations? Great Britain? No; we have the information that Great Britain did not make such a request. Russia? Certainly not; Russia does not want our wheat; she is a large exporter of wheat. France? I am told on pretty good authority that the French Government have already taken measures to buy wheat in Canada, not through the intervention of the Canadian Government, but through the ordinary channels of trade. I am told, but of this I have no positive information—I may be wrong, but I have it on authority which I consider respectable—that some of the wheat which was commandeered, and which was in the elevators at the head of lake Superior, already belonged to France and had been purchased for the French Government.

Possibly this wheat may be intended for the Italian Government; but, Sir, if the wheat were bought for any of these governments, why did we not have an official statement as we had on the 30th of November in regard to the British Government? I firmly believe that the Allied nations are buying wheat to-day in Canada—not a paltry 17,000,000 bushels, but perhaps hundreds of millions of bushels—and they are doing it through the ordinary channels of trade. If the Allied nations wanted wheat from Canada, why were the ordinary channels of trade not made use of? Why was the trade disturbed as it was? Why was this dislocation of business allowed? This is a mystery which has not been explained up to the present time. There is no doubt whatever that the action of the Government has had the effect—which should have been anticipated, whatever may be the motive behind it—of dislocating business and of interfering with interests existing at the head of lake Superior. It has been stated by the millers that they were put back in their operations, and they flocked to Ottawa in order to get redress. They obtained redress and the wheat that belonged to the millers was unmolested. Then the transaction was reviewed by some of the business men; and one of the largest operators on the lakes, Mr. Richardson of Kingston, is reported to have spoken as follows, according to the Ottawa Free Press of November 30:

'The wheat could easily have been purchased on the open market,' said Mr. Richardson, of Kingston, this morning. 'It was not necessary to take such drastic action.'

'How could the grain have been purchased by the government without artificially boosting the prices?' Mr. Richardson was asked.

'By the use of brains,' Mr. Richardson curtly replied. 'The government bought oats at a time when there was a scarcity in Great Britain. They went about it quietly and succeeded in purchasing a large amount without boosting the prices. I myself bought two and a half millions of Du ham wheat when there was only four millions available. I didn't advertise the fact and managed to make its purchase without prices being raised. It wasn't necessary to throw the whole grain and flour trade into a turmoil by taking the drastic action taken.'

'Seventeen million bushels of the wheat taken was contracted for,' continued Mr. Richardson, 'and no compensation is to be given for that.'

Here is the important part:

No man will be sure of a contract in the future, for nobody knows when a similar action is going to be sprung at any time later. However, it is done, and can't be undone.

I make no charge—I never make any charge until the fact has been shown to me, and then I can judge for myself whether a transaction is right or wrong—I make no charge to-day, but I say to the Government that their action has given rise to suspicions. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) resented those suspicions, and he wrote a rather irate letter to the Ottawa Citizen to protest the purity of his intentions. I make no charge against my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce or against anybody else, but it is his own fault if it has been supposed that in that pile of wheat there is an Ethiopian concealed. The

Government should have been more diligent in giving information and in putting the whole facts before the House. My hon. friend would have done justice had he stated in the speech from the Throne: My Government has commandeered a certain quantity of wheat; we need it for such and such reasons, and the whole correspondence will be placed upon the table of the House. That has not been done, but it must be done. I repeat:

5 p.m.

at the present time I make no charge against any one, because I have not the facts before me, but I must insist upon having all the particulars brought to the attention and knowledge of the House. If the transaction is, as I hope it may prove to be, perfectly honest and above board, it will be my duty to say so; but if it is not, then it shall be my duty to say the reverse.

At the opening of this session of the Parliament of Canada, we on this side of the House, His Majesty's loyal Opposition, feel that we should declare that we are perhaps more than ever before imbued with the responsibility which appertains to an opposition, and especially in time of war. It will be our duty to criticise: to criticise fairly under all circumstances, and to criticise forcibly perhaps, but always to criticise wherever there is cause for criticism. It will also be our duty, and a far more pleasant duty it is, to support whatever there is just cause to support. We come to this House with this one aim only: to contribute as far as may be in our power to the final and complete victory of the Allies over Germany. Our supreme aspiration is that Belgium shall again be free and as prosperous as she was, if that be possible, in view of the awful destruction she has suffered. It is our aim also, that France shall recover her lost territory and her natural boundaries restored to her, and that old England shall retain, unimpaired and undiminished and as glorious as ever, her prestige and her power in the world. It is our aim that both England and France shall resume, as early as possible, their onward march towards the future enfranchisement of the human race from the shackles of passion and prejudice; that a renovated German democracy may be triumphant, and that the German people, sobered from their dreams of conquest and domination may return to the instincts of peace and benevolence which at one time characterized their race.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, let me in the first place congratulate you, Sir, upon your election to the Speakership of this House; and, in expressing those congratulations, may I be permitted also to express my confidence that you will discharge the duties of that high office in a manner worthy of its highest traditions. I join with my right hon. friend in congratulating the mover and the seconder upon the very eloquent, patriotic and earnest speeches to which we have listened this afternoon—speeches which express, indeed, the united spirit of the Canadian people with regard to the situation which Canada, as one of the great nations in this Empire, is presently called upon to face.

Since we last met some of our colleagues who sat with us in this House have passed away. One of these was the Hon. Samuel Barker, who represented Hamilton East. Mr. Barker had been a member of this House for about fifteen years. He was a man with whom I had very intimate association and upon whose counsel and aid I have many a time depended. He did not speak often in this House, but when he did address us it was as one well acquainted with the subject he undertook to discuss. Those who knew him only within the last four or five years did not fully realize the great energy and ability he brought to the discharge of his public duties in the earlier years of his parliamentary career.

Another member who has passed away is Mr. Lancaster. He entered the House, I believe, in the same year as Mr. Barker. Mr. Lancaster was a man of very earnest purpose and very strong convictions, which he expressed with great frankness and force. All of us have greatly regretted that during the past few years his health was clearly failing. We shall all pay tribute to his memory as one having an earnest and even intense desire to perform his duty as a public man and to serve the interests of the people in every possible way.

We mourn also the death of Mr. Reid, who represented Restigouche. My personal acquaintance with him was not so intimate as with the others of whom I have spoken. He did not often address the House. He deserved and received the respect and confidence of his fellow members.

A fourth member has passed away since we last met in the person of Mr. Richards, who represented Prince, P.E.I. He was a very genial, kindly man, one who made us feel that, whatever his party feelings might

be, there was back of all a warm and sympathetic nature.

I am sure that both sides of the House will join with me in expressing to the families and relatives of our four late colleagues our very sincere sympathy and condolence.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has not been very critical in his remarks to-day. He has chided us a little for one or two matters to which I may be pardoned for devoting a moment's attention. He spoke of the large estimates of last session. The estimates were not greatly cut down last session, but they were left there with the distinct understanding, if I recollect correctly, that no new works should be undertaken during the pendency of this war, unless they were of the most urgent and imperative character. That policy has absolutely been carried out from the commencement of the war until the present time. We have undertaken no new works whatever, so far as I remember. All members of this House are as much impressed as is my right hon. friend with the necessity for strictest economy during this war. They can fully realize that in addition to beginning no new works we have had to consider from time to time whether it might not be in the public interest even to discontinue the construction of works already under contract. Fortunately the financial strength of this country has proven so great that up to the present time it has not been necessary to resort to such a course. But I desire to say that if, in the urgency of conditions as they may be pressed upon this country in the future it should be necessary for us to take that course, the Government would not shrink from taking it. I believe that in doing so, if it became necessary, we should have the support not only of members on both sides of this House, but of the people as well.

My right hon. friend also seems to have some remarkable suspicions in his mind regarding proceedings taken by the Government to secure a very considerable quantity of wheat in the latter part of November last. He was good enough to say that he had not any charge to make. Well, if he had not any charge to make it might perhaps have been in better taste if he had not referred to a charge at all. If he ever should have a charge to make, we shall be glad indeed to have him put it forward. It has been the aim of the Government from the first, and especially during the past autumn, in view of the abundant harvest with which Canada has been blessed, to seek an outlet for our products in every part of the world where a market could be found. When communications were made to us on behalf of the Allied governments with regard to a needed supply of wheat we took a course which, I think, should commend itself to every hon. member of this House. We sought and obtained the best disinterested advice we could procure in the country as to the proper proceeding on the part of the Government in the matter. To that end we consulted gentlemen whose opinion, I think, my right hon. friend would not be inclined to depreciate.

With regard to the dislocation of business of which my right hon. friend speaks, I do not think that such dislocation, if there was any, was at all of a serious character. As a matter of fact, I understand from my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that the greater part of the wheat, thus secured by the Government in the full belief that the course they took was in the public interest, has been moved out; and I venture to say that our efforts, in that regard and otherwise, to secure for the producers of this country an outlet for the splendid product of Canada during the past year merits the congratulations rather than the condemnation of my right hon. friend. However, as to that, the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be fully prepared to give a complete account of his stewardship. As to the absurd rumours which were spread through some portions of the press, it is almost unnecessary for me to reiterate what the Minister of Trade and Commerce has already made public, that there is not the slightest foundation in fact for any such suggestion as that which has been made.

Leaving these points, I wish to allude to certain matters dealt with by the mover and seconder of the Address as well as by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and also, in a later portion of my remarks, to give some account of the mission which I undertook to Britain in the past summer and of its results so far as they affect the public interests of this country and of the Empire.

In the first place, with regard to the war, my right hon. friend has spoken of the condition as it is today. Looking only at the surface of things and comparing the condition to day with what it was when this Parliament prorogued on the fifteenth day of April last, one would say that the outlook does not seem highly encouraging. All the events have happened to which my right hon. friend has referred. In the

western theatre of war there has been no progress of any great strategic value. In the eastern theatre there was the Russian retirement, the recapture of a great stronghold in Galicia which had previously been captured by the Russians, the fall of Warsaw, the German advance into Russia, the failure of the Dardanelles operations, the entry of Bulgaria into the war and the over-running of Serbia and Montenegro. But I venture to think that, if we look below the surface into the very heart of things, there is not the slightest reason why any one in this Empire or in any of the allied nations should be discouraged as to the outcome.

I do not propose to speak of the economic situation. A great many opinions have been given—not always of an absolutely consistent character—by men who are much more highly qualified to speak on that subject than I could claim to be. Since Parliament prorogued on April 15, Italy has entered the war and has made it necessary that large forces of the enemy should be occupied near her frontiers. We have held the enemy in the west; we have secured time for preparation—and that, I am confident, is the most vital and important factor for bringing this war to a successful conclusion. I do not belive that we in this country—I do not believe that those responsible for the administration of public affairs in Great Britian—realized in the first instance what the German and Austrian preparations for fifty years meant. I shall discuss that more fully in speaking of what the Empire is really doing at present in the organization of its resources to win this war. At the moment let me express my full confidence that the necessary preparation is now being effectively made. Then we have the overmastering facts that the numbers and resources of the allied nations vastly exceed those of the enemy, and that the British and Allied navies have complete command of the seas—a consideration which in itself outweighs, in the balance of victory, all the military successes which Germany and Austria have attained. Then, last but not least, we have a just cause, and that of itself heartens each of the allied nations to the effort necessary for victory.

We remember that when the Russians retired from Galicia and Warsaw fell, the Emperor of Germany sent a somewhat flamboyant telegram to one of his relatives, in which he used these words:

My destructive sword has crushed the Russians; the war drama is now drawing to a close.

We can not pay too high a tribute to the valour of the Russian army and the resourcefulness of the Russian generals. The great aim of the Germans in invading Russia has failed. When we realize that the Russian troops were fighting almost without arms and munitions; that the man in the rear rank was without a rifle; that when his comrade in the front rank fell the man in the rear stepped forward and took his place and his rifle—when we realize that these were the conditions under which Russia fought in that terrible struggle in which Germany tried to crush her, I think we may have every confidence and hope that the Russian offensive, recently undertaken, will be successful, and that Germany will find that Russia is by no means crushed.

I have enlarged many times since the commencement of this war upon the enormous task which faces any nation in building up a great army under modern conditions. There is the enrolment of the men, the training of the men, the training of the officers, the provision of equipment, and, last but not least—this is, perhaps, the greatest task of all—the provision of guns, rifles and ammunition on a scale undreamed of. I hope that hon. gentlemen of this House and the people of this country will realize what it means for this empire to undertake the task of providing guns, rifles, machine guns, trench mortars, ammunition of every type, for an army twenty times greater than this empire ever expected to send into the field. I am ready to believe—indeed, Mr. Lloyd George has stated it openly and frankly in the British House of Commons—that time has been lost in making that preparation. But when we consider the enormous task that confronted the War Office in Great Britain, let us be thankful that so much was accomplished, and that so successful an attempt was made to deal with so appalling a situation. Our task in Canada with regard to the preparation of our own army was, perhaps, even greater than that of Great Britain, because we lacked the assistance of commissioned and non-commissioned officers of adequate training and experience to a greater extent than they did in the Mother Country. But still, what we have accomplished seems to me to have been a wonderful thing. I am making no boast on behalf of the Government, but I am claiming credit for the peo-

ple of this country, without distinction of party, of race or of creed, who have come to the assistance of the Government in every possible way in the gigantic task which has been imposed upon us, and have shown that the races which make up the population of Canada are animated by the same lofty spirit of patriotism as that which characterized their ancestors in the past.

What have we accomplished? Mr. Speaker, you know that we sent within six weeks to Valcartier camp 33,000 men. During the past ten months our forces have crossed the Atlantic at the rate of more than 2,000 men per week. In the six months from July to December, 1915, there were enlisted 94,400 men in Canada and in the first two weeks of January, according to the information supplied by the Chief of the General Staff, more than fifteen thousand men were enlisted. Since Parliament prorogued, that is, between April 15 last and the opening of this session, no less than 80,250 men have been sent across the Atlantic to aid in the battle which our Empire and the allied nations are fighting. We have sent to the front altogether 120,000 men. First and last, we have had under arms in this country 220,000 men, of whom, of course, a portion are non-effective at the present time.

My right hon. friend has spoken of the very considerable increase which was proposed on the first day of January. Our authorized force was increased on November 7, 1914, by 30,000 men. On the 8th day of July, 1915, an Order in Council was passed increasing it to 150,000. On the 22nd day of October, His Majesty the King sent out an appeal. It was not specially directed to the Overseas Dominions; it was more particularly directed to the people of the British Islands. We thought it appropriate that that appeal should be recognized by the people and by the Government of Canada; and so, on the 30th day of October, 1914, the authorized force was increased to 250,000 men; and then, on the 1st day of January of this year, the announcement was made that the authorized force of this country would be increased to 500,000 men. My right hon. friend says that seems to him a very large number. So it is, a very large number. We must, however, remember that we are fighting in this war as one of the nations of the British Empire, and that in Great Britain the authorization for increased forces has reached the figure of 4,000,000 under the proposals made by Mr. Asquith on the 20th of December last. Let us also remember that there are enlisted and on active service in the British navy at the present time not less than 250,000 men. I realize that 500,000 men is a large force for us to undertake in Canada; and I realize further that the national strength of Canada must be maintained, and that in proceeding with our effort to increase our forces in Canada we must have regard to the necessities of the agricultural and industrial interests of this country. Canada, in all the elements of her national life, must be kept strong, and we shall have regard to those considerations. But it did seem to me, in view of all the developments which have taken place during the nine months since Parliament prorogued, it was fitting that at the opening of the New Year we should announce to the Empire and to all the world that we were not only prepared but willing to do something more. I do not know that I could express to the House my view of the situation in better words than those of the Order in Council which I presented to my colleagues and which was adopted by them without any hesitation, and assented to by His Royal Highness. The words which I used were these:

> The Prime Minister further observes that the developments in the various theatres of war during the past year unmistakably indicate the necessity of further vigorous and united effort on the part of all His Majesty's dominions to bring to a victorious and honourable conclusion the present conflict which unquestionably involves the power, integrity and welfare of the Empire, and even constitutes a menace to its existence. The realization of the great issues thus involved in the war has elicited from the manhood of the Dominion a widespread and splendid response ever since the outbreak of hostilities. The Prime Minister is convinced that this impressive response will be continued to the further appeal which is now proposed.

With regard to recruiting, the response has been good from all the provinces of Canada. It has been splendid. It may be that at first the Maritime Provinces and the province of Quebec were a little slower than some of the other provinces of Canada, but I know from information which has reached me recently that the enlistment in those provinces is now all that could be desired, and is thoroughly responsive to the call which has been made. It is appropriate that I should here pay a tribute to those Canadians of French origin who are fighting in France for the Fatherland of their ancestors. Among them are many who have

distinguished themselves. At the moment I recall the names of Papineau, Barté, Dansereau and Roy. No greater, no more heroic deed has been or could be performed in this war than that of Major Roy, who died in the endeavour to save his men from danger. His name, for that gallant deed, ought ever to be blazoned in the memory of all Canadians.

My right hon. friend has alluded to conscription—to the idea in this country or elsewhere that there may be conscription in Canada. In speaking in the first two or three months of this war I made it clear to the people of Canada that we did not propose any conscription. I repeat that announcement to-day with emphasis. My right hon. friend has alluded to reports in the press of the United States. I believe that representations even earlier than those which he mentions were made, and that there was an attempt, not only in the western provinces of Canada, but elsewhere, to convince citizens of American origin residing in Canada that they were in danger in that regard. I doubt greatly whether they would be so influenced even if conscription were announced to-day, judging from the splendid spirit which has animated our citizens of American origin, both in the east and west of Canada. They have been as eager, as determined to do their part in fighting for Canada and for the Empire in this war as the native born citizens of this Dominion.

Now, with regard to this proposed large increase, let us remember that we are in the agony of the greatest struggle that our Empire or the world has ever known. We can win it if we make the necessary sacrifice and the necessary effort. We know what it means to all the allied nations. My right hon. friend this afternoon quoted from the despatch from the French ambassador at Berlin, which has been made public by the French Government. The same idea has been expressed by a great German writer, whose teachings evidently impressed themselves upon the German people, in these words:

> By one means or another accounts must be settled with France, if we are to win elbow room for our world policy. That is the first and most unconditional requirement of our world policy, and as French hostility is not to be removed once for all by pacific measures, recourse must simply be had to the power of arms. France must be so completely overthrown that she can never stand in our way again.

One of the greatest intellects in Germany, dealing with the part which Germany shall play and the part which the British Empire shall play in the future of the world, used these words:

> If our Empire dares to persevere resolutely in the new path of our independent colonial policy, a conflict of interest with England will be inevitable. It lies in the nature of things that the new great power in the centre of Europe must settle with every other great power in turn. With Austria, with France, with Russia, we already have squared accounts. The last settlement with England seems likely to be the longest and hardest.

Are we fighting in this war to win or to lose? There can be only one answer to that question in Canada and throughout the Empire. Then, if we are to win we must realize that this war cannot be brought to a successful conclusion without sacrifice. Undoubtedly throughout our Empire the preparation made by the enemy through half a century was underestimated. Thank God, we yet have time for effort, for preparation. But our preparation and our effort must not be too late. May I quote some very pregnant words of Mr. Lloyd George in his great speech of 20th December last :

> Too late in moving here. Too late in arriving there. Too late in coming to this decision. Too late in starting with enterprises. Too late in preparing! In this war the footsteps of the Allied forces have been dogged by the mocking spectre of "too late," and unless we quicken our movements damnation will fall on the sacred cause for which so much gallant blood has flowed.

So I say it is time for us in Canada to consider our course, to realize what further effort is necessary. Therefore I recommended to my colleagues, and we shall propose to Parliament, that the forces authorized in Canada for assisting the Empire in this war shall be increased in the measure which I have indicated. We owe something to the 120,000 men who have gone to the front. We owe something to those who have died in a great cause and to those who live to avenge them. If we are animated by the spirit of the men who fought at Ypres, Festubert and Givenchy, the Canadian people will not shrink even from the sacrifice and the effort thus proposed.

Before speaking of the results of my visit to Great Britain last summer, I must mention certain important orders in council passed since prorogation which will be laid on the table of the House to-morrow. Two of them at least are in fulfilment of pledges which I gave to Parliament at the conclusion of last session. We have appointed a War Purchasing Commission, the personnel of which, as the House knows,

consists of the Hon. A. E. Kemp, a member of the Government, and Messrs. Geo. F. Galt and H. Laporte. The order in council contains special provisions to safeguard the public interest, which I believe the House will find satisfactory when hon. gentlemen come to examine them. The responsibilities of that commission have been very great; I believe that they have been efficiently and conscientiously discharged, and that the public interest has been conserved and advanced by the step which we have thus taken.

The Government also appointed a commission, consisting of Sir Charles Davidson, an ex-chief justice of the province of Quebec, for the purpose of making inquiry into all matters attending the purchase of supplies and munitions for the Government of Canada since the outbreak of war. Sir Charles Davidson, a man of unquestioned ability, character, and experience, has taken up this task, and has carried it on with vigour. In consequence of his investigation, some prosecutions have been instituted, and at least one man has been convicted. The Commission has not yet made its report, but as soon as received, it will be laid upon the table of the House.

Before proceeding to England in July last, I brought to the attention of the council the importance of inquiring into certain matters which are of obvious urgency at the present time, and which will be of increased urgency after the conclusion of peace. An order in council, then passed, will be laid upon the table of the House, and it will show that the questions submitted to that Commission are of a very comprehensive character. They relate to improved methods of agricultural production, to increasing the acreage under production, to the settlement of the land, to bringing immigration of a suitable type for that purpose, to giving assistance to persons who may be inclined to come to Canada for that purpose, to co-operation among producers, to the distribution of products, and to the problems of transportation which are incident to that purpose. Special consideration is to be given to anticipated immigration after the war. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works delivered a very cogent and impressive speech on that subject a few months ago. The commission is actively engaged in studying the several questions, and they intend to call to their assistance, whether in Canada or elsewhere, the best expert opinion that they can obtain, and to give a complete and thorough investigation to these subjects, which we all agree, are of the greatest possible importance.

There was also appointed during the recess the Military Hospitals and Convalescent Homes Commission. I desire to express my very profound appreciation of the willingness, the eagerness of the Provincial Governments of Canada to co-operate with the Federal Government in that good work. All the Provincial Governments are, I think, represented on that commission, or have established commissions of their own, and the ancillary or assisting commissions in the various provinces of Canada are all working in co-operation with the main commission. I hope and believe that in this way the care of returned soldiers while invalided will be suitably provided for.

Now I come to my visit to Great Britain during the past summer. One of the objects which I had in mind in undertaking that mission was to ascertain from first hand information, as best I could, what might be the preparations of the Empire for winning this war by the organization of all its resources. I was given the fullest possible information by the ministers of the British Government. I recall with great appreciation the fact that for this purpose Mr. Lloyd George rose almost from a sick bed, while he was recuperating in the country after very prolonged and very exhausting labours. He came to London the day before I left Great Britain and discussed with me very frankly the whole situation. Mr. Lloyd George has made it clear in the speech to which I have alluded that opportunities may have been lost, but that there is still time to make good. He has stated that in May last while the Germans were turning out 250,000 shells per day, the greater part of them high explosives, the British were turning out 15,500 shells, of which only 2,500 were high explosive shells. High explosive shells were demanded most insistently by the generals at the front at that time. Production has been enormously increased and is still going on. It would not be proper for me to make public all that Mr. Lloyd George was good enough to confide to me. Those who have examined his speech will remember his statement that there are 33 national shell factories in Great Britain, and 100 factories in the hands of private firms; that the percentage of deliveries has

been increased from 16 to 80; and that these factories will soon be able to produce in one week the amount which some time ago was secured by careful husbanding for four months. Larger guns are necessary. The very largest guns which Great Britain had on hand at the commencement of the war are now the smallest type of gun which they have in use at the front. The industries of Great Britain are engaged on a very large scale in the manufacture of field guns, machine guns, trench mortars, small arms, and every variety of shells and ammunition.

Let me read to the House a very graphic description contained in a letter to the London Times from a neutral who had recently visited Germany and Great Britain. This is his language:

> What is England going to do? This was the whispered query that I heard time and again in Germany. For I found that the possible power of Britain is more truly appreciated and understood in Germany than in any other country in Europe to-day. The great German captains of industry, who have hitherto made the success of German arms possible, seem to realize that if ever the vast industrial might of Britain, so akin to their own, is properly mobilized, if its resources are consistently and adequately exploited; if every ounce of latent energy is made available, then, no matter how great a success German arms may have achieved, no matter how firmly entrenched German troops may stand on enemy soil, the tables will turn, and German chances of final victory will fade into limbo.
>
> I have just crossed Great Britain from one end to the other, and I have visited innumerable towns and cities. Britain at last, after more than a year's delay, is mobilized for war. Her achievement to-day far surpasses the wildest idea of the "kolossal." I have seen factory after factory, working steadily 24 hours a day, seven days in the week, employing thousands of men and women making shells, shells, shells! I have seen factory after factory making aeroplanes; I have seen guns being forged under hydraulic pressure of 12,000 tons; howitzers forged out of the stoutest steel, which requires 16 hours in a blast furnace to heat.
>
> I have seen shell cases pressed out of the living ingot, in less than five minutes, and shells forged at a speed three times as great.
>
> I have seen men working at great forges, where gun parts are cast, straining every nerve and muscle to accomplish their difficult tasks; handling vast lumps of red-hot metal with lightning dexterity. I have seen machine-guns by the hundreds, and rifles by the thousand, all of the most careful workmanship and finish.
>
> The whole north country has been turned into one vast arsenal. The deep pall of fog and smoke that hangs low over the great industrial centres of the Midlands, deeper, denser than it has been for some years past, means that England has at last turned with full energy to the mighty task. The achievement is the more remarkable when it is appreciated that all this work is merely a beginning.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

In that connection, may I speak for a moment of what we are doing in Canada in that regard. A good deal has been made public in the press recently. In Canada we have about 250 factories engaged in the manufacture of munitions, none of them with any previous experience whatever. The value of the orders, as announced by the chairman, of the Imperial Munitions Board amounts to a little over $300,000,000, and I understand that munitions to the value of $100,000,000 have already been sent overseas. The orders that have been filled, and that still remain to be filled, involve the use of 500,000 tons of steel, and the payments in January of this year aggregated $35,000,000. It has been a source of great satisfaction to the Minister of Finance, and I am sure to the people of this country, that Canada, has been able to assist the British Government in financing the payments for that purpose. I believe that of all the payments to be made during the present month of January, the Canadian Government is providing at least one-half, so that we are not only doing our part in producing these munitions of war, but we are also doing our part in temporarily financing for the British Government about one-half of the payments.

Now, the question arises, why we are not doing more in Canada, and why they are not doing more in Great Britain. The reason for that is of a very simple character. The production of a portion of the shell is a work which can be undertaken without great difficulty by almost any factory in the country, but when you come to the more delicate and complex portions of the shell it is impossible to proceed with these as rapidly and as satisfactorily as with the simpler portions. I was told on the best authority that one company in the United Kingdom which undertook some years ago to produce the delicate portions of shells equipped with a time fuse did not make a great success of it for about three years, and that another great firm in Great Britain found it difficult to obtain satisfactory results in less than two years. We in this country, and the manufacturers in Great Britain as well, are undertaking to do it in much less time than that. It is of no value whatever to pile up shell bodies unless you can also supply all the component parts necessary to produce a shell ready for use at the front. As far as the fuse alone is concerned, I believe that 267 different gauges have to be used and that, contained in the time fuse, there are no less

than 240 different parts. The supply of the simpler portions of the shell both in Great Britain and here has vastly outstripped the production of the more difficult and complicated portions. However, the work is in good hands both in Great Britain and in this country, and I have no doubt that we shall be able to advance in Canada as rapidly as in any other part of the world.

I need not speak of the necessity of munitions. Every hon. gentleman who has kept himself acquainted with the incidents of this war realizes most thoroughly that vast armies are absolutely of no use unless they are supplied with artillery of the most powerful type and with a most abundant provision of munitions.

I took up with the British Government Canada's ability to furnish supplies necessary for the war. We have repeatedly brought that subject to the attention of the British and allied governments. I took it up during my recent visit with several members of the British Government and I pressed it upon them most earnestly as I had done previously by correspondence. We provided them with a list of articles of a very varied character that could be furnished by this country for the use of the allied nations. I discussed also with the British authorities the importance of emphasizing to the allied governments the abundant resources of Canada for supplying many needed articles. I had also a conference with the International Purchasing Commission, or, as it is known, the Commission Internationale de Ravitaillement. All of the allied nations were represented there. I furnished them with a full list of articles that we could supply, and I pressed upon them the importance of looking to Canada in that regard.

Mr. Wintour, the Director of Contracts in the War Office, gave me a statement of the amount of the orders which had been placed in Canada up to the 10th July, 1915, and I was glad to observe that the total orders placed in Canada to that time ran up to $240,000,000. I have very little doubt that up to the 1st January, 1916, the amount of orders placed in Canada, not only by the British Government but by the allied governments, will run well up to $500,000,000. This is a great tribute to the producing power of Canada. The variety of articles supplied is immense, many new industries have been established, some of which will certainly be permanent, and there has also been a greatly increased production in others.

Then, I took up also with the British Government the important question of transportation. More than a year ago we arranged with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that we should have the services of Mr. A. H. Harris in order to organize transportation for the very large supplies which were ordered in this country by the British Government. As indicating what has been accomplished in that regard I shall read an extract from a recent report of Mr. Harris. I need not read the whole report, but just a few paragraphs. He says:

> The prompt action of the government in adopting my suggestion has secured to Canadian manufacturers and farmers an uninterrupted outlet for the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of War Office orders, the acceptance of which would not have been possible but for the inauguration of an economical overseas service.
>
> Further, the fact that the transports owing to their regularity in sailings have been in a position to handle promptly the War Office supplies which otherwise would have occupied space on regular liners, has been of distinct advantage to the export trade of Canada, and has released to that extent ocean space for commercial tonnage. Since the inauguration of the service not a pound of Imperial Government transport has been forwarded on regular liners.
>
> During the period between 28th August, 1914, and 30th April, 1915, 244,913 gross tons were handled on account of Imperial and Dominion governments.
>
> Between, however, the 1st of May and 30th November, 1915, there was an enormous expansion—over 410,000 tons being forwarded during that period (7 months), or about 67 per cent more than was moved in the preceding 8 months.
>
> The Overseas Department is now being called upon to provide for about 125,000 gross tons of munitions, war material and supplies per month, or approximately one and a half million tons per annum, and the tonnage is still growing.

He then goes on to give the number of transports and sailings. I need not read further, but I may inform the House that in February, 1915, we arranged with the Admiralty for eighteen transports, which number has been increased during the past six or seven months to forty transports of which, during the winter, twenty are allotted to Halifax and twenty to St. John. In this way the producers of the country have had a great deal of necessary assistance in the transportation of their supplies.

Besides that we have continually been in communication with the Admiralty, both during my visit in the past summer, and by correspondence as well, in regard to the necessity of releasing as far as possible tonnage for the North Atlantic service and we

did secure, by the efforts I made during the past summer, and by the correspondence which has taken place from time to time, the release of several ships for that service. I pressed upon the Admiralty the consideration that a larger proportion of steamships had been taken from the North Atlantic service than from any other service. This was for the reason that the ships plying in the North Atlantic were better adapted to the purposes of the Admiralty. So, we have done the best we could in this way; and the Government have taken some further steps through my colleague the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) as to which he will give the House information at a later date. The whole situation, of course, is subject to the paramount necessities of the War Office and the Admiralty. If we are going to carry on this war successfully it is necessary that large bodies of troops should be transported and that they should have ample supplies of every kind. Thus in all representations made by Canada we had to bear in mind those paramount considerations without regard to which the war could not be brought to a successful conclusion. Transportation on the Pacific was also discussed and I hope that some progress has been made.

I took up also with the British Government the purchase of horses and the establishment of Canadian remount depots in England. As to this we arrived at the conclusion, after a careful discussion of the whole subject, that it would be a waste of money for the Canadian Government to establish remount depots in the United Kingdom, or in France. Therefore we are availing ourselves of the British remount depots which are thoroughly well organized. But we went a step further upon the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). He said that he saw no reason why the British Remount Commission here should not purchase all horses required for the allied forces in western theatre of the war, including the Canadian forces. Therefore, we arranged that the British Remount Commission should make purchases of all horses required for the Canadian forces and issue them as required at the net cost.

We also took up with the British Remount Department the purchase of horses in Canada by the French Government; and after considerable discussion and some correspondence, the British authorities finally consented that the arrangement which had prevented the French Government from purchasing in Canada should be terminated, and accordingly since the month of August last the French Government has been at perfect liberty to buy in Canada; and I hope that they will take steps to make purchases in this country, particularly in the West, where I believe there is a type of horse which would very well suit the requirements of the French Government.

There are other matters, but at the moment I need say no more as to the arrangements arrived at between the Government of Canada and that of Great Britain during the visit of the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) and myself.

It is my privilege and my duty to speak of the spirit which I found in France and in Great Britain. The spirit of France is grave, patient, self-reliant, confident and determined. No great nation animated by such a spirit can be overthrown. The whole manhood of that nation is in arms; each man is doing his allotted task regardless of social condition, wealth, birth, or any other consideration. To give the House an illustration of what this war means to the French people and how each man is doing the duty which is allotted to him, the military chauffeur placed at the disposal of the Officier de Liaison at the headquarters of General Joffre was no less a person than the son of the French Ambassador at one of the great capitals of Europe. This young man did duty there as chauffeur, performing his allotted task to the best of his ability and as a matter of duty.

Wherever the Germans have passed in France is found ruin and desolation. I saw the town of Albert, not one single building of which from one end to the other was left with a roof on it—a perfect picture of desolation. I saw Senlis, only about seven miles from Chantilly, desolate, almost completely destroyed. Hon. members will recall the fact that when the Germans passed through Senlis, more than a year ago, they executed the mayor and, I believe, seventeen of the citizens because they had been fired upon by some Turcos as they entered the town. I saw also the ruins of Creil, which is in the immediate vicinity of Chantilly.

We do not realize in this country what war means; no man can realize what it means until he has witnessed the picture of ruin and desolation which can be seen in

France. At Chantilly itself, only twenty-five miles from Paris, one can hear in the open the booming of the German guns at the front. The French people and the French army have an absolute and perfect confidence in the issue of this war, and I repeat again that they are inspired with an absolute and resolute determination that this war shall never cease until the invaders have been driven from France and until Belgium has been freed.

In Great Britain I found the same splendid spirit. I believe there has been a profound change in the spirit of the British nation during the past twelve months. The gravity of the situation is now realized thoroughly and fully. It may possibly be said that John Bull requires a little bit of hammering to make him thoroughly in earnest; but when John Bull is once aroused he is terribly in earnest, and there is no doubt about it that the British nation is now tremendously in earnest in this war. The British people have not been accustomed to methods of warfare such as those which have prevailed. The British soldier is naturally a humane man; he goes to battle with the idea that if he succeeds in conquering his enemy and taking him prisoner he should treat that prisoner not only humanely, but generously. That is his spirit. It is the same kind of spirit as that which animates two Britons when they fight with each other: when one comes out second best he immediately shakes hands with the man who has thrashed him, and there is no more bad feeling between them. In this war, however, the incidents which have taken place, such as the Scarborough raids, the Zeppelin attacks, the Lusitania horror, and, last but not least, the execution of Edith Cavell, have aroused in the British people a stronger and more intense feeling than I believe has ever been aroused in that nation in any previous war. These incidents and the inhuman and barbarous methods of warfare practised at the front have had their effect; they have brought more recruits to the British standard than any other agency in this war from first to last; and they have aroused a fierce and grim determination that this war shall not cease until the cause for which it was undertaken shall have been fully and absolutely vindicated.

As to the Canadian troops at the front, I saw the Princess Patricia Regiment on the 23rd day of August, 1914, at Lansdowne park, when divine service was held and the colours were presented by Her Royal Highness the Princess Patricia. I saw them on the 21st day of July, 1915, at the front, where they had been since the previous December. There were then only two officers out of all those who had gone to the front, only two still able to perform their duties; those were Niven and Papineau. In the trench warfare at St. Eloi on the 14th of March, on the 7th of May and on many occasions from the end of 1914 up to the time that I saw them, they had shown to the enemy how Canadians could fight. Hon. members will recall that on the 7th of May, 1915, this regiment was attacked in overwhelming force by the Germans. They went into the fight mustering 635 men; at the end of the day only 150 men were able to respond to the call. But they had held the line. Well might their brigadier general, in bidding them farewell, speak of their unparalleled tenacity, and declare that they had earned a reputation which would stand amongst the highest in the record of the exploits of the British army.

I saw the Canadian division at the front as well. I saw them at Valcartier camp in September, 1914, and I had the honour and the privilege of saying farewell to them, of shaking hands with every officer of the force before they went overseas. I saw what was left of them at the front on the 21st of July, 1915. In the meantime, their heroic deeds at Ypres, Festubert, Givenchy, had thrilled the whole country. As the mover of the Address said, they were men of no military experience; they were taken from every walk of life in Canada. Only nine months before they were put to the test, they had been engaged in the ordinary avocations of life in this country. You remember that just one week after this Parliament prorogued, that is to say on the 22nd of April, 1915, these men were put to as fierce and terrible a test as any troops in the world were ever subjected to. They were vastly outnumbered, they were almost surrounded, they were subjected to horrible and unknown methods of warfare. The awful effects of gas no man can realize who has not seen, as I have seen, the survivors of this terrible ordeal. The men I saw in the hospitals and convalescent homes included in their numbers some who had endured the full force of that attack, and who, even months afterwards, were actually gasping for breath. Under these conditions, their left flank in the air, the Canadians held on all that day. They held on during the following day. One brigade which had been eventually sent back for

rest, tired, weary, exhausted, took up their arms before any respite was obtained when a further call was made upon them. One cannot say what would have happened or would not have happened if the Canadians had given way on that occasion. Perhaps the Germans might have really broken through and reached Calais. But the consensus of opinion of all those who spoke to me on that subject, and many of them were men who could speak with authority, the consensus was that on that day, the 22nd of April, 1915, the Canadian division saved the day for the Empire and for the allied nations. There is no doubt whatever as to the issue of this war, if we in Canada and in all the Empire are animated by the spirit which moved those men on that day. Among the men at the front, among the men in the hospitals and convalescent homes, there is a supreme confidence. But they believe also that the Empire must be aroused to supreme effort and to intense earnestness. We owe that to them, we owe it to ourselves.

There is no doubt as to what Germany anticipated and intended when this war was planned. She believed that Great Britain would stand aside and thus earn and deserve the contempt and aversion of her allies and the scorn of the world. France would be crushed, Russia hurled back, and peace made under such conditions as would completely isolate our Empire. Then at her leisure Germany would attend to Great Britain, her colonial empire and her sea power, in pursuance of a policy which regards treaties as scraps of paper, war as a legitimate national enterprise and the possession of overwhelming military strength as a justification for unprovoked aggression. The mills of the gods grind slow, but they grind exceeding fine. I believe we have still a long way to go before we see the end of this war. But I also believe that before its conclusion our Empire will have in the field armies rivalling in numbers and efficiency those of any belligerent nation and more thoroughly equipped than any of them with guns of every type, munitions and all the mechanical devices that are so essential. Again I say that if we are in earnest this struggle can have but one conclusion, and that is victory for the allied arms. And in the fierce flame of this war, in the ordeal of sacrifice which it entails, the strong elements of the Canadian nation will learn the better to understand each other, and through that understanding will be welded into a more perfect and splendid unity than ever before.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): In rising to make a few remarks upon an Address which does not lend itself to excessive comment, I should like to associate myself in the first place with the right hon. leader of the Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition in the compliments which they offered to the mover (Mr. Alfred Thompson) and to the seconder (Mr. Eugene Paquet) of the Address. Some more than ordinary recognition was given to the honourable profession to which I have the honour to belong in the choosing of the mover and seconder, and I am sure that both of those gentlemen gave ample evidence of the fact that a scientific training was not lost upon them when they entered the profession of medicine. The seconder has spoken frequently and fervently in this House—I cannot quite follow the French language, but I am sure that he always speaks with effect; and I think everybody will agree with me that my friend the hon. member for Yukon delivered a speech which, whether we have regard to its matter or to its tone, was a very admirable speech indeed, and far above the average of addresses given by movers and seconders.

I very sincerely would like also to associate myself with the mover of the Address in the remarks he made about the happy circumstance which gives us His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught as Governor General at this crisis in the history of our country and of our Empire. It will soon be 42 years, Sir, since I first saw His Royal Highness. I was a schoolboy in a crowd—such a crowd as always gathers when royalty appears in the old land—and I saw His Royal Highness, a young man at that time, at the head of his regiment, riding from one point in the country to another. From that day to this he has, as prince, soldier and statesman, been an example to all the citizens of this Empire of honourable devotion to duty and its efficient and continuous discharge. As a prince, son of one of the most illustrious monarchs that ever sat upon the throne of Britain—brother of one of the most beloved—uncle of our present monarch, he has been an example of how a man should live, even though he be a prince. As a

soldier, he has ever set an example in his own person of the extent to which those who have had the defence of our flag and Empire in their hands from time to time have exemplified the watchwords of the British soldier, those watchwords being Duty, Discipline and Mercy. But I am not at all sure that the historian will not record, Sir, that in the peculiar crisis through which we have been passing in the last eighteen months—and here I am almost certain that the Government will agree with me—we have owed as much at least to His Royal Highness as a statesman as we have owed to him either as a soldier or as a prince.

Keeping still to grounds of agreement, I desire to express my entire approval of the paragraph in the Address which bids us all be thankful for the bounteous harvest which we have had. I rather agree with my right hon. friend and leader that there was an omission in that paragraph. When I first took up a farm in Western Canada, I did not find that Providence sent it very good crops of wheat; there was a fair crop of willow bush, of poplars and of grass. In the production of the crop we have had, I think the Government might have remembered, in framing the Address, that Providence had the active co-operation of the class upon whom for many years, if not generations, the prosperity of Canada will depend—I mean the great farming class of this community. I think they should have recognized that class especially, because a special appeal was made to them last year in the shape of a pamphlet bearing the title "Patriotism and Production." It was Providence plus the farmer—plus the pamphlet, if you like—which produced the results in which we are now rejoicing. The West especially, from which I come, has given us an example, perhaps for the first time in its history, of what it can really do if it gets proper encouragement. The fact of the matter is that in our western country we can produce almost up to the limits of the possible disposal of the produce, and it is at this point that the activity of a government needs to be associated with the activity of the farmer and the activity of Providence. It is true that at the present time, owing to the special circumstances of the war, we are getting an excellent price for wheat. Beef still remains at a figure highly remunerative to the western producer—a figure which has not descended below the mark which it first reached when a wise government to the south of the line gave us free ingress to their markets for our beef. Pork is higher at the present time than it is in the western states, owing to a special shortage on our farms. But there is a feature from which I think the Government, and anyone of us who wants to learn, may learn a lesson, and that is that when I left home a few days ago, neighbours of mine were selling excellent oats for twenty-five cents a bushel, for which they were getting forty-five cents at the same time last year. Now there is a lesson in that fact, because there are farmers who are reflecting as to how far it is wise for them to produce big crops. It is perfectly clear that a man will be very nearly as well off if he produces one bushel and gets forty-five cents for it as he will if he produces two bushels and gets but twenty-five cents. The lesson for peace times is that, as we have that drop in oats at the present time under the extraordinary and artificial conditions created by the war, so I very much fear we must look forward to an enormous drop in the value of agricultural products the moment peace is restored. It would be a function of a wise government, therefore, as of a wise opposition, to base their thinking and their policy upon that state of affairs, which we all hope will arise so far as it relates to the re-establishment of peace. I thought I detected some evidence that the Government was preparing to learn that lesson during the recess. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Robert Rogers) was in the western country, and he informed the public that he had an open mind on the question of free wheat. Well, so far as I know, he has an open mind still. But the United States boundary remains closed —that is the thing that troubles the western farmer; and an open market in the United States would be of very much greater value to us than an open mind on the part of the Minister of Public Works. The problem remains—it will be accentuated by the declaration of peace—as to how we are going to till our soil profitably in the West if we do not avail ourselves of every available means of disposing of the produce. I do not know why the mind of my hon. friend the minister was not closed in the proper way on this question. If it is closed at all, we have not got any information on the subject; I am afraid it must have closed against opening the market for wheat to the United States. I have wondered if any millers met him

out there and destroyed the good seed which the farmers were trying to sow upon that mind of his. Whatever the influence, we have not got the market yet, and I very much fear that up to the present point in our history the historian will record about this bountiful harvest that Providence smiled upon the efforts of the farmer, that the farmer did his duty in producing the stuff, but that we had a government in power that was so unwise that it did its best to thwart both Providence and the farmer by not opening a market to the south.

I want to congratulate the Government upon the fact that they have, I think, correctly interpreted the mind of the country in regard to the holding or not holding of an election during the time of war. I offer them my very sincere congratulation upon that interpretation and upon the change of heart and attitude which that interpretation indicates in themselves. It would not be in human nature—it certainly is not in mine—not to refer in a good natured way to the fact that there is very grave doubt whether this attitude of mind on the part of the Government existed last spring. I should be shutting my eyes to obvious facts if I did not assert that I know it did not exist. Why, there was one impatient member sitting behind the Treasury benches, the limit of whose patience was expressed in the term of twenty-four hours for this young and impetuous electioneerer said he would not wait twenty-four hours before having an election in the spring. I am certainly in order in congratulating that hon. gentleman, so far as he supports the Government, on his admirable change of heart. The Minister of Public Works, I think, made the discovery in the middle of last session that the people of this country were frothing at the mouth almost to tear the Senate in pieces. I think that during the summer he made the discovery that, in so far as there was any desire to tear anybody to to pieces, it was not the Senate of Canada, so far at any rate as his own province is concerned. The ferocious fangs of the people of Manitoba seem to have been whetting themselves for quite a different prey.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister himself was not free from the suspicion of holding over us on this side of the House, the bludgeon of a general election. He waxed angry with my right hon. leader because he and those of us who sit behind him, ventured to criticise the Budget, even to the extent of introducing an amendment to it. Now, for my part I have no regret about the criticism or about the amendment, especially that portion of it which referred to the raising of additional obstacles against trade from Great Britain at this particular crisis of the Empire's history. I would appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, to whom I have never appealed without receiving careful attention, whether our criticism of that particular part of the Budget of last year has not been justified in the event. It cannot be pleasant to him—I am sure it is not—that at this moment the imports from Great Britain to this country should be disappearing almost to the vanishing point. This decrease in British imports into Canada comes at a moment when we know that Great Britain needs, for the particular purposes of exchange, to be sending more goods into Canada. The imports into Canada from Great Britain at this moment are disappearing almost to the vanishing point, to the enormous hindrance of Britain's complete efficiency in carrying on from a commercial point of view the war in which we are at the present time engaged. It is perhaps fair to warn the minister and the Government that in the event of any further proposals of a similar nature we should consider that we were neglecting our duty, as members of this House and as loyal sons of the Empire, holding the views we do, if we did not once more raise the strongest protest and submit any such proposals to the strictest criticism, even to the point of a division if the need called for it. As I say, these things are ample evidence that there has been a salutary change of heart on the part of the Government in regard to the desirability of an election while the war lasts. If, last Spring, when Parliament prorogued, you asked any prophet who was supposed to be in the inner circles of the confidence of the Government, when the election was to take place, there was not one who did not answer with the utmost certainty of the tipster: June is the time that you have got to look out for.

I do not want to pry any further into ministerial secrets, but I should be guilty of being untrue to myself if I did not admit that there were honourable exceptions. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), since he put his hand to the plough in this war, has never taken it off. I might mention others whom I strongly suspect of having been opposed to this trend

in the party opposite. I am perfectly sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) could never have smiled upon the prospect of an election while the war was on. I know that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), who has done such splendid work in connection with the Patriotic Fund, knew, from the point of view of that fund alone, the damage that would be done to the country, the distraction and confusion that would be caused; and he was always opposed to an election. But I very much fear that the exceptions to those who have undergone this change of heart were like the righteous in Sodom: too few to save the city.

So far as this side of the House is concerned, so far at any rate as I am personally concerned, there has been no change of attitude. I believed at the time the first shot was fired in this war that during the continuance of the war, an election in Canada would be a public calamity, and I believe it now. Who is there that does not believe it? Our ladies are assembling all over the country, irrespective of politics, to knit their eyes out when they are not weeping them out, making comforts for the soldiers at the front. Who is there that would throw a bomb of contention into assemblies like that; distraction and confusion are terms most admirably chosen to describe the conditions which would prevail; conditions which can receive no justification whatever on grounds of policy, because on the ground of the policy of prosecuting this war to a successful termination there has never been the slightest difference of opinion between those on this side of the House and those on the other. Yet, although that is our attitude, we cannot absolve ourselves and do not wish to absolve ourselves for a moment from the duty of bringing to bear the best political ability we have, on any measures for the prosecution of the war, which are brought before this House and this Parliament. I cannot conceive, as I said a year ago, that any member of the Government could wish to avoid criticism. Mr. Asquith, from the very beginning of the war, not only excused criticism but invited criticism. What is Parliament for? What is an Opposition for except to engage in criticism, not necessarily in destructive criticism—and in this case I should say not destructive at all towards the political prospects of a government—but helpful and co-operating criticism. That is the kind of criticism which we thought we were giving when we went to the point of a division in regard to taxation last session. We thought that an extra tariff upon British goods was bound to affect deleteriously the entrance and the amount of goods entering Canada from Britain. That criticism has been justified in the result. It was not hurtful criticism; it was helpful criticism, and the country and the Empire would have been in a better position to-day if the Government had conceded our point, and had withdrawn an impost of which I do not think they are very proud at the present moment, and for which I am perfectly sure they will receive the condemnation of history.

Now, we are embarking upon the third war session of this Parliament, and the Government is once more facing Parliament with propositions which are unprecedented in the history of Canada. I hope that we shall never forget on this side of the House that they are unprecedented. The Government is asking Parliament to sanction their commitment to enormous responsibilities in regard to the raising of men for this war and the raising of money for the support of those men. Now, I just want at this stage in the session to tell the Government quite bluntly that, so far as I have been able to observe—and I have been up and down the country a great deal, both east and west—there are two things which are agitating the minds of the people in regard to these propositions of the Government. There are certain things that are exercising the public mind very widely, from east to west, in Canada. In regard to recruiting, I do not think that the people of this country will have the slightest objection to the Government naming half a million men as the figure at which we should aim for the present in our recruiting efforts. I do not think so, though I agree with my leader in questioning whether it was wise to name a specific number. I have always held and proclaimed in this House that in the event of the Empire being at war, Canada would be behind the flag with all her moral and material and human resources—that she would be there with the men and there with the money. There was a time, if I wanted to be controversial, when our hon. friends opposite were not so sure about the men. I do not wish, however, to press that point, or to raise any controversial point in regard to the defence of the Empire at present. That has been our attitude so far as I, a humble member of the Opposition, have had an opportunity to declare it; and I repeat that we on this side have no holding back as to the number of men that should be sent. It might have

been wiser to say that we intended to proceed with recruiting just as fast as we could raise recruits without hurting the other services of the country, without hurting munition work, and without hurting the raising of those silver bullets by our industries, upon which, after all, the determination of the war will ultimately hinge.

But the point that is exercising the minds of our people is this: I think they would be glad of the assurance that there is no undue delay in getting the recruits, once they are raised, into the trenches. I hope the Government appreciate my point, and I hope that some one will give the country and Parliament the necessary assurance upon that point. One hundred and twenty thousand men have crossed the seas, but, so far as I understand the statements that have come from the Government from time to time, there are only 50,000 men from Canada now in the trenches. We have never had more than 50,000 men in the trenches. Now, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to a great number of my fellow citizens with whom I have conversed on this point that there is a great disparity between the 50,000 men whom it has taken 18 months to put in the trenches, and the half million—ten times the number—that we propose to raise in the immediate future—because I assume that the Government's proposition is not put up merely for show, but that we are to proceed to the utmost extent of our ability and persuasiveness to endeavour to get that number of recruits. I am perfectly sure that the people would be satisfied in their own minds if they could have an explanation of how long exactly it takes the men to get from the recruiting point to the point at which they are doing something really effective in the efforts that are being made for the termination of the war. That is where the Government's responsibility lands it. We have had statements from the Minister of Militia and Defence from time to time; we have had statements which indicate that there is no difficulty about getting a million men, but it is always safe, when my hon. friend is in certain moods, to take fifty per cent off his statements. However, I admire his enthusiasm, and I think his spirit is the correct spirit in which to approach the problem. I am certain that the recruits can be got in as great numbers as we can spare, but the people are not so certain that the best use is being made of the recruits when they are raised. I hope that that criticism can be repelled; I hope the doubt can be dispelled. After all, it is a simple problem in arithmetic. If it has taken a year and a half to get 50,000 into the firing line—and I believe the proper reserve for 50,000 is 100,000—then it will take six years at least to get the proper proportion of 500,000 men into the firing line. Does anybody anticipate that this war will last six years? It may, but I do not think anybody anticipates that it will last for that length of time; and, if not, then there is a disparity between the recruiting that is going on and the effective fighting that is going on as the result of the Government's efforts. I trust I have made my point clear, and that some explanation will be given of this matter. I think it is possible that an explanation will be forthcoming. I know the difficulties of transportation from Canada to the field of actual hostilities. I should be the last to want to minimize the difficulties that have beset the Government, and I hope the last to want to detract from the efforts they have made. But there is an uneasiness upon this point, and the uneasiness is not only in the minds of the civilian population of the country, but in the minds of the soldiers themselves. It is in the minds also of those who would become soldiers if they did not know that in our cities in the West it is possible to find men who have been in khaki for months and who seem to be no nearer the firing line, and who, I believe—I speak with bated breath—are learning in the cities where they are billeted more than belongs to the proper training of a soldier. This is not a point merely raised by an Opposition speaker for the sake of making a point against the Government. It is not raised for that purpose at all. It is raised with the practical object of helping the Government to satisfy the minds of the people that they are doing their utmost in this matter, and it is raised so that an obstacle may be taken out of the way of their getting the recruits whom they are setting out to seek. I am sure that the Government will be glad to have a chance of dealing with this matter, and of giving the country and Parliament the explanations which I think are due to them. That is one of the points upon which I have ventured to think there is considerable uneasiness in the public mind.

It is but a step of the mind from men to money and with regard to money the attitude of our people is exactly their attitude in regard to men. There is no stinting in the minds of our people. I am an adopted Canadian myself, Sir, but so far as my

experience goes, and I have been as active as the average member, I think our people have been splendid.

One only needs to go to the most remote homestead, to the little schoolroom, and present the needs of the Patriotic Fund, to find that the poorest homesteader in the West is ready to respond in a way which makes one feel that the last dollar of Canada is behind this fight, and the spirit which I find there I am sure prevails everywhere. There is no desire to stint the Government as to money; there is no desire to stint the givings of our people for the purpose of the Patriotic Fund, Belgian relief, Red Cross work, or the taxes for the enormous undertakings which the Government is carrying on. But I should be false to my own sense of duty if I did not say that at this time the air is full of rumors as to what is being done with the enormous amount of money that is being voted by the Parliament of Canada. It goes without saying that the $150,000,000 which we have already voted is a mere drop in the bucket compared with what we shall have to vote if we are going to raise anything like half a million recruits. It is important that some one should do what I am doing, and I might as well do it as any one. It is important that it should be impressed upon the mind of the Government that while the people will give, and give freely, of their last dollar for a war in the objects of which they believe, they have grave suspicion about the road this money is travelling—some of it. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister state this afternoon that it has been discovered that there are horses in Western Canada, and there are horses galore in Western Canada. It would have been as well if all the horses had been taken from Western Canada if it would have spared us the discovery of those one-eyed Equine Methuselahs which were recruited in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACDONALD: And in Ontario as well.

Mr. CLARK: I think the most antediluvian horse was found in Nova Scotia. I have very little appetite, Mr. Speaker, for this class of politics; very little appetite indeed, and I do not know that in the midst of a war our people have a keen appetite for it, but when things like those that were exposed last year in the Public Accounts Committee, are pushed under their noses, they would not have been human if they did not ask themselves this simple question: Is the Government making the best use of the enormous sums of money which Parliament has voted for the purpose for which it was voted, that is, for the purpose of terminating this war at the earliest possible moment? That question is being very widely asked. I would be the last man to approach Parliament with rumours, I would be the last man to approach Parliament with statements which were not authenticated facts. I quite realize that there must be inquiry into all these matters and I am sure that the Government realizes it too, and I have not the least doubt that their attitude towards the appeal I am making now will be precisely what it was last year, and that they will hail an investigation; that they will hail the fullest possible inquiry as to the way in which these appropriations are being used. They would be unwise in their own interest, as well as unwise in the interest of the Empire, if they did not hail such an investigation.

As far as we on this side of the House are concerned, our attitude is unchanged. While we believe and endorse to the full the policy of the Government we do not by any means pledge ourselves to support the details of that policy, nor do we mean to condone for one moment any diversion to the private pockets of individuals of the public funds that should be given to the killing of Germans and the termination of this war. With this reservation our attitude is to-day what it has always been, one of hearty, thorough, and sincere support of the Government in providing the last man and spending the last dollar that Canada can afford for the legitimate purposes of this war.

I am going to claim, before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, that from the time the first shot in this war was fired until the present moment, there has been no citizen of the British Empire, there is no citizen of the British Empire at this moment, of whom the whole Empire has more reason to be proud, of whom it is more proud, than my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With not a drop of British blood in his veins, he has never ceased to be an admirer and supporter of British institutions and an exponent of the highest statesmanship which has guided the destinies of the British Empire whether in the old land or in the new. From the beginning of this war his attitude has been that of a man who was impressed with the

magnitude of the issues of the war and who was able to rise above all considerations of partisanship or of personal advancement; who has afforded to the world and to the Empire an example of a patriotic statesman who believed in British institutions and was prepared to do his best in defence of them. Need I recall the fact that during this last summer, when under the disadvantage of great physical pain and illness, he was game enough, he was British enough, if you like, to resume a speech in which he had to take a momentary rest, when most unfortunately, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) had missed his train and did not get to the meeting at all? Then I have noticed no one in the province of Ontario, not even a minister of the Crown, who has been more assiduous in season and out of season in attending patriotic meetings, than has my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), and in varying degrees we, the followers of my right hon. friend and his chief lieutenant, have nothing to regret in our record in this respect. Our attitude to-day is what it has been throughout this war.

The major portion of the speech from the Throne is taken up with the expression of two sentiments on the part of the Government, of the Parliament and the people of Canada, sentiments which received admirable expression in the eloquent speech of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister this afternoon.

The speech in the first place asks us to express our admiration for the efforts which have been made by our soldiers at the front along with the other soldiers of the Empire and of our Allies. We on this side of the House desire to claim our full share of that admiration. Upon the fields of Festubert, St. Eloi and others too numerous to mention, these sons of Canada have, by sacrifice of blood and of life, performed deeds of which the glory will never fade away. There is no one on the opposite benches who admires their deeds more than we do.

The Speech expresses not only admiration, but what is much more necessary at the present moment, and that is determination. And once more, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that we here also claim our full share of the determination which is expressed in the Speech, that no effort shall be wanting on the part of Canada, so far as we can speak for any portion of it, to bring this war to a successful termination. Whether the blood that flows in our veins is English, or Scotch, or Irish, or Welsh, or Norwegian, or French, aye, or even German, there are few Canadians to-day, Sir, who do not know in their heart of hearts that we live under a flag which, wherever it floats, spells liberty, which in this fight spells succour to the oppressed, help for the small against the great, for the weak against the strong, that this flag to-day floats over a fight which is justified on the part of the Allies, if ever a fight was justified in this world. We on this side of the House hold these things as strongly as hon. gentlemen opposite, and in addition we hold no pessimistic views as to the future. We have no shadow of a doubt, any more than hon. gentlemen opposite have, that this flag will finally float over a complete and dicisive victory, because above this flag stands the god of justice, liberty and truth.

On motion of Hon. T. C. Casgrain (Postmaster General) the debate was adjourned.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

NAVAL SERVICE PAPERS.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Naval Service) presented:

Copies of Orders in Council authorizing Regulations for the Department of Naval Service in accordance with Section 47, Chapter 43, 9-10 Edward VII, as follows:

P. C. 2864, dated the 4th December, 1915, Payment of Separation Allowance in the case of Warrant Officers.

P. C. 3009, dated 21st December, 1915, with reference to application of the Naval Discipline Act, etc., for the Government of the Naval Volunteer Force.

P. C. 63-2422, dated 15th October, 1915, with reference to appointment of Assistant Paymasters in charge.

P. C. 2267, dated 25th September, 1915, with reference to regulations for payment of "Detained Pay."

P. C. 93-2151, dated 17th September, 1915, with reference to allowances to officers and men employed on coding and decoding duties, etc.

P. C. 1712, dated 21st July, 1915, with reference to scheme of pensions for officers and men of the Royal Canadian Naval Forces, etc.

P. C. 748, dated 13th April, 1915, with reference to institution of the ratings of rangetaker first and second class in the Royal Canadian Navy.

P. C. 58-1470, dated 24th June, 1915, with reference to increase in amount of Separation Allowance to a motherless child from 3s. to 5s.

P. C. 85-1158, dated 20th May, 1915, with reference to revision of amounts payable on account of Separation Allowance to dependents of Royal Canadian Naval Permanent Ratings.

P. C. 756, dated 13th April, 1915, with reference to payment of Allowances to officers of the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, —— performance of duties which carry with them an Allowance to officers of the Royal Canadian Navy.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 9 p.m.

Tuesday, January 18, 1916.

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

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Mr. Speaker, I have explained this Bill so often that I hope this will be the last time it will be necessary to explain it. If this Bill becomes law, it will have for effect the abolishing of legalized murder in Canada, and also of largely reducing the number of homicides and all other crimes in this young country of ours. It will also have the effect of making convictions for crime much less difficult, as juries will not hesitate to bring in verdicts of "guilty" when they are sure, if a mistake has been made, there will be time for the prisoners to prove their innocence; while if the law continues as at present, juries will hesitate to bring in verdicts of "guilty" in murder cases.

An hon. MEMBER: But explain the Bill.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The Bill will do away with that evil.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LATE SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a committee composed of Sir Robert Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir George Foster, the Hon. Geo. P. Graham, and Mr. R. B. Bennett, be appointed to prepare a resolution of condolence on the death of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G., and report the same with all convenient speed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of Customs for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Printed copies of proclamations, orders in council and documents relating to the European war, compiled by the Department of the Secretary of State; also supplementary copies of proclamations, orders in council and documents relating to the same subject compiled by the Department of the Secretary of State; also a list of the orders in council which have been passed between the 29th April, 1915 and the 12th January, 1916.—Sir Robert Borden.

CANADA'S SHARE OF WAR EXPENDITURE.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY: I desire to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) if he will kindly lay on the table of the House, or if he can give now, information in a concise manner as to the arrangement between the Government of Canada and the British Government as to what proportion of the expense in connection with the carrying on of the war, in so far as Canadian soldiers are concerned, is to be borne by the Government of Canada. I desire to know whether all the expense of ammunition, guns, equipment, etc., is to be borne by the Government of Canada, or what the arrangement is.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): The matter will be dealt with probably by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in introducing the war Appropriation Bill, which will provide means for continuing our participation in the war, or, if not, by myself in the Budget Speech, which will be made at a later date. In a general way, I may say to my hon. friend that the Government of Canada is bearing the entire expense of Canada's participation in the war. There will necessarily be certain accounts which cannot be adjusted until the war is over, or until a later

date. Recently I had a conversation with Col. Ward, who is immediately in touch with the situation in London, and I understood from him that the Canadian Government is to-day paying all the expenses connected with the Canadian Expeditionary Force at present in England, and is paying the men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in France, and Belgium, but that there will be certain adjustments of accounts necessary between the Government of Canada and the British Government at a later date covering such items as rations, supplies, and other equipment for the Canadian troops who are actually on the firing line. That matter is not susceptible of calculation and adjustment to-day, but the Canadian Government is responsible for the entire expense of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That means, of course, all the ammunition, all the guns, all the boots and shoes, and all the clothing used by the Canadian soldiers at the front?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Our understanding is that the Canadian Government will pay all, but that an adjustment is necessary and will have to take place later.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Does that include transportation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I speak subject to correction by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, but I believe that the Canadian Government has agreed to pay all the cost of transportation also; in other words, we desire to pay the entire cost of the Canadian Expeditionary Force abroad.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, January 17.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster-General): Mr. Speaker, it must have been a source of gratification to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden)—it certainly was a source of gratification to his colleagues—to notice the acclaim with which the people of Canada received the announcement made by him at the beginning of the year that half a million Canadian soldiers would be raised to participate in this war for the vindication of British justice and British freedom. So far, two leaders of the Opposition party have so expressed their views on that announcement that no doubt remains, if ever there was a doubt, about its unanimous endorsation by the whole people of Canada. We already had some indication as to how this announcement had been received by what had appeared in the press of the country. The comments of the leading Liberal journals of Canada proved that the Prime Minister was right in believing that although Canada had been doing her share in the war up to the date of the declaration made by my right hon. friend, Canada was ready to make still further sacrifices to support the cause of the Allies. May I give some citations on this point? Le Soleil, of Quebec, after discussing the question of the contribution of Canada to the cause of the Allies, ends an article of the 7th of January, 1916, by saying:

> It cannot be decently pretended that this sacrifice—

Meaning the sacrifice of five hundred thousand men.

> —is above the forces of Canada; it is a little more than one-eighth of the total male population of the country.

A correspondent wrote to the Toronto Globe asking what would George Brown say if he were living and saw the tremendous expense to which this country was put by its participation in this war. The Globe answered on the 11th of January:

> But on the main issue Sir Robert Borden is right, and the great mass of the people of the Dominion, irrespective of political ties, will endorse his decision. Canada joins with Britain in the declaration made by Premier Asquith on her behalf when he said: "We shall not sheathe the sword, which we have not lightly drawn, until Belgium has recovered more than she has sacrificed; until France is adequately secured against menace; until the rights of the smaller nationalities have been placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until the military domination of Prussia is finally destroyed." If George Brown were here he would say amen to every word in that declaration of the nation's purpose.

In an article which appeared under the signature of my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) in the Montreal Herald of the 6th of January, I read:

> The announcement made by Sir Robert Borden that his government have decided to authorize the enlistment of 500,000 men for overseas service will not be a surprise to the country. It will be a welcome announcement to the Empire and will demonstrate once more that Canadians are in this war in earnest, and that they are decided to leave nothing undone

to achieve victory and a lasting peace. Sir Robert and his colleagues have had carte blanche, from the very start, the Liberal leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and his colleagues in the House having assured the government of support in their military measures. Not only have the federal Liberals done this, but many leaders in the provincial field, Sir Lomer Gouin in Quebec, Mr. Rowell in Ontario, and the other Liberal leaders in other provinces having promised and given support and co-operation. The moment Canada entered the ring it could not rest with any half measure.

These articles, I believe, Sir, represent the sentiments of the country. In the speech which my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) made to the House last evening, he made allusion to the number of men which the Government had decided to send to the other side; and without criticising at all the tremendous outlay which this involved, he expressed the feeling of anxiety of the people of this country at the delay between the recruiting of the regiments and their despatch to the trenches. My hon. and gallant friend, the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) will no doubt give a full explanation of this; but as far as I can gather from the information I have, it is due to no fault of the Government. One must take into consideration the difficulty of transportation, and then again, if I am correctly informed, we send across as many troops as possible under the circumstances. Once they arrive on the other side they are under the control and command of the British authorities.

May I say, Sir, that the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer commended itself to me by its dignity of tone; indeed the tone of the debate so well set by my hon. friends who proposed and seconded the Address, the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Alfred Thompson) and the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Paquet) has been characterized by the loftiest patriotism. I commend particularly to the attention of the House the remarks made by my hon. friend from l'Islet. The members of the House who could not follow him in the language in which his speech was delivered, I am sure will find in the translation of that speech the real sentiments which animate the people of the province of Quebec in this momentous crisis. I trust, Sir, that in the few remarks which I am about to present to the House, I shall say nothing in manner or in form which may be disagreeable in any way to my hon. friends on the other side, or to any one in the country who may differ from me on the great questions at issue.

My hon. friend from Red Deer alluded to the splendid spirit which exists in the West, and I am a witness to the truth of what he says. Last summer I had occasion for two purposes to visit the West—that great portion of our Dominion of which we are so proud. The first purpose which I had in view was to judge at first hand, to hear with my own ears and to see with my own eyes, the postal situation there. The second purpose, and probably the most important one, was that I wished to allay certain prejudices, and to convey to any who might be misled correct opinions and ideas as to the situation in Quebec. I had read in some of the western papers that there was such an anti-war feeling in the province of Quebec that the Liberal party—and I do not wish to make the Liberal party responsible for this—wished to profit by this feeling to bring on an election, hoping by that means to secure a greater number of supporters in the province of Quebec. It seems to me—and I think I am correct in this view—that there is nothing which will detract more from the unity and harmony which should exist between all sections of the country, than the arousing of suspicions and prejudices between those of different race and faith who compose our federation. I wished to do as much as I could to allay those prejudices and susceptibilities, and suspicions, and to work so far as lay in my power for that brotherly love and good will which above all other things, should exist at this time in Canada.

Everywhere I went in the West I was received not only with the greatest courtesy but with the greatest sympathy. It was impressed upon me everywhere—that I was indeed a welcome messenger from the province of Quebec. Upon my return to Eastern Canada it seemed to me the imperative duty devolved on me of going into my own province, and placing before its people the real issues which confronted them. In the month of September, October, and a part of November, I held eighteen or twenty meetings in the eastern section of the province. My colleagues the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Patenaude) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Blondin) held other meetings in the central part of the province and in the district of Montreal. The reason for holding these meetings was to bring home to the people the origin and nature of the present conflict, and the results which were bound to follow from the unthinkable possibility of a German victory. As far as I could see while addressing audiences sometimes twenty-five hundred or three thous-

and people in the most remote districts, my remarks were well received. I was listened to not only with courtesy, but with sympathy, and the opinions and ideas which I gave expression to were received with approbation by the people of my province. These meetings were held with no political object in view, and it is scarcely necessary for me, I hope, to deny the unworthy allegation made in some quarters, that, under the guise of holding patriotic meetings, we were holding political meetings in which to expound the principles of the Conservative party. I believe that under the system of Government under which we live it is the duty of the ministers of the Crown to visit from time to time the different parts of the country, and more particularly the different parts of the provinces they represent, so that there may be a bond of sympathy and union between the ministers of the Crown and the people whom they represent. I believe that in that respect we should take a leaf from the book of the great English statesmen, who are continually speaking to their constituents. That is the reason why I thought it was incumbent upon me, and why my colleagues in the Government from the province of Quebec thought it was incumbent on them to explain directly to the people the real position of affairs, so that they might judge for themselves of the action and conduct of the Government. It is true, Sir—and I must tell the whole truth—that at these meetings I defended the Government from what I considered to be unfounded and unfair attacks; but on no occasion did I make any attack on my political opponents, or introduce any controversial matter. It was not that I think the case we Liberal-Conservatives are called upon to defend is not a good case; not that I think there is no cause of complaint in respect to the opinions held on the other side; but it was that I did not think the occasion warranted any controversy. It was because that I sincerely believe that the only subject that should occupy the attention of our people at the present time is this war in which the very existence of this country is at stake.

I wish, Sir, to render justice to whom justice is due. It was not only the Conservative ministers who held patriotic meetings in the province of Quebec. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) held such meetings, some of which I had the honour to attend. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) also took part in patriotic meetings. I regret, however, that others who should know better did not follow their leaders, but gave expression to opinions in some distant parts of the country which were not in consonance with the expressions which fell from the lips of their leaders. But, so as not to detract from the tone of this debate, which has been conducted on higher than party lines, I shall say no more on this at present, leaving to another and perhaps less dignified occasion its discussion.

What struck me most in these meetings in the province of Quebec which I attended was the manifest prosperity of the farmers. Everywhere we went we saw evidences of this great prosperity. I well remember that at a large meeting in the constituency of my hon. friend from Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard), at which there were present at least three thousand people, in that new country, which but a few years ago was nothing but a forest, we saw the farmers coming to the meetings in their automobiles and in carriages drawn by teams of splendid horses. Everywhere was to be found convincing proof to our friends from the other provinces, should they come to visit us, that Quebec is one of the most prosperous provinces in the Dominion.

Mr. PROULX: That was the result of Liberal rule.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not agree with my hon. friend. When we were in these more remote districts of the province of Quebec, we seemed to be very far indeed from the scene of the war. The residents have not yet felt the touch of the war; and such was the prosperity and peace which prevailed that we could not help thinking that even more than three thousand miles separated us from the theatre of hostilities. It has been said by an hon. member in this debate that recruiting was not quite so rapid in the province of Quebec and the eastern provinces as in the West. But let me point out that with the first contingent we sent 2,500 French-Canadians. Let me mention to my hon. friends the names of some of the officers who are serving in this war. At present we have in Canada Colonels Dansereau, Barré, Derosiers, Majors De Serres and Ranger, and Captains Leprohon and Roy, who have returned to Canada from the front and who are either organizing new battalions or otherwise help-

ing to recruit new regiments in the province of Quebec. Among those still in the theatre of the war we have Brigadier General Landry, Lt.-Col. Edouard Panet, Lt.-Col. Henri Panet, Majors Lebel, Gagnon, Verret, Milot, Chaballe, Captains Lefebvre, McDonald, Lemieux, Lacroix, Brosseau, Darche, H. Beaudry, Lieut. Pinnode, Capt. Garon, Capt. Leblanc (son of Quebec's Governor), Capt. Caron, Capt. Duchene and Capt. Picard. Some of the best families in the province of Quebec are represented, among them De Beaujeus, DeSalaberrys, Laviolettes, Babys and de Lanaudières. And surely it is a spectacle to be admired when we see the descendants of those who fought against the British for supremacy in Canada fighting side by side with the Allies.

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has the proud advantage of having one if not two sons at the front. Let me congratulate him sincerely. And may I be permitted to say that there are five men of my own name, of my own flesh and blood, who are now wearing the King's uniform and doing their duty in this war—there were six, but one has made the supreme sacrifice on the field of battle.

I have shown that the Prime Minister's announcement at the beginning of this war was well received by this House, by the press, and by the country, and that is due, I have no doubt to the united efforts of the political leaders. Let me call attention to a point which was referred to in the speech of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Paquet), and it is this: the Catholic Church in the province of Quebec, as in days of old, has done its duty. At the very beginning of the war, a pastoral letter was issued by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec calling upon their flocks to respond to the call of duty and to serve the flag. The memorable words quoted in this House the other day by my hon. friend from L'Islet and also by my hon. friend from Yukon (Mr Thompson) are there to show that the Catholic Church, the hierarchy and the clergy, in the present war as during the Napoleonic wars, are faithful to the British flag and to the free institutions which have given them such great liberties in the Dominion of Canada.

And what has been the result of all these efforts? Up to the first of December, 1915, there were at least 9,000 French-Canadians enlisted in the army. It is difficult to tell the exact number of French-Canadians now enlisted or the number that were enlisted at that time, because as hon. members of the House are aware, many of those British soldiers who came across with Wolfe settled in Quebec and adopted the language of those among whom they came to live, so that to-day there are Frasers, Blackburns Warrens, McLeans, and many others of similar names the descendants of these hardy British soldiers, who speak not one word of English. But I take from the official lists which have been furnished me by the Militia Department, that on the first of December last, there were 9,000 men bearing French names who had already enlisted.

This is not enough. We did not consider the province of Quebec, when it enlisted 9,000 men was doing its full duty, and every effort has been put forward to ensure that in this great cause the province of Quebec shall bear its full share in the defence of the Empire. At the present time, apart from the regiments of Colonels Gaudet and Archambault which are on the other side of the ocean, there are now organized or being organized in the province of Quebec, regiments under Colonels Dansereau, Barré, Readman, Piuze, and last, but not least, under Major Asselin, the Nationalist. Let me say here that all praise is due to Mr. Asselin. I take it that it is not a crime for a man to change his views or his political opinions.

Mr. MURPHY: When he changes them rightly.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When he changes them right. In the words of M. Guizot, 'celui qui ne change pas d'avis est un sot." But, Sir, when I spoke of the unanimity of sentiment in the province of Quebec I was not forgetting what had been published in a paper which is well known to many members of this House, and from the columns of which I desire to read a few articles. On September 18, 1914, Le Devoir, of Montreal, under the signature of M. Henri Bourassa, published an article in which that gentleman first laid down the principle that Canada, as an irresponsible dependency of Great Britain, had no moral or constitutional obligation in regard to or immediate interest in the present conflict, and then this article proceeded:

> Independently of these colonial obligations, which from the standpoint of history, the constitution or the facts, are inexistent, is it possible for Canada as a young nation (nation embryonnaire), as a community of men, to remain indifferent in respect to the European conflict?
>
> To this second question, as to the first, I reply without hesitation: no!

Canada, an Anglo-French nation, connected with France and England by a thousand ethnical, social, intellectual, economic ties, has a vital interest in the integrity of France and England, their prestige, their right and their world action.

It is, therefore, Canada's national duty to contribute, according to her resources and by the proper means of action, to the triumph and especially to the endurance of the combined efforts of France and England.

Again, on September 15 of the same year, the same writer repeated what he had said about the national duty. He said he gave his definition of national duty after mature deliberation, and added:

At the risk of being accused of weakness and inconsistency by those who only look at the intrinsic situation of Canada and only the ulterior and real dangers of her immixture in the wars of the Empire, I have not written and I will not write one line, one word, to condemn the sending of Canadian troops to Europe.

There are circumstances, and this appears to be one, where logic and even the most legitimate fears must give way before the exigencies of the moment.

The Ministry and Parliament having taken the whole responsibility of their action, one must look at, for the moment, only the immediate objective of that intervention—the free and voluntary aid granted by Canada to England, France and Belgium. Even if one believes that this aid, independently from the motives of a political nature which we cannot admit, is not the most efficient which could be taken to attain the object in view, the time has not come to pass judgment. But what is legitimate and even rigourously obligatory, is to suggest and promote all measures which are proper to render as efficient as possible Canada's action, and especially to put Canada in a position to sustain and prolong her effort.

Hon. gentlemen who have read Le Devoir of later date must ask themselves what has taken place since the month of September, 1914, to change the views of its editor. Is it because we have not been successful in chasing the Germans out of France, that we are now to desist? Because we have lost ground in the Balkan States, should we refrain from continuing the efforts which we have begun? It seems to me, Sir, that everything that has occurred impels us to continue and to increase our struggle to secure success, triumph and victory.

The province of Quebec understands what her duty is; she understands that it is in her interest to participate in this war. A great deal has been said in this House, and out of it, as to the nature of the conflict. One has only to turn back the pages of history in order to see what is the origin, the object, and the motive of the present conflict between Germany and Austria on the one side, and France, Great Britain, Russia and Italy on the other. Ever since 1840, and before that, German writers have been telling the people of Germany that the only aim of the German Empire is that she shall be the dominant power in the world; that the commercial centre of the world shall be no longer Paris, or London, but Berlin. Let me repeat a quotation which is taken from one of the writings of the author of Der Wacht am Rhine, and was probably written in 1840 or 1845:

German Switzerland, Alsace, German Belgium, Holland, Denmark, the Baltic Provinces which speak German, will all be reincorporated in the Fatherland. Prussia will assume the direction of this new Germany. As for the old house of Hapsburg, it will no longer play any part, and Austria, whose frontiers will stretch to the mouth of the Danube, will be a slav empire, extending from Pesth to the Black Sea and from Prussia to Greece.

In 1840, Henrich Heine, who was not an ennemy of France, wrote that he loved the German Fatherland, that he would never deliver the Rhine to the French, that the day would come when Germany would roll her thunder with a roll such as history had never heard before, that she would retake Alsace and Lorraine, that she would precede the French by thought as she had preceded them in action and that she would surely impose her authority on the whole world. "Often have I thought," he continues, "of this mission, of this universal domination by Germany, when I was promenading alone with my dreams under the eternally green fir-trees of my country."

Sir, these thoughts were carried out in the war which Germany waged against Denmark for the conquest of Schleswig—Holstein; they were carried out in the war waged by Germany against Austria; they were held in view in the terrible war which was waged in 1870 by Germany against France. To-day the same aim is always held in view—the domination of the world by the German Empire and the substitution of German dominion and German power for the power of Great Britain on sea and on land.

The war which is now being waged is, therefore, for Canada a war of self-defence. It has been rightly said that the first line of defence of Canada is in the line of the trenches in Flanders. Let us consider for a moment what is the condition of Germany. We all know that her population has increased tremendously. It has been said with truth that England has colonies and colonists; that France has colonies but no colonists, and that Germany has colonists but no colonies; and one of the principal aims of Germany in waging the present war is to acquire colonies for her excess

population. So far as Canada is concerned, what would be the result of the humiliation of France or the defeat of Great Britain? One of the first acts of the German Empire would be to acquire this Dominion, which has always been looked upon as the brightest gem in Britain's crown. I say, therefore— I have repeated this time and again in my own province—that the aim of the German Empire is not only the domination of the world, but the acquiring of colonies as well, and that this war is not only the war of Great Britain, the war of France, the far of Russia and the war of Italy, but it is the war of Canada. It is Canada's war; it is the war of free men who cherish the free institutions under which they live and prosper. If Canada became a German colony, what would befall the province of Quebec? To answer that question, I point to what befell Poland, and to what befell Alsace and Lorraine when they became German provinces. When we are told that we do not enjoy a full measure of liberty in this country, we ought to remember that if we ever became a dependency of Germany—which God forbid—the fight which we had to make for the liberties we now enjoy would have to be fought over again. Do we not remember the terrible struggle which took place in Alsace and Lorraine, and in Germany itself after the war of 1870? Hon. gentlemen who are old enough to remember will recall the kulturkampf which was inaugurated in Germany: the terrible fight against the Roman Catholic Church in Germany; the exile and imprisonment of its priests, bishops, even its cardinals. Everybody knows that in Alsace and Lorraine the use of the French language has been prohibited; it has even been erased from the crosses and monuments in the cemeteries. In the Danish provinces of Holstein and Schleswig no public meetings can to-day be held where anything but the German tongue is spoken. This is a picture, Mr. Speaker, of what would happen to the province of Quebec if it ever became a German possession.

It seems to me, Sir, that the province of Quebec has had its full share of constitutional controversy, and that it is about time to take measures which will prevent the occurring of such controversies in the near future. From some quarters we are confronted by what was said in years past by Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper and others as to the participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire. We are confronted by what Sir John A. Macdonald said at one time as to Canada's participation in the Soudan campaign. But can any parallel be drawn between the wars of those days and the war which is going on to-day? It is sufficient merely to call attention to the differences which exist between the circumstances connected with the campaigns to which Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper and other leaders referred and this world war. Does any one doubt that if Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper were in this House to-day they would not be strong advocates of Canada's participation in this conflict?

But, Sir, this is putting the matter on a wrong basis. It is not England's war that we are asked to participate in; it is not the war of Great Britain, it is the war of Canada. It is a war in which every patriotic Canadian is bound to do his duty.

So much for the interest of Canada in the war, and so much for the interest especially of the province of Quebec in this great struggle. But what about sentiment? What do we owe to England? Is it not a fact that we owe her our free institutions, our autonomous government, the privileges which, I have no hesitation in saying, make us the freest people in the world? Is it not true, I say, that we owe these institutions and privileges to England? We have truly a government of the people by the people. Our Government is a democratic government in the truest and the widest sense. If sometimes we do not act wisely, we alone are to blame, not the mother country, who gave us the means wherewith to make good laws and to administer them wisely. It surpasses my comprehension how people can be so obdurate as to say that we should hold England responsible for what is said in some parts of this country simply because the words which are used are said and written by men speaking the same language as that which is spoken by the majority of the people in Great Britain.

What do we owe to France? We owe to France what the child owes to the mother: our greatest love and our fondest admiration. What an example France is giving us to-day! what an example France is giving to the province of Quebec! Everybody knows that before this great struggle began, France was divided and torn by factions. Everybody knows also that since the first day of August, 1914, France has given an admirable spectacle to the entire

world; it has been called le miracle de la France. Sir, when the sound of the drum rolled over the peaceful fields of France; when its people heard the bugle call, all these cries of discord were hushed; one cry only was heard, and that was the cry of "Vive la France." My right hon. friend and leader of the Government, when he spoke yesterday, rendered a just tribute to the heroic French army. I know that my hon. and gallant friend the Minister of Militia, when he came back from the scenes of battle, was full of praise for the French generals and for the French army.

Let me refer for one moment to the heroic women of France. I do not think that there is in France one home which the hand of death has not visited, or in which mourning is not seen. Nevertheless, the women go on in the calm pursuit of the only aim which the whole nation has—to vanquish the German foe. Let me give one instance to show what the heart of the French woman is like. I read the other day in a newspaper—and some hon. gentlemen in this House must have read it— that a young woman holding a babe in her arms was standing on the roadside while a regiment which had just come from the trenches was passing by. In that regiment her husband had been captain. One of the friends of the captain, seeing the woman on the side of the road, came out of the ranks and said: "Do not wait; it is of no use; you will never see him again." The wife's heart stopped beating for an instant; then she took her child in her arms, and, raising it above her head, she cried: "Vive la France." That, Mr. Speaker, shows the character of the French nation; that shows the heroism of the people from which the majority of the people in the province of Quebec have sprung.

I should like to call attention also to the splendid example which is given by the British Empire, at home as well as in the colonies. My right hon. friend the leader of the Government, and other speakers who have preceded me, have referred to what the navy has accomplished and is accomplishing to-day. Where would we be if the British navy had not existed? Where would France be to-day if the British navy had not existed? What would have become of her ports, Cherbourg, Toulon, Bordeaux? They would have been bombarded and perhaps destroyed. Sir, if it had not been for the British navy I have no doubt that the ports of Canada would have been bombarded; and that we would have seen German cruisers sailing up the river St. Lawrence. The fact that we can go on with our trade and commerce as we did before the war, and that we can send our troops across the ocean, is due only to the unequalled and magnificent British navy.

I turn to the overseas dominions, and what a splendid example they have given to the world! An example unequalled in history. The moment the battle call went forth Australia and New Zealand came to the rescue. In South Africa we saw the loyal subjects go forth, first of all to put down rebellion in their own midst, and to-day they, too, are sending troops overseas to fight the battles of the Empire. As for Canada, she has done her duty, and she will continue to do her duty until the last man has gone and the last dollar is expended. In this concert of the British Dominions the province of Quebec will take her proper part. Her political leaders, her religious leaders, her representative bodies are unanimous. Is it possible that we are all wrong, and that a small group in our province has a monopoly of wisdom, sagacity, experience, and judgment? What I ask from this House, Mr. Speaker, and what I ask from the country, is simple justice. I ask that the province of Quebec be judged by the declarations which have been made by the Lauriers, the Lemieuxs, and the Marcils,—if I name them, Sir, I hope to be pardoned for this breach of parliamentary etiquette—and by the declarations of the Patenaudes, the Blondins, and the Beaubiens. These are the standards by which I wish the province of Quebec to be judged, and not by the vagaries and vaporings of a small group of misguided gentlemen.

But, Sir, by those who remain at home, by those who cannot go to the front, there is an important duty to be performed, and that duty is, first of all, to instruct those who need instruction. In view of what is being said and written at the present time, I say that in the province of Quebec we should redouble our efforts so as to bring her contribution up to the standard of the other provinces of the Dominion. We should make sacrifices in every way, sacrifices of our time, sacrifices of our talents, however humble they may be; sacrifices of our means. We should go to the last dollar that we possibly can spare to replenish such funds as the Patriotic Fund. What, after all, are those sacrifices that we who remain here are called upon to make? What are they compared with the sacrifices of those whose homes have been laid desolate by

German invasion? What are they compared with the sacrifices of the Belgians, or of the French, of whose territory one-fourth is still in the hands of the Germans? What are the sacrifices of those of us who remain here and cannot bear arms compared with the sacrifices of our noble boys who to-day are in the trenches? Sir, it seems to me that in this conflict—and I am only repeating what I have heard others say, and what I feel most earnestly—the whole nation must have but one aim in view, that is, the triumph of our arms and the vindication of the eternal principles of right, and justice, and freedom.

4 p.m.

My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) alluded to the great speech which was made by Mr. Lloyd George in the British House of Commons. I take Mr. Lloyd George's words in concluding that speech and incorporate them in mine as expressing my own sentiments and the sentiments of the country:

> Let us fling to one side rivalries, trade jealousies, professional, political, everything. Let us be one people, one in aim, one in action, one in resolution, so to win the most sacred cause ever entrusted to a great nation.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Mr. Speaker, let me at once congratulate my hon. friend, the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain), on the very able and very patriotic address which he has just delivered to the House. I was unfortunate last year to be absent from the House mostly every day during the session on account of illness, but I have been amply repaid to-day in listening to my hon. friend. Let me say to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Robert Borden) that he and his party are to be congratulated on their new acquisition. In speaking as he has spoken, the Postmaster General has followed and obeyed life-long convictions; the language which he has used to-day is the language which he used in 1911 and in all the general elections which have taken place since he entered politics. During the recess the hon. gentleman visited the West, and there delivered many patriotic addresses. These addresses were received in the spirit in which they ought to be received. Passing from the West my hon. friend came East. He was needed in the East, as you know, Mr. Speaker; he addressed several large gatherings; and I can give him credit for this, that at least he made two important converts. If there is such a thing as a ministerial heaven, there should be more rejoicing in that heaven over the two sinners whom he brought with him than over many of the just that are around him.

I now pass to the speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General. For the third session Parliament has lived under the shadow of the greatest conflict in the history of mankind. I need not repeat, Mr. Speaker, what has been said from the beginning of the sittings of this House, that there can be only one opinion, only one determination, as regards the great issue confronting us: that we must help carry to a successful conclusion this terrible war. The issue is and must be all-absorbing. All others are mere contingencies compared with it. All others should fade away and vanish. Sir, it is in that spirit that the members of the Liberal party have approached this great issue. Prior to the declaration of war on the 4th August, 1914, the right hon. the leader of the Liberal party (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the veteran among the privy councillors in Canada, and probably in His Majesty's dominions, spoke thus:

> I have often declared that if the mother country were ever in danger, or if danger even threatened, Canada would render assistance to the full extent of her power. In view of the critical nature of the situation, I have cancelled all my meetings. Pending such great questions there should be a truce to party strife.

Sir, as a humble follower of my right hon. friend, I am proud to say that he has lived up to that patriotic pledge. During the recess he has addressed meetings at Napanee, in the province of Ontario, here, in the city of Ottawa, in his old native village of St. Lin, at Sherbrooke, and, a few days ago, in Montreal, and he has consistently and eloquently appealed to the yeomanry of this country to buckle on their armour for service in His Majesty's army. That has not been the attitude only of my right hon. friend individually; it has been the official attitude of the Liberal party. On the 21st December last representatives of the Liberal party met in Ottawa, and they unanimously passed the following resolution, which speaks their sentiments and their opinions:

> The National Liberal Committee is of opinion that so long as the war lasts, the Liberal party should continue as it has from the first to give its chief attention to the tremendous struggle in which the country is engaged and that, to that end, it should continue to give loyal support to all necessary war measures whilst exercising a vigilant supervision of the conduct of the Government, both in military and civil matters.

I am pleased to hear that my hon. friend from Peterboro (Mr. Burnham) has asked the Clerk of the House to wipe out from the Votes and Proceedings the notice of motion which he gave at the beginning of this session. My hon. friend from Peterboro reminds me of the Lord High Chamberlain in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. We know that for three hundred years, at the opening of Parliament, the Lord High Chamberlain, accompanied by the Yeoman of the Guard, and all bearing halberds and carrying lanterns, visits and scrutinizes the regions underneath the Parliament buildings at Westminster, to see if, perchance, he can find any Guy Fawkes of gunpowder plot fame . My hon. friend has fortunately found out that this meeting of the members of the Liberal party a few days before the opening of this Parliament did not smack of any Guy Fawkes or gunpowder plot.

Sir, there is a truce, but that truce, I must say, does not spell abdication. We agree, both sides of the House, both currents of public opinion in Canada, as to the essential thing, namely, the legitimate prosecution of this war, but as to the scope of legislative enactments, as to the expenditure of public money, as to the mode of taxation, I reserve my right to be critical and to investigate if need be. The Government must expect to-day more than ever a strict control and scrutiny of its actions. The functions of the government in any British country are of the nature of a trust, generally speaking, and more so during a war when the expenditure are as stupendous as they are to-day. It is not a trust in the ordinary sense of the word; it is a sacred trust, and surely the Government will expect that His Majesty's loyal Opposition will be inclined to ask questions and be critical at times. This perhaps may surprise some of my fellow members, but I take my brief from probably the greatest of all parliamentarians in Great Britain. I refer to the immortal Burke. When he, for the first time, offered himself as a candidate in the old city of Bristol, he used the following language:

> Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment and betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices that to your opinion.

As a Liberal, as a Canadian, as a free citizen of a free country, though I agree with the Government on the essential thing, the legitimate prosecution of the war, and the necessary expenditures entailed by that war, I wish to reserve for myself the right to criticise and to investigate if need be. Let me give a case in point. Without traducing any one, without making any accusations, I am simply referring to the rumors which are at the present time, saturating the atmosphere of this capital city of the Dominion. We all know that, acting under the direction of this Government, a commission has been appointed to give shell orders for the British authorities throughout the various industrial centres of Canada. That commission has been replaced of late. It is being said, and it has been said, that large orders were given without any tender. It is being said, it is hinted, that orders were distributed amongst the members of that commission. It is being said that extensive profits, profits abnormally high, were made. I do not know, I am not in a position to state if this is a true statement of the fact, and I make no accusations, but I say, Sir, that it is the duty of this Parliament to investigate, to scrutinise and to know whether such is true or not.

Oh, I know that people say that this Government, that this Parliament, has nothing to do with that commission, that the money was spent on behalf of the British Government, and that therefore we have nothing to investigate. Let me give the answer to that quibble by citing the words emanating from the trenchant pen of one gentleman who sat in this House when first I was elected in 1896, from a man whose crisp style is well known to the Conservative organizers in this country —I refer to my friend Mr. Ross Robertson, of the Toronto Telegram. Here is the answer made to that quibble by Mr. Ross Robertson writing in the Toronto Telegram of November 30, 1915:

> The worst sort of quibble travels in the suggestion that the shell committee was spending the money of the British taxpayers, and the work of that committee is therefore none of Sir Robert Borden's business. The shell committee was acting on behalf of Sir Robert Borden, just as Sir Robert Borden was acting on behalf of the Canadian people. The shell committee was not the steward of Canada's money. The shell committee was the steward of Canada's honour.

I make no accusations, I feel sure that the right hon. gentleman, who is the steward of Canada's honour, as was so well said and penned by my friend Mr. Ross Robertson, can answer any charges that may be made on account of that committee's action.

This being said about our right to criti-

cise and to investigate, let me now pass to the speech from the Throne and state at once that it is an agreeable duty for me to join with my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) in saying that the speech from the Throne this year reflects the admiration and the pride of the Canadian people at large for the noble achievements of those who fought and died in the trenches in Flanders. At Festubert, at Langemarck, and at St. Eloi, our soldiers, as the right hon. the leader of the Opposition well said yesterday, fought like veterans and heroes. They maintained high the traditions of the nation; they made immortal the name and the fame of our common country Canada. Sir, my right hon. friend the leader of the House was kind enough yesterday to mention the noble deed of Major Roy who fell in the trenches. Let me reciprocate with him and take off my hat in mentioning the name of Guy Drummond who left his palatial home in Montreal, who had in his possession all the happiness which life could yield a man, millions to spend, a bright intelligence, who left the shores of Canada with the Princess Patricia Regiment, and who fell like a hero in the trenches of Flanders. The effort of Canada is happily summarized and fully justified, it seems to me, in two phrases of the speech, as follows:

> The Empire's part therein has been amply maintained at sea by the aspiring achievements of the Navy and on land by the distinguished valour of the great armies which have enrolled themselves in all parts of His Majesty's dominions for the common defence of our liberty.

And further:

> Equally praiseworthy and impressive has been the self-sacrificing and loyal spirit shown by all the Canadian people who have freely dedicated their manhood and substance to the common defence of the Empire.

I have no hesitation in proclaiming high and loud that the common defence of the Empire means in my humble judgment the common defence of our liberty. In this sense my hon. friend the Postmaster General is right when he says that in the present war the first line of defence of Canada is in the plains of Flanders. I forget the name of the American statesman who once said, "I stand for my country right or wrong." The more I study the causes of this conflict, the more I am convinced that Great Britain is in the right in this war. The crime of blood guiltiness does not lie at her gate. History will say that she sought to prevent the strife from the very beginning, but that she could not view with indifference the brutal outrage perpetrated on poor Belgium and the unprovoked terrorism displayed on the Meuse and further on in Champagne. Great Britain was not attacked: France and Russia were attacked. Britain might have awaited the onslaught; she might have stood clear even; she might have husbanded her resources of men and money; she might simply and swiftly have prepared; she might even have loomed over the stricken adversaries in the end and claimed for herself the hegemony of Europe; but Britain did not do so. In the light of history it will be said that Britain did not do so; that she spontaneously and bravely threw her trident into the scale; that she threw her gold into the scale; that she threw her racial record, her great prestige; that she threw and is throwing in the balance the whole puissance of the mighty British Empire—and all for what? for that principle of the liberty of the individual which is the mainstay of the British institutions as against mediaeval autocracy. In the light of history, in the eyes of civilization. Germany on the contrary stands at the bar. She, and she alone, is responsible for this awful conflagration. Her aim, lust of conquest; her ambition, the domination of the world. And in order to dominate the world she had to crush the small nationalities. In order to dominate the world she had to maim France for the second time. In order to dominate the world, she had to humble the British Empire. This is why I say that in the present conflict the common defence of the British Empire, as stated in the Speech from the Throne, means the common defence of our liberties.

It has been said that we owe nothing to England. Sir, the whole structure of the British Empire is based on freedom, religious and civil freedom; and the fall of the British Empire would mean the destruction of those liberal institutions which are so necessary to mankind. It would mean the revival of autocracy and the disappearance from the world of those principles of government by the people for the people which were once so eloquently defined by the greatest of Americans, Abraham Lincoln. Need I say with my hon. friend the Postmaster General that we of French origin in this House and in this country, inspired by the memories of the past stand by the British ideals of government in this crisis. We know, as students of history, what is Britain's true glory. Britain's true glory, Sir, is not Agincourt, it is not even

Waterloo. Britain's true glory is not her commerce though it spread its sails on the seven seas of the world. Britain's true glory is not her literature, so brilliant, her rhetoric so powerful, for even in that field she has rivals. Britain's true glory, Sir, is her genius for free government. It is not unlike the majestic dome of the great St. Paul's cathedral. To eyes that view that dome superficially it may appear aerial. But behold the massive pillars by which it is upheld. The British Empire also is surmounted by a dome, the freedom which it spreads over all the Dominions. And the pillars are the Dominions themselves—Canada, Australia, Newfoundland, New Zealand, South Africa, all young and lusty nations made free and happy under British institutions.

With the vast number of troops which this war has created in Canada, some may apprehend danger of militarism. Mr. Speaker, Canadians, even at the sight of five hundred thousand soldiers, will never be carried away by the glamour of arms. They will not be dazzled by the exploits of war. At best they look upon militarism as a curse. But they understand that this war is waged against militarism. It is because of the existence of the Empire, and because the liberties of that Empire were challenged and threatened, that the Canadian people decided, as by a lightning flash, to participate in this war. The Canadian people understand that this is not a war of conquest; it is a conflict of ideals, a conflict which may be summed up in these words: Shall the rule of the soldier in the twentieth century prevail over the rule of the citizen; shall the rule of fear replace the rule of law? We Canadians wish to maintain the rule of the citizen and not the rule of the soldier, the rule of law and not the rule of fear. And we know that in England the soldier is not the master but the servant of the people. Mr. Speaker, the reason why Great Britain stepped into this gigantic conflict has been aptly given by the Prime Minister the Right Hon. Mr. Asquith. Speaking at Bristol, at the beginning of hostilities, Mr. Asquith explained to the electors why England had taken the plunge into this war, and he used the following words, which, in my judgment are most inspiring:

> It is because we believe here, old fashioned people as we are, in the sanctity of treaties; that the weak have rights, that the strong have duties; that small nationalities have every bit as good a title as large ones to life and independence; and that freedom for her own sake is as well worth fighting for to-day as it ever was in the past.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Noble words! They constitute in the present instance my brief as a French Canadian, if brief were needed, to justify my action in supporting the war. Yes, I belong to the minority. But I am proud also of my British citizenship. And it is because I belong to one of those small nationalities referred to in Mr. Asquith's Bristol speech, that I cling the more to the flag which protects my race and protects my rights. The triumph of Great Britain will be the triumph of the minority in this country; the defeat of Great Britain would be the defeat of the minority.

Sir, let me say to my friends of the English-speaking persuasion on both sides of the House that it shall never be said that England's difficulties are Quebec's opportunities. There now exists an indissoluble union between England and France, a union cemented by the blood of the bravest on the plains of Flanders and on the cliffs of the Dardanelles. May we not hope that as a result of this war, in which the two mother countries of the two leading races in Canada are taking such a noble part; in which the sons of those two races have joined the standards of both their mother countries—may we not hope that a better feeling will exist in the future between the French and the English races in Canada? My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, at the conclusion of his speech yesterday, used the following language:

> In the fierce flame of this war, in the ordeal of sacrifice which it entails, the strong elements of the Canadian nation will learn the better to understand each other, and through that understanding will be welded into a more perfect and splendid unity than ever before.

I commend the right hon. gentleman for this noble language. I say to my hon. friends on both sides of the House that the hon. leader of the Government was only re-echoing in that sentence of his, the sentiments at one time entertained by one of the greatest Canadians who ever lived. I refer to the late Edward Blake. In 1887, speaking in the province of Ontario, Mr. Blake used the following language:

> The true path of duty in a community of divers races and creeds like ours—where we must combine firmness in the assertion of our rights with fulness in the recognition of the rights of others—is to cultivate moderation and forbearance; we must hold to the ample acknowledgment of each man's individual rights of conscience in religious matters, and to the common citizenship of all in civil matters, if we would make of Canada a great and free country, inhabited by a happy and united people.

On another occasion, speaking of the minorities, he said:

> But more, I say that being strong, we ought to be what the strong should always be—generous to the weak. Measure full, heaped up and running over, is the measure to be given by the strong to the weak.

I ask my hon. friends who belong to the majority to reflect upon, to ponder, to read and to digest the words of Edward Blake:

> Measure full, heaped up and running over, is the measure to be given by the strong to the weak.

Edward Blake has passed away, leaving a name and fame worthy of his great intellectual power. May we not expect that there will rise another Blake in Ontario to defend and protect the minority? Sir, speaking at a recruiting meeting held in St. James Methodist church, Montreal, not long ago, I said:

> To respond to the call of the King is not only a duty, but an honour and a privilege.

And I added:

> This is a holy war, it is a new Crusade which fires us with moral enthusiasm. Let the churches be as many recruiting tents for the Crusaders.

I was taken to task by a so-called religious weekly for having used that language. But I have, as regards what I said at that church, nothing to retract. When I uttered those sentiments I remembered that it was from the pulpit that, in 1775, Mgr. Briand urged upon his flock to rally to the king's colours. I remembered that it was from the pulpit that, in 1812, Mgr. Plessis called upon his flock to rally to the colours of the King. Mr. Speaker, the language of the Archbishop of Montreal the other day does not reflect a new sentiment or a new devotion of the Roman Catholic church to British institutions in Canada. The traditional policy of the Roman Catholic church in the province of Quebec has always been one of fealty and loyalty to the Crown and to British institutions. It would take too long, perhaps, to quote the language of the first Bishop of Quebec after the Conquest; let me, however, quote to the House the language of Mgr. Plessis at the outbreak of the war in 1812:

> We have never ceased to inculcate in you on all occasions the principle of loyalty, respect and attachment with which you should be filled for our august Sovereign and his government. We have repeated to you many times that those words of the Chief of the Apostles, "Fear God, honour the King," were not only a counsel but a precept and an essential article of religious morals; that your fathers in the faith have ever followed no other doctrine.

This is, Sir, the doctrine of my Church as regards the duties of the flock towards the Crown and the constitutional authorities. As in 1775, as in 1812, so in this year of our Lord 1916, the clergy and the laity in the province of Quebec shall remain faithful to that doctrine, and do remain faithful to it.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General has referred in very eloquent terms to the efforts made in the province of Quebec to promote recruiting. May I say once for all to my hon. friends on both sides of the House—I wish that my voice could be heard all through this land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—that the heart of Quebec is in this war, and that we must not mistake the words of a few eccentric persons as being the expression of the sentiment of my native province. Mr. Bourassa does no more represent public opinion in my province on this issue than Bernard Shaw represents England's opinion in the old country. Mr. Speaker, we are a unit. Nine thousand of our kith and kin are on the battlefront. I wish that my province should be judged of her efforts not by those who enlist at the present time in large numbers, but by the lists of the wounded which are being published every day by the press of this country. Mr. Speaker, recruiting is active at the present time in the province of Quebec. Thanks to the direction given not only by the Church—because we do not need the direction of the Church to direct us to our purely civil duties; I am a Liberal and I require no dictation as to my duties to the King and constitution—not only by the Church but also by the public men, my fellowmen, Conservative as well as Liberal, have united in making an appeal to the yeomanry of the province of Quebec which, thank Heaven, has been listened to. My hon. friend has mentioned some names which are prominent in the armies of His Majesty. We claim, with no uncertain pride, as being of our blood, men who belong to the historic French-Canadian families: the Gaudets, the Dansereaus, the DesRosiers, the Deserres, the DeSalaberrys, the Talbots, the Papineaus, the Duchesnays, the Casgrains, the DeLanaudières, and the Verrets—I could name many others. Last, but not the least, we are at the present time organizing two regiments, one under the leadership of Major Asselin and the other under the leadership of Major Barré. I was appointed president of the civilians' committee which raised the regimental fund for the Asselin regiment. I refused many contributions offered me by my English speaking fellow-

citizens in Montreal, because I knew that they had done their duty liberally in connection with regiments raised by Colonel Meighen, Colonel Davidson and others. I insisted that the contributions should come from the French Canadians only, and I am proud to be able to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the many calls which are being made on behalf of Patriotic fund, the Red Cross, the Comité France-Amerique, the Belgian fund, the Serbian fund—in spite of the many charities that are needed at the present moment for our institutions in Montreal, within three weeks we raised a very substantial amount amongst my fellowmen towards the regimental fund of the Asselin battalion. In six months, the turn of the tide having taken place, the public of the province of Quebec will have been educated—yes, educated as regards this war, because the population, being largely rural, and having enjoyed peace for a hundred years, is not, as many would think, so much affected by events in Europe as other sections of Canada, because it is Canadian born, seven, eight, nine, ten generations back. I say that the public, having been made acquainted with the facts concerning this war, thanks to the eloquence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, thanks to the campaign of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, thanks to the articles published by the Quebec press, within six months, we shall have nearer twenty thousand than fifteen thousand new recruits in my province.

Mr. Speaker, when the rolls are published after the war, and when we shall be in a position properly to assess the Macleans and Scotts and Rosses—gallant French-Canadians with Scotch names—it will be found that the province of Quebec had its full proportion in this great conflict.

The speech from the Throne mentions the lasting peace which is to come. The last paragraph says:

> Measures will be submitted for your consideration to further the effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire and in the maintenance of this war, waged for liberty and lasting peace.

The time for peace is, I am sorry to say, still far in the future. There is not a single point of agreement between the contestants, and there can be no peace for men fighting for their lives; life must first be assured. No peace is possible, Sir, while the rulers of Germany cling to the belief that it is within their grasp and power to dominate the world. There can be no assurance of life for Russia, France and Great Britain until the German dream is destroyed; until the military caste, and the madness which conceived it, is shattered to pieces. In this gigantic struggle, the Allies all stand for freedom against autocracy, and on that roll of honour I am proud to see my own country, Canada, fighting for freedom, fighting against autocracy. Yes, Russia, tied down by her barbarous past, is fighting so that Europe may be free; Serbia refuses to accept the yoke of serfdom; Italy has drawn her sword, as in the days of old, for her unity and independence; France, gallant, imperishable, has been stemming for the third time in her marvellous history the tide of the barbarians; Ireland, the land of a thousand sorrows, has responded nobly to the call of Redmond; Belgium, undaunted and unyielding, has preferred the path of duty to the Hun shackles; England and Scotland are spending lavishly their treasure of men and money in order that the cause of free government shall subsist in the world. Yes, I am proud to see the name of Canada on that roll of honour alongside the names of those other countries, standing for the cause of democracy challenged by the German military party.

But, Sir, the speech from the Throne is silent on some vital questions. There is an old French adage which says: "Gouverner, c'est prévoir"—to govern is to foresee. We all agree as to the war expenditure properly speaking. I am not criticising the war expenditure, but I wish to refer to the ordinary expenditure—I should call it extraordinary expenditure—of this year. It has reached the breaking point. I wish to call the attention of my genial friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) to the trend of events in Canada from a financial point of view since he took office. You will remember that in 1891, with a population of practically 5,000,000 people, the cost of running this country was $7.50 for every head of population. In 1901, with a population of 5,500,000 people, it was $8.75 for every head of population. In 1911, that famous year, wherein no truck and no trade was to be had with our neighbours, with a population of 7,206,000 people, the cost of administering the country was $12 for every head of population. In 1915, the year that my hon. friend was knighted, after four years of his activities in the Finance Department, we can estimate a population of not more than

8,000,000, and the cost of running the country has reached the sum of $16.90 for every head of population. And let me at once, while he is sitting next the Postmaster General, tell him that in the Post Office Department, notwithstanding the administrative ability of the Postmaster General, notwithstanding his honesty of purpose, there exists a serious state of things. I charge nothing for the information—there is a ghost haunting that department. That ghost appears periodically when the Tory party takes office. When Sir William Mulock took charge of the department, with a vigorous hand and a few adjectives, he rid the department of the ghost, and I followed suit. But when my mascot, the former Postmaster General, took charge of that department, the ghost reappeared and he hugged the ghost.

5 p.m.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The ghost is in the closet now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is an old man with a long beard. His name spells deficit, and he seems to be installed in the Post Office Department, not for many years to come, I hope, but for some time at least, unless my hon. friend takes a leaf from my book or from the book of Sir William Mulock.

Now let us take the Post Office Department. In 1896 the expenditure in the Post Office Department was $3,752,805. In 1911, when a handsome surplus was shown, it had increased to $7,954,000 or an increase of a little over $4,000,000 in fifteen years—and we were selling stamps at two cents instead of three cents. By the way, let me congratulate by hon. friend on having relieved the people from the task of having to lick two stamps for every letter. In fifteen years we increased the expenditure by only $4,000,000. When the Hon. Mr. Pelletier appeared in that department and when he hugged the ghost, the expenditure increased from $7,954,000 in 1911, to $12,822,000 in 1914, and to $14,956,000 in 1915, an increase of nearly $5,000,000 in the three years and of nearly $7,000,000 in the four years. In other words, the increase in the annual cost of administration of the department for the fifteen years prior to 1911 was something like $4,000,000 while the increase for the four years following was something like $7,000,000. My hon. friend is a business man, besides being a brilliant jurist. I will ask him to restore the surplus which had superseded that ghost, and to rid once more the department of that deficit. Of course it means hard work on the part of my hon. friend. I am glad to see that he is still young hardy and jaunty. He has broad shoulders. It requires, indeed, quite an Atlas to carry the burden left to him by his immediate predecessor. I must not forget that he has three hundred and fifty thousand Pelletier padlocks to carry in the Post Office Department. If that is too heavy a load for his shoulders let him send them to the scrap heap or to the Shell Committee who might use them to make shells. Sir, in these days of loans and huge expenditures, let me tell the Minister of Finance that he might well adopt a policy of economy and retrenchment. I said in those days of loans. I hope that some time during this session the Minister of Finance shall be permitted to explain to the House, to the country, and to the noble seventeen of Toronto, how it came that he went—yes to New York to borrow money from the American financial institutions; he borrowed money from the United States! No truck, no trade with the Americans save when it is necessary to run a Tory Government machinery! Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend became a convert or a pervert after that famous meeting in Toronto when it was announced as part of the political gospel of hon. gentlemen opposite that there should be no truck and no trade with the Yankees. Before that he was, I know, a sound and consistent Liberal, and though it is true that he broke away from modern Liberals like the right hon. the leader of the Liberal party, surely he must hold dearly in his memory and green in his heart the name and fame of Mr. Gladstone. I shall not surprise my hon. friend when I say that Gladstone was, perhaps, the greatest exemplar in public finance in any country of the world. So keen was Gladstone in his battle for economy and retrenchment that that master of phrases, Disraeli, once said of him: "His duty is to supply ways and means, yet he is proposing votes with innuendo and recommending expenditures in whispered invective." My hon. friend the Minister of Finance learned in the whispering campaign of 1911 how to whisper. I know that he is not strong in invective. He has not the vocabulary of his friend the Minister of Militia and Defence. He is the Webster of the ministerial party, so far as invective is concerned. I would ask my hon. friend to learn invective from that Webster—I do not refer to the Webster of Brockville—Yes, I would ask my hon. friend

to learn how to whisper invective when the Minister of Public Works, or the Minister of Customs, or even the Minister of our Navy, are besieging him for such huge expenditures as appear in the blue books this year. The words of Gladstone should be remembered by my hon. friend. What did Gladstone say?

> Economy is the first and great article in my financial creed. . . The Chancellor of the Exchequer should boldly uphold economy in detail and it is the mark of a chicken-hearted chancellor when he shrinks from holdng economy in detail, when because it is a question of only two or three thousand pounds, he says that it is no matter. He is ridiculed no doubt, for what is called candle ends and cheese parings, but he is not worth his salt if he is not ready to save what are meant by candle ends and cheese parings in the cause of the country.

I know the Minister of Finance is the salt of the earth, but he is not worth his salt if he cannot save the candle ends and the cheese parings for the cause of his country, which is now engaged in a terrible conflict, involving large inroads upon the revenues of the country, a country which is being taxed, and taxed severely, because of the war.

We must not forget that when peace is restored this country will be saddled with a huge war debt. The public debt in the month of November last was $501,668,167.71. If the war lasts two years longer Canada will be saddled with a debt of over rather than under one billion dollars. Therefore, the first lesson which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has to learn is the lesson of economy, the most stringent economy. He has been borrowing and wasting too much, and a halt should be called, because he should not forget that while the burden of debt must be borne, the capacity to bear it is limited. Peace will some day be restored, and this country will have to face most serious problems. The land problem seems to me the most important, and I congratulate my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) on the compliments which he paid in his speech yesterday to the farmers of Canada. The farmers of Canada are to-day, and to-morrow will be, the best hopes of this country. The roots of manhood are in the soil of Canada. "That nation is strongest," said Froude, "which has the largest proportion of its people with a direct interest in the land." In some parts of it, Canada may be an industrial country, but to a limited extent. Canada is bound to become the greatest farming section of the American continent. Our system of immigration in the past has not been as successful as it should have been. Thousands of immigrants have left their homesteads for city life; there is a congestion in the cities to-day, and many of these immigrants are a burden on the municipalities. With the fertility of our soil, with the advertising given to Canada abroad during the last 20 years, we should have had in this country a population of at least 20,000,000 people, whereas we have barely a population of 8,000,000. The farming industry of Canada must be specially looked after when peace is restored. because it is our great national asset for the future, as it has been this year, and unless we increase our output we cannot hope to meet our annual interest payments on the huge war debt that will be accumulated. The world, we know, is hungry for the foodstuffs of Canada, for her wheat, and for her meats and dairy products. We have millions of vacant acres, and with men eager for work, land needing to be worked, and the world ready to buy the products of such work, our country should emerge successfully from the wave of economic depression which now exists. I read only yesterday a description of the probable situation in Europe after the war, a description which is very graphic, in my judgment. This is published in the Daily Mail, of London, England, by Mr. T. Wells. He says:

> Twenty-five million men have taken up arms. It is estimated that nine million already have been slain or disabled, and that the total destruction of life in Europe in two years of war will be twenty million.
>
> This is the combatant waste alone. Civilian populations everywhere in Europe, even of neutral nations, are affected by the physical and nerve stress of Armageddon. Nearly everywhere the birth-rate is falling, the death-rate rising. British births are already 40,000 a year less and deaths 50,000 more than in 1913, a net deficit of 90,000 lives a year—the total population of whole towns like Coventry or Northampton, Paris is losing similarly, and Berlin and Vienna much more heavily.
>
> When the great war is over a shrunken Europe will realize that no plague of the Middle Ages ever ravaged it like the black death that came from Potsdam.
>
> The direct monetary cost of the war to the belligerents can be put at nearly ten thousand million pounds a year, figures that, like the astronomers' distances, outpass the human conception. Titanic as they are, the figures of the indirect cost of the war exceed them; lost trade, lost production, and creations of science, art, humanitarianism and discovery that have perished in embryo.
>
> Europe after the war will be a little Europe, with a population not much greater than the population of Europe before the Napoleonic wars, a Europe with these stupendous social problems:
>
> Three women to two men of marriageable age.

More old men than young men.
More boys than workers in their prime.
More physically unfit than physically fit.
Millions of men to be fitted again into civil employment, millions of women who have learned man's work and earned his wages.
Millions of manual workers who will have become accustomed to wages twice or three times as high as they earned in pre-war days, and who will still expect those wages.
Greatly diminished food supplies for many years owing to ravage of cultivated lands, diminished breeding stock, and shortage of production.
High commercial freights, dear imports, and handicapped exports, owing to shortage of ships.
These are only a few of the major problems that will confront Europe after the war.

Sir, out of all this awful welter Canada may benefit, Canada may profit, and that profit will go, must go first to the tillers of the soil. The farmer will secure a high price for his produce. So the policy of the Government at the present day should be to increase our farming population, to increase the yearly volume of agricultural products and to do away with the artificial barriers which exist in the West, to give the farmer of Canada fair play, a free hand and thus help him to make headway after this war is over.

New conditions will be created in belligerent countries and in neutral countries as well. Has the Government provided for the return of our soldiers? Has the Government provided for the return of those soldiers to civilian life and industry? The employment of our returning soldiers is one question and the large influx of immigration to Canada after the war is another. A meeting was held the other day in Montreal under the chairmanship of the Anglican bishop—His Lordship Bishop Farthing. At that meeting a memorandum was prepared which in a few days will be presented to the Government. That memorandum contains data and facts as regards the conditions of unemployment in the large centres and as regards the urgency of the establishment of labour bureaus throughout Canada. What reliable nation-wide organization does Canada possess to deal with the following gigantitc problems at the close of the war? The replacing of returned troops in suitable occupation; the readjustment of dislocated industrial conditions and the transference of workers from war industries to normal industrial occupations; the industrial training and technical equipment of potential citizens to meet the strenuous and fierce competition for industrial and commercial expansion; the handling of the stream of immigration which will set in when peace is concluded; the replacing of interned aliens from concentration camps throughout the country. These are the questions which were discussed the other evening at that meeting in Montreal at which the largest and most influential bodies in the city were represented. The memorandum will be submitted to my right hon. friend in a few days. A deputation headed by the Bishop of Montreal will be here. I hope that the Government will take the necessary measures to protect our returning soldiers, to protect the immigrants who will come into this country in large numbers after the war and to provide as much as possible for the distribution of employment among the various industrial centres of Canada.

I have just mentioned the question of technical education. There is a most interesting report on the shelves of the Department of Labour on the all-important question of technical education. Has the Government taken any action on this report? Has the Government the intention of taking any action on it? We know that the success of Germany and of the United States from the industrial point of view, and, in a measure, of England and France, is due to their system of technical education. I am pleased to know that there has been established of late years a splendid technical institution in the city of Montreal. But that is not enough. The Federal Government ought to help the provinces to establish and multiply technical institutes in order to equip the young men of this country for the economic battles of the future.

One word about another question. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister yesterday said that he would speak until after six o'clock in order to impart to the House the result of his trip to the Mother country during the recess. I waited and waited and listened attentively with bated breath to my right hon. friend as I always do. I expected something startling from him and yet, Mr. Speaker, will I surprise him when I say that I was sadly disappointed in his statements. It is very interesting indeed to know that he met the Prime Minister of England and the Minister of Munitions, Mr. Lloyd George, that he discussed the question of remounts and other sundry matters, but I expected from him a statement as regards

that promise which he has made on so many occasions to the faithful jingoes of Toronto. Long before the war, my right hon. friend repeated time and time again, as he has done since the war, that the old order of things had passed away and that now on, Canada would have a voice in the affairs of the Empire. To be just with my right hon. friend let me quote his ipsissima verba in Toronto in 1913:

> Those whom those questions concern must always reckon with the inborn feeling in the Canadian breast that a British subject living in this Dominion must ultimately have as potent a voice in the government and the guidance of this worldwide Empire as the British subject living in the United Kingdom.

And after this deliverance I know that the stout and faithful from Toronto expected that within a very short time indeed that voice would be heard in the councils of Downing street. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) went further. Speaking in April last in Toronto again he said:

> Before the war many persons argued that Canada ought to have no foreign policy. Now Canada had a foreign policy and that was the policy of the British Empire. For good or ill they had taken an advanced position, and from this time forward they must have a united foreign policy.

At Folkestone in England on the 4th of August, 1915, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said:

> The old order has in some measure passed away. Once for all it has been borne upon the minds and souls of all of us that the great policies which touch and control the issues of peace and war concern more than the peoples of these islands.

I know the old historic city of Folkestone, and I feel that perhaps the words of my right hon. friend, eloquent and wise as they were, had not much effect on the plain people of Folkestone; but I know that when he spoke at Folkestone he spoke for the stout and faithful of Toronto.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As a matter of fact I did not speak at Folkestone at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is reported in "The New Empire Partnership," a book published by Mr. Percy Hurd, page 289. I will pass the book to my right hon. friend. Anyway, did he use anywhere the words that I have quote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is very likely.

Mr. LEMIEUX: An event took place anyway which was heralded by the jingo press as really an epoch-making event. On the 15th day of July, 1915—

Mr. MURPHY: What is the date?

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the 15th of July, 1915—not the 12th—the English press reported that by the invitation of the British Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, attended a meeting of the Cabinet at Downing street. If my right hon. friend can break the news to an impatient listener, I would like to know if he was present at that meeting of the British Cabinet as a spectator or if he was there as a participator; or let him say at once what I suggest as the case, was he playing to a Toronto gallery? The country is entitled to know this. True, Mr. Bonar Law said at Folkestone on the 4th of August, 1915:

> The time will come when the whole of the self-governing dominions, in proportion to their population and resources, will share with the motherland in the duty and honour of governing the British Empire."

But this is a mere opinion, an obiter dictum of Mr. Bonar Law, who no doubt clings to the opinions he held before being a member of the coalition government. But the statesman who really spoke for the British Government is Mr. Asquith, who in 1911—and I wish my right hon. friend would think of this—was present at an Imperial Conference in which the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition took part when the proposal was made by Sir Joseph Ward, the Prime Minister for New Zealand, for the very thing which has been propounded so assiduously and so insidiously by the right hon. gentleman during the last few years, that is, the idea that the Dominion should have a voice in the councils of the Empire and should dictate the terms of peace and war in the foreign policies of Great Britain. Mr. Asquith's answer was very plain. It reads as follows:

> It would impair, if not altogether destroy, the authority of the Government of the United Kingdom, in such grave matters as the conduct of foreign policy, the conclusion of treaties, the declaration and maintenance of peace, or the declaration of war, and indeed, all those relations with foreign powers, necessarily of the most delicate character, which are now in the hands of the Imperial Government, subject to its responsibility to the Imperial Parliament —that authority cannot be shared, and the co-existence side by side with the Cabinet of the United Kingdom of this proposed body—it does not matter what name you call it for the moment—clothed with the functions and the jurisdiction which Sir Joseph Ward proposed to invest it with, would in our judgment, be abso-

lutely fatal to our present system of responsible government.

Now, Mr. Asquith has not varied his opinion; he has never said that he has retracted that statement. and until he declares that he has retracted it, I say that my right hon. friend in his claim for a voice in the councils of the Empire is only playing to the gallery. The modern, the sane idea of the British Empire is that of Gladstone, is that of Asquith, that its unity is based on the freedom of each of its component parts. Sir, freedom alone breeds the loyalty of the dominions. For my part, notwithstanding the hopes expressed by the right hon. the leader of the House, I am satisfied with my lot as a Canadian and as a British subject. Canada has won responsible government. Formerly England drafted our tariff, managed our post office, looked after the public works—and perhaps it was not a bad thing for Canada compared with the present-day administration—involved us in her commercial treaties, and defended Canada with her regulars. But, Sir, we have outlived that policy; we have moved towards greater efficiency, greater self-reliance and more complete self-government. I am proud of what we have acquired—our full freedom, —and I do not care to be involved in the foreign policies of Downing street. As Canadians we are masters in our own house; we none the less recognize the Empire as a fact; nay, we welcome it as a trust. As our freedom grew our reverence for the Motherland grew, proceeding from the depths of our hearts. Sir, when, in August, 1914, the tragic hour came, the Canadian people, before responding to the call of duty, did not insist that they should have a voice in the councils of the Empire. The Canadian privates, the Canadian officers, did not volunteer on any sordid considerations of a preferential tariff policy. They knew that, though fighting for Britain's cause in their full freedom, they could at the same time tax British imports. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people responded with one heart and one voice to the call of duty. They were moved by higher, loftier motives than those suggested by some jingoes. Of our soldiers it might well be said, as the Latin poet said of the Roman legions, "Amor patriae ratione valentior."

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate our hon. friend from Yukon (Mr. Thompson) on the splendid address he gave us yesterday, showing a great deal of thoughtful research, and drawing to our attention many facts of history that were both inspiring and educational. The hon. member who seconded the resolution (Mr. Paquet) also made an admirable address. I am sure both these hon. gentlemen are worthy of the thanks of this House for the manner in which they dealt with the important questions that are before us. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) also gave us a very excellent resume of his visit to the front, and I am sure that his words of encouragement and praise of the Canadian soldier found an echo in the hearts and minds of all on both sides of the House.

The war in which we are engaged has called for very strenuous efforts during the year through which we have passed and since we last assembled here. It will call, perhaps, for a great deal more vigorous efforts in the future than it has called for up to the present. I am sure there are no hon. gentlemen on either side of the House who will begrudge in any way the expenditures that have been made in connection with the sending of our forces overseas. Up to date, as I understand it, we have voted about $150,000,000. Probably not the whole of that is yet expended, and that has run us for nearly a year and a half of the war. In that time 80,000 Canadian soldiers have crossed the water, probably 100,000 or 120,000 have been gathered ready to cross the water, and a further call is now being made for 250,000 more troops to be prepared to take their places at the front as soon as their services are needed.

These, of course, are very large matters for a country such as Canada which has not been accustomed to efforts of this kind within the past hundred years. We have been brought up to believe that we lived in a country of perpetual peace, that our peace was never likely to be assailed from outside our own borders. For this reason when the war broke out Canada's permanent force consisted of probably not more than three or four thousand men, and the militia, which is the backbone of the defence of Canada, consisted of not more than fifty thousand men—though nominally, perhaps, seventy-five thousand were enrolled. I question if more than fifty thousand were ever under training in any one year. So it was a very large undertaking that faced the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) when he was called upon on very short notice to prepare the first expeditionary force. The call that went out in August, 1914, met with a more hearty

response than might have been expected under the conditions that then prevailed. Upwards of thirty thousand men answered the call almost immediately, and within a few weeks were embarked to cross the water. That is not a very large force as compared with the armies of Europe, it is true. Yet that flotilla that went from Canada at that time, consisting of the transports and their naval convoy, was the greatest force that had ever crossed any sea since the world began in any one unit, so far as I am aware, and I think I am speaking according to the records of history. Upwards of thirty thousand men were embarked on these transports, and they were convoyed by a large number of cruisers and battleships and some of the lesser arms of the naval service.

All of these troops were successfully landed on the shores of Great Britain; not a man was lost. And in all the transfers that have been made to and fro during the war across the Straits into France and overseas, and also to the Mediterranean, scarcely any mishap has occurred. That speaks volumes for the efficiency of the British fleet. We have cause for thankfulness, in the opening of the New Year, that the British fleet, which was supreme when the war began, still commands the Seven Seas, and is supreme upon every water. This is a fact that cannot be gainsaid even by our enemies, and day by day the blockade of German ports is being tightened by the watchfulness of that fleet. It is true, in the early stages of the war, the British fleet did not perhaps put into force all those measures that we may now think should have been put into force earlier. The Declaration of London, under which we as an Empire were endeavouring to work, and which has perhaps received very little consideration in this House, has made a very important change in the manner of naval warfare, and in regard to those articles that were considered contraband of war. Therefore, for a considerable time the enemy received a very large supply of articles that were absolutely necessary to enable it to carry on the war effectively. Particularly was this true of cotton, which was allowed to cross until a few months ago, and which, though perhaps it was not landed directly in Germany, no doubt found its destination there very soon after it had crossed the water. Also, German reservists, under the Declaration of London, were allowed to cross in neutral vessels and take their places in the ranks of the German army, though Britain could have seized them in the early stages of the war and taken them off these ships, as she is now prepared to do. But at that time the enemy was given the benefit of every doubt and the naval service was conducted with a laxity which some might have said was commendable, but which in reality was feeding the enemy in such a way that its cost was all the higher in the late stages of the war.

This, however, will all be corrected as time goes on. It was inevitable that the education of the British people to meet the conditions of a world-wide war should be a matter of gradual growth, and so it has been a matter of gradual growth. But to-day the old lion, which some people think has been rather slow to wake up, has finally got going pretty strong; and if the signs do not fail it appears to me that the enemy will have reason to regret that he has twisted the tail of the lion. Britain has now under arms probably four millions of men, with possibly 250,000 employed in the naval service of the Empire; and further calls have gone out in Britain lately, and it is not unreasonable to expect that in the very near future we shall have five millions of men under arms in Britain and serving in Flanders, France, the Near East, Mesopotamia, Egypt, South Africa and other countries in which the war is being carried on. The vastness of the war has been something that was not contemplated in its earlier stages, and there has been a tendency on the part of almost everyone to underrate the capacity of the enemy and so to underrate the requirements of men, munitions and ships. For this reason we were pretty slow in getting started in that great conflict. It took Great Britain about three weeks to get the first 120,000 men on the firing line, and probably Great Britain's standing army at the moment war broke out did not exceed 150,000 of thoroughly trained and effective troops, ready for immediate action. Thank God for that small army! It was not large, but it did its part at a time when it was very much needed. It was on the spot at the time when the critical stage of the German advance on Paris was reached. We all know the history of the great fight at Mons and where the British were first engaged; and how both Great Britain and her French Allies were gradually driven back until the Marne was reached and German guns were almost heard within the city of Paris itself. They came very close to the city of Paris—they reached a point

only about twenty-five miles from the Capital of France.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition expressed the horror with which he views the possibility of conscription. It is to be hoped that we will not require conscription in the Dominion of Canada. Probably, in the present state of public opinion no government could live that attempted to put conscription in force in this country at the present time. But while we may not be ready at the moment to adopt it ourselves, we should be very slow to condemn it in others, because it is conscription that has saved the day and that has put us as near victory as we are. If you condemn conscription you condemn the policy of France, of Italy, of Russia, and of Servia, as well as of Germany. In other words, all the Allies of Great Britain to-day are fighting under a conscriptive system. Where would France and Paris have been had France been as unprepared as the British were on land? Let anyone think of that for one moment. France was an armed camp the day war was declared. Every man knew his place, every man knew his duty; and to-day there is not an ineffectual man, we are told, in the whole of France who has not donned the arms and insignia of the French army and taken his place at the battle front, while the women and the old men are carrying on the work of the farm, in the field, in the factories and in the marts of commerce. That whole nation to-day is one armed camp as a result of the conscriptive system and of the universal training system which has done so much to head off the enemy. A great war is a good deal like a great fire. Those members who have been in Ottawa a good many years have seen some very threatening conflagrations in this neighbourhood, and very close to this city. A fire brigade that can put two good streams of water on a conflagration when it is starting is worth more than a fire brigade that can put on two hundred or three hundred after the conflagration has spread. It is the same way with regard to a nation. A nation thoroughly prepared, that can immediately jump into the breach and take its place against the enemy, is in a better position than one that has to hunt around, as Canada had, to get new recruits who know nothing of war, to train them and equip them as soldiers, send them across the sea and get them into the firing line. Time was the essence of the contract, and time was on the side of the man who was ready; and had it not been that our great and bold ally, France, in this war was more ready than we were, on land, we would have had a sorry tale to tell to-day, there is little doubt of that. The same may be said with regard to Belgium. Belgium was a peaceable country, a land that had not been led to expect that it would have any part in any great war in Europe, its neutrality having been guaranteed by all the great powers. And so Belgium was not well prepared for war. But for three weeks almost, that little country, with its gallant little band of 150,000 men, held up the German hordes at the border, and that three weeks enabled the British to get their forces across and tackle the enemy about the time the Belgians were exhausted. Look what happened in the country of Belgium, a little land but with almost the same population as the whole of Canada, seven millions of people, where we have perhaps seven and a half millions! For three weeks that little gallant band of Belgians held up the whole of the German army, and that gave Britain a chance to get her 120,000 men of the first division across, and gave France a chance to have her millions prepared, which she did in short order. Russia came forward with an immense army; Serbia was early on the field, a little country, gallant but impoverished and decimated and devastated to-day in a way that challenges the sympathy and pity of all communities. That lot might have fallen to us had it not been for our geographical position; and while we to-day have heard the sound of no foreign gun in Canada, and perhaps will not, if we are fortunate, in the whole course of this war, yet the fight is just as much ours to-day as it is the fight of Belgium, of Serbia, of Russia, of France or of Great Britain. We are then a peaceable country, a country where from almost every pulpit peace has been preached, and the wonder is that our people have been able in so short a time to overcome a prejudice that had been inculcated into their minds from their youth up, and to take their place now and rank with the armies of Europe in valour and in glorious deeds upon the battlefields. The roll of our first contingent, made up from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and comprising representatives from every province, from every city, from every town, from every hamlet, and from many farms scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land, included men who it was said were somewhat lacking in discipline; but though they had comparatively little preparation

for the fray, they went to the front, and when the crucial test came at Langemarck, at St. Julien, at Givenchy, at Ypres, and at other points of which you all have heard —when the trial came, the Canadians were just as good as the best. Even the Germans themselves admitted that up to that time they had met no better soldiers than those who came from the western plains and the eastern provinces of the Dominion of Canada. We were all proud of the gallant deeds they performed on that day, and when the startling news came to us in the latter days of April that more than one-half of our first contingent had been wiped out, after three or four days of the most strenuous fighting that had taken place since the war began, the spirit of the Canadian soldier was reflected in the Canadian people at home. There is no better test of the vitality and endurance of a people than adversity, and the grim determination with which Canadians received the blackest news that has ever come across the Atlantic to this country, and learned that upwards of ten thousand of our men had gone down in that one fight—I say the grim determination with which our men, yes, and the mothers, and the wives received that news showed that the Canadian people were a people who not only could stand prosperity, but had the grace of God in their hearts to carry them through the days of adversity.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: When the House rose at six o'clock I was endeavouring to recount some of the deeds of our Canadian sons who have gone to the front and taken their part on behalf of the Empire. Some of the speakers, notably my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, think that we are undertaking rather more than we will be able to accomplish in announcing another 250,000 men, or in all 500,000, as Canada's contribution for the present war. We can only decide that, in my judgment, by comparing what we are doing with what other parts of the Empire are doing. I propose to spend a few minutes this evening in showing both what the financial obligations and the contributions in men and ships have been of the other component parts of the British Empire. I certainly have a good conceit of Canada, of its resources and people, and no word I shall speak shall be in the way of belittling what Canada has done and done so well. But in deciding whether or not we have done all that could reasonably be expected of us, we must look farther afield and see what the Mother Country and our sister commonwealths and dominions over the seas have done within the past eighteen months. Before the House rose at six o'clock I had stated that the Dominion Parliament had up to the present time voted $150,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on this war. It sounds like a large sum and my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) thought it a very large sum. So it is, but compared with what the other constituent parts of the Empire are doing it does not appear to be quite so large. I have before me the financial position of the Mother Country as stated by Mr. Reginald McKenna in a recent speech in the British House of Commons. In order that I may not make any mistake in the figures, with your kind permission, I will read a short extract from the round table illustrating Great Britain's financial task as outlined by Mr. McKenna:

> Mr. McKenna has recently estimated that Great Britain's expenditure during this financial year will be about £1,600,000,000. Of this about £300,000,000, will be covered by taxation, leaving £1,300,000,000 to be covered by loan.

So, in other words, Great Britain proposes to raise one-fifth by taxation and carry four-fifths forward to loan account or borrowings.

> In last July a loan of £600,000,000 was raised. To cover our expenditure up to the end of next March loans in some form or other amounting to not less than another £600,000,000 will be required. By March next our daily expenditure will probably be well over £5,000,000 a day, or at the rate of not much less than £2,000,000,000 a year, a sum practically equal to the nation's whole income. Our revenue for next year is estimated at about £400,000,000. In other words, if the war lasts for another year beyond March next, we shall have to find an additional £1,600,000,000 by loan. Thus our financial burden, vast as it is now, is growing rapidly. Our present expenditure is enormously increased by the necessity we are under of lending very large sums to our Allies. These, we are told, will amount this financial year to about £400,000,000. We may hope in time to recover these huge debts, but for the time being they are just as much expenditure which we must meet as anything else. How important and essential is the financial help we give to our Allies is proved by the calculation that our loans are sufficient to pay for the equipment and maintenance in the field of 3,000,000 men.

Allow me to call the attention of my hon. friend from Rouville to the fact that while we spend $150,000,000 in eighteen months to carry on our share of the war that sum lasts Great Britain just six days at the rate of $25,000,000 a day. If we run our war for eighteen months for $150,000,000 surely we

cannot say we are doing too much as compared with the Mother Country, provided, of course, the money is spent as it should be. I quite agree with any criticisms that my hon. friend has to offer in regard to the nature of our expenditures. Every dollar should be wisely expended and every dollar may need to be very carefully expended. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Rouville when he says that economy is necessary. I shall deal with that later on.

Having drawn your attention to the fact that Great Britain is spending all that money, the question naturally arises: how long will her resources stand it? That is a very crucial and a very necessary question. How long can Great Britain stand the strain, how long can she go on spending $25,000,000 per day upon this war only in addition to her ordinary expenses? I have here some figures dealing with that question and I think they are worthy of being placed on Hansard:

It is interesting to compare the figures usually given by statisticians for the value of our capital and income as compared with Germany's, and for the respective expenditure of the two nations, a comparison which gives some remarkable results. Statistical figures of this nature can only be very approximately true, and other difficulties arise, in comparing results as between nations, whose standards of life and ways of living are very different. Nevertheless they form an adequate ground for broad comparisons. Dr. Helfferich, the present German Finance Minister, placed Germany's capital wealth in 1913 at something under £16,000,000,000. He estimated the United Kingdom's capital wealth at only £12,000,000,000. But British statisticians make a considerably higher valuation, and usually give for the United Kingdom the same figure as he gives for Germany—namely, £16,000,000,000. Since then, the populations are respectively 68,000,000 and 47,000,000 our capital wealth per head is considerably greater, a result due no doubt in the main to our much greater holdings of foreign and Colonial securities, which are usually said to equal about £4,000,000,000 though it is probable that they have of recent years largely decreased in value. The comparative figures for income yield still more striking results. For Germany we will take Dr. Helfferich's figures, for the United Kingdom the figures of the Census of Production of 1907, though since that date our wealth must undoubtedly have increased.

	England.	Germany.
Goods, and services produced and received, about.. ..	£2,150,000,000	£1,960,000,000
Goods and services consumed.	1,800,000,000	1,560,000,000
Surplus wealth.. ..	350,000,000	400,000,000

These figures show that 47,000,000 British have an income of £2,150,000,000, just over £46 per head, whereas 68,000,000 Germans have an income of £1,960,000,000, or under £29 per head. They further show that, while our expenditure—

That is speaking for Great Britain.

—is over £38 per head, Germany's is £23. According to this calculation each man, woman and child in the United Kingdom spends £15 a year per head more than each German man, woman and child, and if, therefore, we were to cut down our expenditure to theirs, we should save £720,000,000 per annum.

There is room for economy in Great Britain, as the hon. member for Rouville pointed out.

The German economy in expenditure is especially striking owing to the fact that the cost of living is generally considered to be higher in Germany than in England.

But that is a matter about which I have a good deal of doubt. I have given these statistics in order that hon. members may know the financial resources of Great Britain and of Germany. We can now strike an estimate as to how long Great Britain with an income of this kind can continue to spend $25,000,000 per day on this war. When we look at Canada's contribution up to date of $150,000,000 for the forces we have sent abroad, and at Great Britain having spent already almost ten billions of dollars and spending at the rate of $25,000,000 per day, I ask my hon. friend from Rouville if he thinks that Canada is spending more than she should. My hon. friend does not choose to reply. I therefore take it for granted that he does not think that Canada is spending more than she should, provided of course that she spends it wisely.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not disagree with my hon. friend as regards the war expenditure; I stand with the Government as regards that. What I objected to was the huge ordinary expenditure. That is where I wish the Government to practice economy.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not wish to misinterpret my hon. friend, and therefore I asked the question. We can conclude that as regards Canadian expenditure as compared with that of Great Britain, we are not doing too much if we provide 500,000 men.

Let us now see what Australia, the next elder member of the British family of nations is doing. Canada as the eldest child in the family should be the leader and not the follower. We have the resources, the population and the extent of territory. Why should we follow any of the other members of the great family contained in the British Empire? As being the eldest and the first-born, so to speak, we should show the way. In comparing our expenditure and also our resources in men,

I find that we have not led the way, and I am rather sorry for that. Australia, during the first few months of the war and long before we had done nearly as much, put into the field 165,000 men, although she has a population about half that of Canada. She has made further calls so that the total will now be 300,000 men. In putting those forces into the field how much did she spend? This is very important, because it shows what the Commonwealth of Australia, that great sister member of our family in the Antipodes, three times as far from the firing line as we are, is doing. Her contribution in men and resources placed at the disposal of the British Empire exceeds that of Canada until we make this further call which we are about to make. The Government of Australia is a labour Government, because Australia is the workingman's paradise, and the people of Australia have been ruled for many years by the labour party. These drastic measures with regard to Australia have all been put into force by the Labour Government, they realizing perhaps more fully than we do the great issues at stake. Mr. Fisher estimates the ordinary expenditure for the current year up to June 30, 1916, at £17,676,025, and payments due to the various states in the Commonwealth of £6,290,000. He estimates the cost of the forces at £45,749,450, or $225,000,000 for the one year, as compared with Canada's expenditure of $150,000,000 for about eighteen months. Therefore I say to every hon. member that, as compared with Great Britain and with Australia, whether it be in financial resources or in men that we are placing at the disposal of the Mother Country in this struggle, it cannot be said that Canada, with a programme of 500,000 men, is doing more than she should or more than can be reasonably expected of her. That does not include the navy, as I am reminded by an hon. member.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What portion of that $225,000,000 is for munitions of war manufactured by the Australian Confederation?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am sorry that the information I have at hand does not permit me to answer the question. The estimated cost of the forces is all put in in one lump sum. The number of men, I presume, would answer that question, because the expenditure is almost entirely for the raising and equipping and the sending forth of those forces.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

New Zealand, only about one-fifth the size of Australia, has a record about as good as that of Australia. South Africa first attended to a very serious insurrection on her borders, and finally put it down, and then that gallant soldier and loyal premier, Botha, who has the admiration of this House, because the right hon. the leader of the Opposition on many occasions has thrown a bouquet to that statesman over the seas, immediately steps out of the House where he was leader and premier, buckles on the harness, and goes to show which side he is on and which side he is prepared to fight for. I say that the lead given by that hon. gentleman to the British Empire is one to which we should all take off our hats and say, God speed him. He has done nobly. I only refer to this in order that we may see that Canada is not alone in the great efforts she is making.

Then let us come to the great Empire of India. What has been done there? Immediately on the outbreak of the war they offered their resources of men and money. The princes and the rajahs came from far and near bringing their tributes of horses and camels, of jewels and silver and gold, and saying: Take these for that great Empire that has done so much for us. India was thought by the enemy to be on the verge of insurrection. Germany believed that the moment Great Britain got into a war, India would rebel and Britain would be unable to send her forces from that country. But we see that India is at the back of the Empire too. There are three hundred and fifteen millions of people in that little empire—it is little by comparison, scarcely one-fifth the size of the Dominion of Canada. It has been shown that these dark-skinned sons of the Empire know a good thing when they see it. Knowing British rule, British justice, British honour, British fair play, they declared: Though Britain has done some things that are not altogether to our taste, we prefer to have the rule of the good old benificent British Empire than to have Hun rule as exemplified in the continent of Europe. And so to-day we have a united Empire where Germany prophesied we should have discontent and division. Germany believed that Canada would take no part in the war; that India would break away, and above all that Ireland would immediately be in insurrection and that not only would England be unable to find a man jack in Ireland to send to the war but that she would have to send many troops to Ireland to keep the peace

there. These prophesies have failed. Some of the most heroic deeds of the war have been performed by Irishmen. Perhaps I may be pardoned if for a moment I tell what was done by Michael O'Leary. Before dinner I recounted some deeds of Canadian valour and heroism; let me recall to you what that brave Irishman, little Mike O'Leary did. And, troth, I believe that Mike O'Leary lived for seven years in Western Canada and was a member of the Mounted Police when he enlisted for the war. Michael O'Leary came of humble parents. We are told that they lived behind the hill fourteen miles from nowhere. But Britain does not forget even the humblest of her sons who performs a great deed, and when Michael O'Leary won the Victoria Cross, and won it in the most gallant way, his parents in their little home were advised by telegraph of the fact. The company in which Mike was serving was ordered to retire as the fight looked hopeless. But Mike said, "Sure I am not going to retire; I will fight it out myself." And he broke from the ranks, jumped into the German trench, killed five of the enemy and captured two and the machine gun. That is what Mike did. And when he was asked by a friend how he did it, he replied, "Why, faith, I surrounded them." So, the British Government telegraphed to Michael's mother that Mike had won the Victoria Cross. The dear old lady had never received a telegram in her life before and was naturally very much flustered. But very soon telegrams came pouring in from everywhere congratulating her on having such a brave son. Then came the dreadful news that though Michael O'Leary had won the Victoria Cross he had been killed. And the neighbours all turned out to mourn with the bereaved parents and to hold a wake. But while the wake was in progress came the news: Mike is not dead at all, but is alive and in London. And it is said that the mother declared, "I never believe again that Mike is dead until he tells me so himself."

This was the exploit of Michael O'Leary. And I think that we can claim that something of the heroism that he showed was built up in him by the seven years he served in the Mounted Police in Canada.

It is very pleasant to recount the daring deeds of our own countrymen and of the sons of the Empire. But we must remember that we have a lot to do yet. If it was "A Long Way to Tipperary" when the war broke out eighteen months ago, it looks almost as if it were a longer way to-day. Some think we are farther away than we were eighteen months ago. I never have been an optimist on this war. I have for years expected exactly what has come. As I do not want any hon. gentleman to say: It is easy to be wise after the event, I have taken the precaution to bring a clipping from the Mail and Empire of February 10, 1910, the heading of which reads: "Immediate Aid to Empire Fleet—Empire Club Applauds Mr. W. F. Cockshutt's Remarks—Danger from Germany—No Sacrifice too Great to Save Nation for Posterity." And here is the report of the address in which I endeavoured to show to the people of Toronto that, as I saw it, we were in danger then of exactly what has since then happened. I take no credit to myself for believing at that time that danger existed. I had read the remarks of such men as Earl Roberts, Mr. Maxse and Mr. Blatchford, the Socialist. As a Socialist, Mr. Blatchford did not believe that workmen should be called upon to engage in war, nor was he convinced that Germany intended to fight Britain. But he made up his mind to go to Germany and learn the facts in order that he might be able to contradict the statements that were made. He went a believer in Germany, a believer in peace, a believer in the peaceful designs of Germany in relation to Britain, a believer that there was no emergency and no danger. But he came back a converted man, and declared to the people of Britain that not only was there danger for the future but that that danger then existed and that they could not prepare too quickly to meet it. It was reading the remarks of such men as these, men who faithfully endeavoured to tell the Mother Country of that peril that faced her, that convinced me eight or ten years ago that we must meet just such a crisis as that which has arisen.

It may be said that if Great Britain is furnishing about four million men and is spending about twenty-five millions of dollars a day, she is doing more than she ought to do. Let me state briefly what she has been doing up to date. I do not speak now of what she has done on the sea—as to that she has proved that Britannia rules the waves as she has done for hundreds of years and as she will do, I believe, to the end. But what is she doing on the land? It will be necessary to give a few figures which I will simply quote from memory. On the west front, the battle-line extends

for about five hundred miles, from the North Sea to the border of Switzerland. It was upwards of a year before Great Britain held one-tenth part of the line. She held only thirty miles of that five hundred miles for over a year, only thirty, and that with the assistance of Canada, Australia, the Indian Empire, and all of her overseas Empire! She held thirty miles, while France looked after four hundred and seventy miles. All honour to that brave nation that for upwards of a year has held as though it were an impregnable fortress four hundred and seventy miles of battle front against the most powerful enemy and the best equipped nation the world has ever seen. Britain held only thirty miles, so I think that France had every reason to ask the Mother Country to stretch her lines; but with heroic fortitude she hung on and did her share, and she waited and waited until, after the end of the first year, Britain has now extended her lines and is to-day holding about one hundred miles of that five hundred miles, or one out of five, leaving France four-fifths and taking care of one-fifth, so that we, as Britons, cannot say that we are doing too much as compared with that splendid ally, France, who, as I said before dinner, has every man, woman and child that is able to do a stroke for the country at the country's service. There is no haggling about rights, about whether I am doing a little too much and the other fellow a little too little; but every man, and every woman, and every child, has placed his or her services unreservedly at the command of the nation, and has said: Where I can serve, send me! That is the spirit which we must display if we are going to win this war.

What have we won up to date? I do not want to be a pessimist, and it is not because I am a pessimist that I am trying to show you a few plain facts with regard to the war. But what have we gained up to date? Not one foot of German territory has yet been conquered, on the right, on the left, on the north or on the south—not one foot. Instead of that Belgium has been devastated from end to end; Poland has been devastated from end to end; Serbia has been devastated from end to end, and millions, yes millions of men, have bit the dust in this great war. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) estimated the casualties up to date at twelve millions of men, and I think that is not very far wrong. I estimated from figures I have endeavoured to collect with some care that about ten millions of men have been put out of business in this war up to date. Britain's casualties are a little over half a million, five hundred and twenty thousand, including Canadians, Australians and others; so that Britain has lost about one-eighth part of her fighting force, provided she has four millions of men under arms. Thus she has lots of reserves left. Canada and Australia have both suffered, but, while we mourn our losses in Canada, let us remember, in comparing ourselves with others, that Australia has suffered more than twice as much loss in men as we have—and in a far more hopeless task. I was a pessimist when I spoke in the House on the Dardanelles situation a year ago. I was a pessimist on that, and anybody who refers to my speech on that occasion will see that when people were talking in the House and out of it of wheat pouring out of Russia in the near future through the Dardanelles I made the remark that it is a long way to Odessa, a long way to Constantinople, and that the Allies would not be through the Dardanelles for a long time to come. That prophecy has more than come true. The event has been far worse than I anticipated, and to-day the whole peninsula has been evacuated; we do not hold a foot of territory there and the Australians, whose lives have been sacrificed, are buried in that lonely land. To-day we have a force of two hundred and fifty thousand men at Saloniki and I trust their fate will be more satisfactory than that of the British expedition in the Dardanelles. That goes to show that when anybody sets out to tackle an enemy such as we are lined up against they must have reserves of men, guns and munitions of war, and that is where we were sadly lacking. That is where we were outclassed, so to speak, by the enemy, because they had been preparing for years while we had made comparatively little preparation. The result was that when the war began England had little in the way of munitions, guns or anything else necessary for fighting on anything like the scale that has been required in this war. That was a pity and cost us dearly. But we are making up for that, and we are now called upon in Canada to raise another two hundred and fifty thousand men. I want it to be distinctly understood that in anything I say with regard to conscription I am expressing my own view and speaking for myself alone. I am only a comparative back

bencher and do not claim to speak for anyone else. But I do believe that it will be necessary to take some other means before we get the five hundred thousand men we are asking for. I say it may be, and I think it will be necessary to take some more drastic means than we have taken with regard to the obtaining of recruits for the overseas service. Again I will quote from Australia, because there you have a democratic government and you have a labour government and surely what they do cannot be very far wrong. They are talking of conscription very strongly in Australia and have been for several months, under a labour government and it is a question to-day, if it were brought up in their House, whether it would not pass by three or four to one. That is the position in Australia. Let me tell you two or three of the arguments that they advance. This is what is said in one of their publications:

> The unsatisfactoriness of the voluntary system is not only that it does not produce a sufficiency of aid in proportion to capacity, but also that it induces the best to serve and leaves untouched the residue of careless and selfish, the "slackers" and the "cock-tails." The young men who have volunteered are among the best the country has. Thoughtful people ask whether it is justifiable that the flower of its youth should, by a process of "unnatural selection" be sent into the field whilst a larger and unworthier section remains behind.

That is one of the arguments used by the so-called conscriptionists in Australia. I shall read from a paper called the Bulletin. It is not the Edmonton Bulletin, but the Sydney Bulletin of Australia. That paper says

> The time is ripe, has been ripe for months, for the abandonment of the old conventions. The first anomaly that ought to go is voluntary service. The business of wailing for recruits by means of posters, politicians' speeches, white feathers, and so forth, is as degrading as those other appeals by which our hospitals are periodically rescued from insolvency. Speaking broadly, the system gets the wrong men—the best—leaving the bad patriots and the cowards behind. There is everything against voluntary service as a means of raising a national army, and nothing but a few deceptive old catchwords in its favour. It is especially fatal in a war where every fit man is wanted, inasmuch as it can never rope in all the nation's fit men.

Now, I hope that conscription is not necessary in Canada. I hope that it will not be necessary in Canada. But I make this statement—I do not know whether I am the only man who will make it in this House or not: If I have to choose between going in for conscription or the loss of this war, I am going to be a conscriptionist. That is my view. I say that rather than lose this war I am going to be a conscriptionist, and I say that knowing that every member of my family fit to go has already enlisted and that therefore conscription has no terrors for me, and the old man who has his harness on to-night has placed his services in the hands of the minister to be used at any time he can use them; and when men of my class go I am prepared and hope to go, but I say this House must realize that every fit man is wanted and wanted now. Our boys need them at the front. Why should we not go over and rescue the prisoners who have been held for a year in Germany? Why is not tnat front bench occupied by the late Postmaster General, a man whom we recall with honour to-night, Dr. Beland, who has been a captive in that far off country all these months? I say that calls like that ought to rouse every Briton. No deaf ear should be turned to a cry like that of our late Postmaster General. Let me give another instance. Talk about frightfulness in this war, talk about the frightfulness of the enemy! Was there ever a more frightful deed in the history of the world than the murder of that faithful women Edith Cavell at the hands of the Huns? And will you say that recruits will not go when men deliberately march out a woman and put her up against a wall and shoot her down—one of the most heroic spirits the British Empire has produced in later years? I say the blood of that murdered nurse cries out to every Canadian from the ground to-night: Will you enlist in the service of your King and country? That is a cry that should be heard, and it should be heard now.

These five hundred thousand men are wanted, and they are wanted now, there is no doubt of that; and we should be ready at the call of our King and country to say that we are prepared to go if you can use us. That is the spirit that we must have, and the voluntary system is on its test right now. The test of the voluntary system is this, that if it does not produce the goods it is not the right system. It has been tried in Britain for generations, and in all ordinary wars it has filled the bill. But this is no ordinary war, whether you look at it in regard to the extent of territory ravished, the number of peoples at war, or the sacrifices we are making in material and financial resources. Viewed in that respect, all the wars of all the ages, as

estimated by the Finance Minister last year, are required to be thrown into the scale on one side, and then they would not make a war equal to the one we are in at present. While we sit here to-night, upwards of twenty millions of men are shaking every country in Europe with their tread, with the thunderous march, with their guns and the shriek and noise of those shells that fly by day and by night. We have not yet wakened up in this country to the fact that we are really at war. If some of us could only see trampled Belgium, if some of us could only take a walk through Serbia, take a glance through Poland and see homesteads devastated, the land bare and every young man, woman and child, old, maimed and crippled, all driven out of the country which to them was just as dear as ours is to us, then we would realize perhaps that we are at war. How soon will we realize it? This is a war that calls for service and for giving; and I for one am ready for extreme measures on the part of either the Minister of War or of the Minister of Finance. I say that this war should cost us all something if we value our rights, our liberties and our homes, and if we, as British men and citizens, let the British flag go down at the present time, and let the British Empire go down and be set at naught and dispersed, if we live to be one hundred years old we will find no place of repentance, though we seek it carefully with tears. There is something in this war that stirs the blood of every man who thinks of it. It calls for the best efforts of the best citizens. I for one do not agree entirely with what I have read from Australia in that respect. I say that no young man in this country is too good for the job—no young man. He may be a Christian and a saint, but he is not too good to fight for the issues that are at stake in this war, and for the rescue of posterity from the hold of tyranny that would be upon the necks of all nations for years to come if we should be so foolish as to allow the enemy to win.

How can the war be won? Only by supreme efforts—and supreme efforts now, not five years hence, not two years hence, but now. Mr. Speaker, that calls for prompt action, for drastic action, and I say to this Government that I believe they will be backed up to any extent, both financially and in men, that they are pleased to go.

I was surprised to hear yesterday the honourable the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) express the opinion that five hundred thousand men was too many to call for, and that the call should not have been issued unless the House had asked for it. Let me bring to his attention the fact that Mr. N. W. Rowell, the leader of the Opposition in Ontario, has been stumping from end to end of this province calling for five hundred thousand men for many months past, and long before this Government announced it. So that is where the leader of the Ontario Liberal Opposition is; he is calling for five hundred thousand men, and I think he is right, and that we are not doing too much. Think of the issues at stake! You say you do not want conscription and do not want taxation, but I tell you, if you lose the war you are going to get both, and you are going to fight, not on the side of the flag, but on that of the enemy. If you do not fight now, voluntarily, for Britain and the British Empire, and do not pay taxes, voluntarily now for Britain and the British Empire you will have to fight later on as a soldier of Germany, and you will have to pay a war indemnity to Germany to let you live on the face of the earth at all. So, is it not better that we should voluntarily offer ourselves and our resources to the Canadian Government and to the Mother Country to the full limit, put everything, both material and personal, into the lap, and say that to the full extent of our resources we will be at the back of the Mother Country to see the finish of this war. There is a responsibility resting on us, a responsibility that we do not yet fully realize. It is the heritage that we have received from generations that have passed away. It is the heritage that we have received in freedom, in the laws that we have, in the constitution that we have, in the enlightenment, the education, and the history that we have received from our forefathers. We have received more: We have received the light of the gospel, and have scattered it abroad throughout all the nations of the world. What a fearful thing it would seem to us if we were lacking in what we might do and allowed the lights of liberty to go out that have been blazing all down the ages! Britain has always stood for the weak against the strong. She always stood for the weak, always stood for the oppressed against the oppressor. She has always stood against the tyrant and for the chap that is down; and I say that bad as she is—and I admit that Britain has her faults—she has shown the best example of Christian enlightenment and of Christian civilization and of Christian lib-

erty that the world has ever known, and we will be unworthy of our heritage, we will be unworthy of the name we bear and of the race to which we profess to belong, if we do not see that when the time of reckoning comes the grand old Union Jack still floats aloft above all the Empire and for all the principles for which it has for a thousand years braved the battle and the breeze.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure to the very eloquent address which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Cockshutt). While listening to that address, I could not help thinking that there are many places in this country where it might be delivered with the hope of producing results greater than can be expected in this Parliament, for the reason, Sir, that all the members of this Parliament are either ready to enlist if they come within the proper limits and are qualified, or, if they cannot enlist, I am sure they are all prepared to contribute of their means, be they great or small, towards all the objects which will assist in the cause for which Canada to-day is fighting as one of the great oversea dominions of the Empire. Let me assure my hon. friend that so far as the members on this side of the House are concerned—and I am sure I can speak also for the members on the other side of the House—they need no urging to make all the appropriation which the Government thinks necessary in order to send whatever number of men it may call for, whether it is 250,000 more men, or 500,000. This Parliament has shown by its unanimity of action since the war began that it is eager to respond in the readiest manner possible to any appeal which the Government may make to it.

My hon. friend in his very interesting address has made reference to what Australia has done. He does well to point to Australia as a great country which stands as a noble example to the people of Canada. Not only has Australia equipped an army for the front; Australia has done her duty also so far as the establishment of a navy is concerned. During this war, there has not been a deed enacted which redounded more to the glory of Australia, or which caused a greater thrill of interest throughout the Empire than the destruction of a German cruiser by one of the ships of the Australian navy. One hon. gentleman who spoke on the other side of the House—indeed, I think it was the mover of the Address, my hon. and eloquent friend from the Yukon (Mr. Alfred Thompson)—asked, What would Canada do if the British navy should be destroyed? Well, Sir, we all pray to God that such a dire calamity may not happen to the British Empire and to the civilized world; but if that dreadful day should ever come there would be found thousands, hundreds of thousands of people in this Dominion who would feel like praying that condign punishment might be visited upon those who prevented the establishment of a Canadian navy for the defence of our coasts.

My hon. friend, in referring to Australia, spoke of what she had done, and said it had been done by a Labour government. Well, Sir, why should not a Labour government be just as patriotic, just as broad-minded, just as prepared to stand behind the Empire, as a government of aristocrats or plutocrats? I am unable to discover any reason why we might not expect just as much from the Government of Australia, as at present constituted, as we would expect from the government of any other part of the British dominions.

I have listened with the greatest possible pleasure to the addresses which have been delivered on both sides of the House. They have all breathed a spirit of loyalty; they have all breathed a spirit of determination that this country shall do whatever is possible for the defence of the Empire. They have all breathed a spirit of confidence, and one could not help being inspired by the patriotic remarks which hon. gentlemen have made. One hon. gentleman sitting not far from me said that it seemed almost like a love feast as he listened to the members who have spoken. There has scarcely been one word of controversy. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon this side of the House have made no attack, so far, upon the Government; and hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House have made no attempt at defence of the Government, in respect of their conduct since we last had the pleasure of meeting within these walls. Whether it is because they thought that the occasion was not a proper one, or whether they thought that the task would be an impossible one, I leave it to the House and to the people of this country to judge.

9 p.m.

We have in the Speech from the Throne the statement which has been placed by the ministry in the mouth of the Governor General:

My advisers, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to-night to discuss the advisability, or otherwise, of extending the term of Parliament. That is a question which will come up when the resolution, of which notice has been given, receives consideration. But let me just say, Sir, in passing, that in my judgment it is a most serious matter for this Parliament, created as it was by the British North America Act, by agreement between all the provinces, and having its constitution fixed by the Imperial Parliament—it is in my judgment a most serious matter to alter the constitution and to extend the life of Parliament. Those who occupy seats in this House, private members as well as members of the Government, have been sent here by the people to serve them for a specified period of time; and under our constitution, as it stands to-day, when that time expires we are obliged to go back to the people and resign to them the trust which they have placed in our hands. Therefore, as I have said, it is in my judgment a matter of the most serious importance that Parliament should be asked to empower the Government to request the Imperial Parliament to make provision to extend the life of Parliament. I have no doubt that the Government have taken that point into their serious consideration, and when they state that they are of the opinion that "the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time," we must assume that, having considered the importance of the situation, the Government would not ask Parliament to have this change made in the constitution unless for the gravest possible reasons. I, as one member of this House, will await the statement of these reasons with the greatest possible interest, and if these reasons commend themselves to me, it will afford me very great pleasure to comply with the wishes of the Government in this respect. Since this war began I, conjointly with the gentlemen with whom I have been associated in this House, have complied with every request which the Government has informed Parliament it was necessary to comply with in order to enable it the better to take part in the carrying on of this war.

But, Sir, I shall be obliged, during the remarks which I feel it my duty to make to the House, to depart somewhat from the course which has been taken by hon. gentlemen who have spoken, and to find fault with certain actions of the Government, and also with their want of action, since this war began. I trust I shall not offend anybody by throwing into the discussion what may be deemed a discordant note. I do not intend to do so. My only purpose is to call attention to what I think have been the errors which have been committed, in the hope that these errors may be rectified and that a different course may be pursued in the future. When we feel there is anything to criticise or with which to find fault, I consider it our duty, sitting as members of Parliament, to criticise and find fault. If we are here simply to register what the Government brings down, to say no word to indicate our real views in regard to its conduct or misconduct, in regard to its actions or want of action, then we might better have stayed at home. We have come here under false pretenses, and we have no right to draw our indemnity if we fail to express our views on the questions which are before Parliament and the people. Therefore it is that I intend, in the discharge of what I believe to be my duty, to call the attention of the House, and, through the House, the attention of the country, to what I think have been grave errors of judgment committed by this Government since the war began. There are matters in regard to which, through their agents or through their appointees, this Government have been guilty of misconduct of the gravest character. I do not say that they have been guilty personally, but I say they have been guilty of wrongdoing through their agents, through those whom they have appointed to carry on matters in connection with this war.

First, in regard to their errors of judgment. Let us go back to the commencement of the war. Everybody who gave any thought to the matter must have been of the opinion that this was going to be a long war, that it was not going to be settled in two or three months, that it was going to be a war of long continuance. Everybody knew from the very day that the war began that Germany had been making preparations for a great many years. Everybody realised that she had vast stores of muni-

tions, that she had a vast army, that the war would be not only a great struggle, but a struggle which would not be easily ended, and that it might reasonably be expected to last for a number of years.

What steps did the Government take when the war broke out to prepare to do its duty and take that part in the struggle that the Canadian people wished it to take? There were two matters to which attention should have been given at tne outset. I speak now with all respect, and as one humble member of this House who feels bound to express his opinion with regard to these matters. One was the great subject of transportation. Canada is a great agricultural country, a country of abounding resources, a country in which the farmers produce, taking them man by man, many times as much as is produced in almost any other country. Canada has often been described as the granary of the Empire. Under proper cultivation Canada would be able to feed the British Empire. The Government very properly urged the farmers of Canada to increase their production. Produce, produce, produce, was the watchword which the hon. Minister of Finance and other members of the Government spoke to the farmers of Canada. The farmers of Canada responded nobly. They tilled the soil with great care. I am told by some of my hon. friends from the West that on hundreds of thousands of farms they went over the land two or three times with the harrow in order to prepare it thoroughly well for the crop of the coming year; they used the very best seed they could get; they bought additional machinery and teams of horses; and the result was that they produced the greatest crop known in the history of Canada. It has been said during this discussion that in the West alone the wheat crop amounted to 330,000,000 bushels this year.

Was there not another consideration which the Government should have had in mind, and was not that the getting of the crop to the market or over sea to feed the Allies? What would you need for that? You would need proper rolling stock upon the railways, proper ships and an abundance of ships upon the Atlantic, so as to assure to the producers of the country and the consumers on the other side of the water the transportation of these foodstuffs at reasonable rates. Was not that something which went right to the root and foundation of the production of the great crop in Canada? What did the Government do? They bought not a single ship, they established not a single shipyard, they took no steps to build a single merchant vessel in Canada. Although they knew that the British Government would commandeer many British vessels, this Government took no steps whatever to ensure that the products of the Canadian people would be sent to the Allies at reasonable rates. What is the result of this want of action, Sir? That grain produced in our western country, brought from a long distance over the railways and reaching the Atlantic, has to pay a rate a thousand per cent greater than the rate was before the war broke out. The Government say: We are powerless to control the rates which are charged upon the steamers. Powerless, they say, we are, even in regard to those ships to which we pay enormous subsidies, notwithstanding that we have power by our contract with them to control the rates. Yet they say we are powerless, and as a result every bushel of grain which is crossing the Atlantic to-day is paying a thousand per cent more in freight than what the reasonable and ordinary rate was before the war began. Surely in that the Government fell down absolutely.

But what more was needed, and no one knows this better than my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). You must have elevators in different sections of the country, you must have great storage elevators upon the Atlantic coast, if you are going to ship your grain across the Atlantic. The Government had before them at that time the fact that there was just lately completed the Transcontinental railway running from the city of Moncton, and through the Intercolonial extending from the ports of Halifax and St. John on to Winnipeg, and by means of its ally the Grand Trunk Pacific railway through one of the most fertile sections of the Canadian West. This was a system of railways which was admirably adapted to bring the products of the West to the ports of the Atlantic, from which they might be sent across the ocean. Although nearly two years ago the grain elevator at the port of St. John connected with the Government railway system was burned down, this Government, although they appealed to the patriotism of the farmer to produce more and more grain. took no steps whatever to rebuild that elevator, and to-day its ashes remain as

they were nearly two years ago, and the only remaining elevator connected with the Government railway system is a small one at the port of Halifax. The spectacle we have to-day is that the Government railway officials are advertising rates of freight for the grain of the Canadian West over the Government railway, and down to the port of Portland in the State of Maine, there to be shipped to the markets of the Old World.

In what other respect has the Government failed in its duty so far as transportation is concerned? This Government is one of the owners of the Canadian Northern railway system, and is entitled to be represented, if it is not already represented, on the board of directors of that railway. Yet so negligent has that railway been in getting the necessary rolling stock and motive power for the proper operation of the road in order to meet the demands of the farmers of the West, that I am told that upon one branch alone, where ten million bushels have been raised by the farmers, they are unable to get the necessary rolling stock in order to ship their grain to the markets. I would like my hon. friends on the other side to answer the charge which I make in that respect. When they made the appeal for increased production, they should have taken the necessary steps to see that the products which could be so produced by the farmers would get to the Allies in the old land at reasonable and fair rates. The result of these increased rates is that not only is the farmer of the West prevented from obtaining those reasonable profits which he has a right to expect by reason of the great demand for his crop, but he gets little additional profit over what he had before the war, because what should be his legitimate profits go to the transportation companies, and the consumer on the other side of the water is obliged to pay more for his breadstuffs because of those extra costs of transportation.

The same is the case with the lumberman. Go down to the province of New Brunswick, which is a great spruce producing country, the market for which is on the other side of the water. Although there is a great demand in Europe, resultant from the war, yet the lumberman cannot get his lumber to the European market except upon the payment of freight of as much as two hundred shillings per standard, whereas before the war the normal rate was about thirty shillings per standard. That is an increase of about eight hundred per cent in the tariff upon lumber, which is a great burden not only upon the producers, but upon those on the other side of the water who might be able to use the lumber to advantage.

What was the other great duty which rested upon this Government? Have these sixteen gentlemen who are in this Government given any thought to this subject, or have they been too busy? The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) spent weeks, perhaps months, down upon the shores of the Pacific; other gentlemen were in the United States attending social meetings and delivering addresses, and others were frequently holding political meetings under the guise of recruiting.

Mr. ROGERS: Where?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I could tell my hon. friend of a number.

Mr. ROGERS: Tell us one.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will tell you one. Just take one on Monday night. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) went to Prescott with about half a dozen Conservative members of this House, who were to speak, and not a single Liberal speaker was asked to address that meeting. Every speaker was put up to tell the audience that General Sir Sam Hughes was the greatest soldier—perhaps he did not use these very words—who had appeared since Napoleon, and perhaps before.

Mr. ROGERS: Quite right. There is nothing political about that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I could tell my hon. friend about many others. The Postmaster General to-day admitted that he and his colleagues went around the province of Quebec professedly holding recruiting meetings. He said: It is true we defended the Government from the unjust attacks of the Opposition, but that was only in the line of our duty to the country; those he says were not political meetings. When I used to be a member of the Government half of my time in addressing meetings was taken up with the defence of the Government of which I was a member—and properly so. It is the duty of the Opposition to attack the Government in respect to matters which they think are worthy of attack, and it is the duty of the Government to defend themselves, and I venture to say that when the time comes that this Government must go to the people of this country the very largest part of the time

that they will take up in public meetings will be in defending themselves from the attacks which their opponents will make upon them.

Mr. ROGERS: That will be easy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: All the Postmaster General was doing was taking a preliminary canter along those lines down in the province of Quebec, and he called them recruiting meetings. If these gentlemen, however, had not the time to devote to these matters why did not they ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia? He must have known that this would be a war of metal as well as of men. He must have known—he ought to have known, and this Government ought to have known also—that in this Dominion of Canada there is a class of manufacturers, who, for executive ability, for the ability to turn out machinery of the very highest character, are not excelled by the manufacturers in any part of the world. Would you not have thought, Sir, that he would have at once endeavoured to mobilize the industries of this country? Would you not have thought that he would have arranged in England to bring out experts, or to have got men from the United States, where, for many years, they have been manufacturing shrapnel and high explosives? Those great and magnificent workshops which have been built near the city of Winnipeg, those magnificent workshops in connection with the Intercolonial which have lately been erected at Moncton, those new shops at Quebec which are nearly or quite completed —would not you have expected the Government to place these great establishments at the service of the Empire, saying to Great Britain and to her Allies: We will engage in the manufacture of these munitions which will go as far towards the ending of the war as even the sending of men, and we will furnish thm to the Empire at actual cost. We all know that Britain is engaged in a struggle which means civilization or barbarism, which means liberty or slavery, for the people of all the world. Canada is interested in this great struggle beyond any other question. Would it not have been reasonable then that the Government should say: We will put our men, our resources and our workshops at the service of the Empire to turn out shells, machine guns and field guns, not only for the use of the Canadian soldier boys, but for the use of all the soldiers of the Empire, without exacting any profit for the people of Canada. Would not that have been the noble, the patriotic and the wise course? But did the Government take that course? No.

Apparently, from the statements which the Minister of Militia has made, the first thing he knew about shells being required was when he was requested by the Home Government to order two hundred thousand shells in the United States. Why had not the Home Government been informed before this that Canada could turn out shells in any quantity required? If the members of the Cabinet could not go to Europe, where was the High Commissioner for Canada? Could not he have told the officials of the War Office something of the resources of Canada and of the ability of her manufacturers to turn out shells in great quantity? How different was the conduct of this Government from the conduct of the Australian Government to which I will invite attention a little later on. Instead of utilizing the Government workshops to turn out munitions for the service of the Allies, the Minister of Militia and this Government proceeded to form a Shell Committee, and that Shell Committee's record is one which brings shame to the people of Canada. The actions of that Shell Committee have produced scandals from which this country is reeking almost from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The press has been filled with the stories of these scandals, and newspaper after newspaper, Conservative and Liberal, have joined in demanding that this Government shall investigate the actions of that Shell Committee. The Shell Committee proceeded upon the theory that their organization was a great machine through which favouritism could be shown towards those who were closely connected with its operation. They proceeded to give orders for millions of dollars to companies with which their members were closely associated. They gave the firm of John Bertram & Sons, a company of which Sir Alexander Bertram, the chairman, is vice-president, orders amounting to upwards of a million dollars. They gave to a company with which Mr. Carnegie, another member of the Shell Committee, is not only closely connected but is the directing head, orders for upwards of a million dollars. Orders for other vast amounts were given to other companies with which members of the Shell Committee are closely connected. And did they call for competitive prices? No, they fixed the prices far higher than would be reasonable to pay even if the shells were not being turned out in large quantities. And what was the excuse

they made? It was that they made a price at which manufacturers great and small could produce. So, the company that was producing a million shells would get the same price as the firm that was turning out a small order of five thousand. This was the excuse given by General Bertram in his extraordinary valedictory when he retired from the chairmanship of the Shell Committee, taking with him the honour of knighthood and going away for a rest. He said that he had fixed these prices in order to enable orders to be placed throughout the country so as to relieve the industrial depression then existing. Sir, one would have thought that the supreme object would be to furnish munitions for the Allies at actual cost, and not to distribute these favours throughout the country in order to create small industries that could not possibly turn out shells at anything like the price for which they could be turned out by properly organized industrial establishments.

The story of the Shell Committee is one of very great interest, and as it will take some time for me to dispose of it, I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) who leads the House, to permit me to move the adjournment of the debate. Though it is only half past nine o'clock, still it is half an hour later than the time at which the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) moved the adjournment last night.

Mr. ROGERS: Go on until ten o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will go on until twelve o'clock if the hon. gentleman wishes. If a commission is appointed—and I should like my hon. friend's assurance that it will be appointed—to investigate the actions of this Shell Committee, it will be shown that through the bungling of this Government prices were paid for shells far beyond what was reasonable and fair, and that the Allies have been called upon to pay vastly larger sums than would have been necessary if proper organization had taken place. Note the contrast. The Australian Government organized the industries of the country in the manner to which I intend to call attention when I address the House to-morrow, and fixed the price which they would give for shells. And remember, this was the finished shell, the eighteen-pounder high explosive shell, and the price they fixed was $5.05, which is about $2 per shell less than the price fixed by the Shell Committee of Canada. When I tell you that and when you bear in mind how much further advanced Canada is in manufacturing than is Australia, you will realize how excessive were the prices fixed by the Shell Committee; prices, in which, as I have said, General Bertram, Mr. Carnegie, and I think possibly other gentlemen of the Shell Committee participated from the outset. This price of $5.05 fixed in Australia included the steel used for the making of the shell, whereas the price of $5.70 fixed by the Shell Committee did not include the steel, but the steel was furnished by the Shell Committee free of all cost to those who did the machining of the shell. The result is, I say, to make the price fixed by the Shell Committee $2 per shell more than the price fixed by the Government of Australia.

Mr. WILCOX: How did the Canadian price compare with the price that was paid in the United States at the same time?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I take the statement of Mr. Thomas, who says that the price was higher in Canada. Mr. Thomas is a gentleman who was sent out from England in consequence, I take it, of the dissatisfaction which existed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman take all of Mr. Thomas's statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am quite willing to take all of Mr. Thomas's statement. Let my hon. friend take particularly Mr. Thomas's statement when he says that if he could raise the veil just a little—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman quote that from Mr. Thomas's statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right, bring it out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will do so; I should like to oblige my hon. friend. I think it was in Montreal that Mr. Thomas made the statement; if my hon. friend will allow me, I will give it to him before I get through with my remarks. In that statement Mr. Thomas says also that he is a politician himself, and he rather conveys the impression that he found a great deal of politics in Canada in connection with the Shell Committee. He says also that the prices are rather higher in Canada than in Great Britain or in the United States, and that orders will be given to Canada provided the prices are fair and reasonable.

Let me tell hon. gentlemen another thing that has come to my knowledge. I do this, Sir, because I believe it is in the interests of Canada that these matters should be cleared up. I am not making an attack upon the manufacturers of Canada; their

enterprise, their energy, their skill and ability are worthy of all praise. But they did not fix the price of the shells; the price was fixed by the creature of this Government, the Shell Committee. The manufacturers were not asked to tender; they took the price fixed by that committee. The matter which I am about to mention is a very important one, and should, I think, receive the very serious attention of this Government. As the Prime Minister said to-day, fuses are required in large quantities, and orders for fuses were given by the Shell Committee. I am told—these things get abroad; they are talked of in Toronto; they are talked of in Ottawa—that something like $24,000,000 worth of orders were given by this Shell Committee in the United States. I have not the shadow of a doubt that this statement is correct; it will be found in a statement in Toronto Saturday Night. Included, I presume, in that $24,000,000 was an order for about 4,000,000 fuses. While that order was under consideration, so I am told, by the Shell Committee, a gentleman of large manufacturing experience, representing a thoroughly equipped company in Canada, went to the Shell Committee and said that he was prepared, by himself and his associate company, to make a bona fide offer to supply these fuses in Canada at about $4 each. While, as he supposed, this offer was being considered, the Shell Committee, through, I am told, Mr. J. Wesley Allison—I beg his pardon, Lieut.-Colonel J. Wesley Allison—placed an order in the United States for 4,000,000 fuses at prices of $4 and $4.50 per fuse—almost 4,000,000 fuses at the very high price of $4.50.

Mr. ROGERS: You cannot get them for any less to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me tell my hon. friend that not long after that, so I am informed, the Canadian company which was seeking the larger order took from the Shell Committee a smaller order at prices ranging from $3 to $4 per fuse.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Have they produced any?

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the other company produced any?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, they have produced some.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At any rate, if my information is correct, $2,000,000 beyond what was a fair and reasonable price, was paid to a company in the United States for these fuses. I will not say that Col. J. Wesley Allison got any part of that $2,000,000, because my hon. friend the Minister of Militia says that Mr. Allison is a true patriot, and that he worked absolutely without pay so far as the Canadian Government was concerned, expecting to receive nothing but due recognition for his services in purchasing these goods for the Allies, including the British Government. It would be most unjust, therefore, for me without having knowledge on the subject, to say that any part of this $2,000,000 of excessive price went to J. Wesley Allison, the middleman through whom, I am told, this order was placed.

I am sure that a committee of investigation will be appointed by this Parliament to inquire into these matters, because the Government would not venture to refuse a commission to examine into a question of such importance, involving so many millions of dollars, and in which the people of Canada take such a great interest. If that commission is appointed I shall be able to show that in a large establishment the reasonable and fair cost of machining an 18-pound high explosive shell is about $1.85, as against $5.70, which was the enormous price paid by this Government through the Shell Committtee for the supplying of shrapnel shells and high explosives to the soldier boys at the front.

The actions of the Shell Committee, Mr. Speaker—I make this statement with full knowledge of the responsibility that rests upon me as a member of this House—appeared to have been animated by a desire to distribute favours to friends of the party in power and to give them the opportunity of making money out of the manufacture of these munitions.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid that is not correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like my hon. friend the hon. member for Picton to be here.

Mr. ROGERS: Who is he?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend from Picton, Ontario.

Mr. ROGERS: You mean from Pictou, N.S.?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, I mean my hon. friend, Mr. Hepburn, who resides in Picton, and who represents Prince Edward County. Now, Mr. Hepburn, not un-

naturally, wanted to get his finger in the pie. He had been taught this fallacy, that the Shell Committee was not the creature of this Government but that it was an Imperial committee appointed by the British Government and therefore it would be right—

Mr. ROGERS: Quite right.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear, does my hon. friend say? I hope I will be able to convince him in a short time that he cannot shelter himself or his Government behind the suggestion that this was an Imperial committee and that no matter what their wrong-doing or errors of judgment, sins of omission or sins of commission, might be, he can refuse to allow Parliament to investigate them.

Mr. ROGERS: We are not looking for shelter; let the hon. member not make any mistake about that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before we get through with this discussion we will find that Parliament will demand an investigation, and that the gentlemen who sit behind my hon. friend, while they may not do it publicly will privately demand it as strongly as the members on this side of the House. If there is an investigation this will be shown: That there were enormous profits in the manufacture of shells. That was the discovery which was made, there is no question about it. People came here from all parts of Canada, politicians, canvassing agents, committee men, influential people from different sections of the country, all clamouring for orders for shells, and among others my good friend, the gentleman to whom I have referred, the member for Prince Edward county, obtained for his company a large order. His company is not engaged in the manufacture of steel. It owns a planing mill, I understand, and is engaged in the manufacture of wooden ware. I could understand if he had limited his application to shell boxes that would have been a worthy ambition which could have been fulfilled by the utilizing of his machinery. But he got an order for shells, and the people of Picton naturally supposed it would mean the creation of a local industry which might have justified him in pressing upon the Shell Committee and the Minister of Militia that he was right in using his influence to secure this order so as to enable a steel plant to be erected in my hon. friend's home town. But he got an order for shells and took it to Montreal, and the shells are being made there now in the east end of Montreal by another concern, the member for Prince Edward county being simply the go-between or the middleman in connection with the transaction.

Then, again, I am told that another gentleman, a gentleman of my own profession, a lawyer in the city of Montreal, who contested the constituency of Richelieu at the last election, Mr. Morgan,—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not Pierpont?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, Mr. E. D. Morgan.

Mr. ROGERS: Pierpont's brother.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Pierpont's brother? If he keeps on manufacturing shells he will be Pierpont's partner and it will not be long before he can laugh at Pierpont Morgan. This gentleman, I am told, got an order at a considerably higher price than that which had been previously given, and at a very recent date, showing that the Shell Committee was disposed to recognize the arduous services which had been performed by Mr. Morgan in his efforts to defeat the Liberal candidate in the constituency of Richelieu. Then, again, as showing that the Shell Committee were looking around to find where favours could be bestowed, we find that a merchant in one of the constituencies in Ontario—I am not sure whether it is the constituency represented by the Minister of Militia—got an order for shell boxes. He had no plant, none whatever. He immediately proceeded to farm it out, gave it to a man having a planing mill, and that man proceeded to fill the order. And so I am sure, if my information is correct, all over this country orders of that character were given, given to the middleman, the man who had no machinery, and given in this way for the purpose of distributing patronage and doing what was a gross injustice to those who had manufacturing plants.

Mr. ROGERS: Unfortunately about 75 per cent of the orders went to Liberals.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well,——

Mr. HAZEN: That is certainly the case in the city of St. John in my hon. friend's constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In my own constituency? I suppose the hon. member refers to Haley Bros.

Mr. HAZEN: To the Messrs. McAvity and the Phœnix Foundry.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Messrs. McAvity got their order as a sub-order from the Canadian Car Company, as part of an order which the Canadian Car Company had obtained for shells for the Russian Government. And while my hon. friend is upon that subject, what would he say about the York and Cornwall Cotton Mill?

Mr. HAZEN: What would the hon. gentleman say about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY: They are very worthy people and make splendid cotton. There is no better cotton mill in Canada than the York and Cornwall Cotton Mill. Their whole buildings are well filled with their cotton manufacturing plant. Their people are well employed in making cotton and I do not think from the intelligence of the gentleman—take my hon. friend Senator Thorne, one of the directors of the York and Cornwall Cotton Company, a most worthy gentleman, a gentleman of the very highest intelligence, who would not for a single moment mistake a shrapnel shell or an 18-pound explosive for a ball of cotton. Well, all over this country investigation will disclose that fact. But, more than that, it will disclose the fact that there were scores of plants throughout Canada capable of turning out shells which were not employed and which to-day are standing idle. It will disclose the fact, which I know, that in some cases manufacturers of wooden goods were demanding orders for making shell boxes, gentlemen who had all the machinery, all the plant for the purpose, but they were told at Ottawa, by General Bertram, Chairman of the Shell Committee: Nothing doing, orders all filled. And yet these orders had been given to middlemen who had no plants, machinery, or buildings, but who were simply getting orders in order to farm them out to others. The investigation will show more than that. I am only glossing over these matters at present, only speaking of some of those to which my attention has been particularly called, but it will show that one manufacturer in Ontario, who had an excellent plant, whose factory was examined by the inspector for the Shell Committee, and who was told he would get an order for shells, who went to an expense of $15,000 in getting additional lathes, when the day came and he was expecting the order, was waited upon by two gentlemen, one of them very closely connected with the Chairman of the Shell Committee, and was informed that he could not get the order unless he paid a commission of one and one-half per cent upon the cost. And there have been brought to my attention the cases of three other manufacturing concerns which were in exactly the same position.

Mr. STANFIELD: To whom was this commission to be paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY: To be paid to these gentlemen who called for it.

Mr. STANFIELD: I thought you meant to the Shell Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no. I said a commission of one and a half per cent on the contract price. I do not pretend for a single moment that any of this was to go to the Shell Committee. I do not pretend for a single moment to say that anything was given to any one associated in any way with the Government, or with this House; I make no pretence to say that, but what I do say is that it was a most improper thing; that it was an act which ought to meet with the most severe condemnation of this Parliament and of the courts of this country.

10 p.m.

Mr. MURPHY: Did the man not get the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The man declined to pay 1½ per cent, and he did not get the contract. Now, whether my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) would draw any inference from that fact in favour of the Shell Committee or not, I do not know. The two things synchronized, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would say. These two gentlemen approached the manufacturer who had already, as I have said, installed $15,000 worth of plant, and they demanded 1½ per cent on the contract as a condition of his getting it.

Mr. HAZEN: Who are they?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend will hear of them when the commission is appointed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be like the submarine inquiry.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend want me to go into that? Let me tell him that he should hesitate before mentioning the submarine commission because, Sir, the investigation—the most shallow investigation—at which the Government refused to allow counsel to appear on behalf of the people of Canada, the examination, shallow as it was——

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does my hon. friend say—

Mr. PUGSLEY:—the examination, shallow as it was, brought forth this fact,—my hon. friend the Solicitor General will have ample time to answer me; if he will only allow me to finish my sentence I will sit down—the examination, shallow as it was, brought forth this fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Government, of which my hon. friend the Solicitor General is a member, paid for those submarines, although they had been rejected by the Chilian Government because they were not up to the specification, $332,000 more than the Chilian Government would have paid if they had been up to the specifications.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say, if he complains of the investigation, why after making the charges in the House he was not there to substantiate them?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me remind my hon. friend that a very able lawyer, one much better able to conduct the case than I would be, appeared before the commission in the city of Victoria, and asked that in the interests of the people, and in the interests of the Liberal party, of which party I happen to be an humble member, he might be permitted to appear before the commission, to produce witnesses and to examine witnesses, and that right was denied him by the chairman of the commission. I had it from the gentleman himself, because I happened to meet him in the city of Vancouver, and he told me of the application he had made, and which I had also noticed in the newspapers, and he told me that the chairman of the commission had denied him the right to appear and to examine witnesses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was not denied the right to produce witnesses to substantiate the charges if he could.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is quibbling not worthy of one occupying the distinguished position of Solicitor General of this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let us have this clear; it is just as well to have it cleared up.

An hon. MEMBER: It cannot be cleared up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says that the right was refused to counsel to produce witnesses and cross-examine witnesses. I am aware that counsel representing the Liberal party was refused the right of cross-examination for the reasons given by the Commissioner, who has been commended by almost every Liberal paper in Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was not refused the right to produce witnesses.

Mr. CARVELL: It was the greatest whitewashing operation in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not like to say one word against Sir Charles Davidson, but from my long experience in the courts, where you have a lawyer on one side, and no lawyer on the other; where you do not have a lawyer to examine and cross-examine, the judge may unwittingly do the greatest possible injustice. Let me give an illustration. I watched with considerable interest the newspapers in Vancouver when I happened to be there for a day or two, to see whether it would occur to the gentleman who represented this Conservative Government, the Government with which Sir Richard McBride is, or was, so closely allied before a certain event took place; I watched to see whether any question would be asked of Mr. Logan as to how it was that he had carried on the negotiation for the purchase of the submarines for a fortnight and yet did not know what the price was to be, and why he simply whistled over the telephone when he found that the enormous price of $1,150,000 was named. I was struck with amazement to find that when Mr. Paterson, the man who had been in Seattle when the submarines were tested, and when the experts of the Chilian Government refused to accept them—I was struck with amazement to find that he was not asked as to the nature of the test, or as to how the submarines acted under the test. I was amazed to find that Mr. Paterson had not been asked to produce his books. I was amazed to find that no question had been asked of Sir Richard McBride, or of Mr. Paterson as to the grounds on which the former had represented that the Chilian Government were not able to pay for the submarines—a government which in respect to one article alone receives a revenue every year of $45,000,000; a government which has never defaulted during the past fifty years, at least in respect to any of its obligations; a government which stands high in financial circles, as a government which always carries out its obligations; I was amazed to find that the Commissioner had not asked him whether or not the Chilian Government had practically paid the whole amount of

the contract price before the inspection and rejection took place. I was amazed to find that not a word had been asked upon all these vital questions, which a law student of six weeks' experience would have felt it necessary to ask.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did you not go and ask them?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was not at the investigation.

Mr. MACDONALD: He would probably have been refused.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Government had said to me: We will allow you to go to Victoria to act as counsel and to examine and cross-examine witnesses before Sir Charles Davidson, I would gladly have gone, and I would not have asked a farthing for expenses, because I would have elicited the truth, I think. But further, I was surprised to find that none of these gentlemen were asked to explain why three cheques were given, why a draft on a Seattle bank was given, and why the remainder was divided into two sums, one of which was a Bank draft amounting to $500,000 and the other was for the balance out of which the bank charges and exchange were taken, Not one single question was asked in regard to that. What was asked of these witnesses was: did you pay any graft in Canada; did you pay any graft or commission to anybody in Canada? forgetting, apparently that Seattle in the United States is only forty miles away. Well, possibly my hon. friend is satisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am satisfied of one thing only, and that is that the hon. gentleman is absolutely unfair and has deliberately misstated the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I —

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, do not ask the hon. gentleman to take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is satisfied —

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perfectly satisfied. If the hon. gentleman forgets himself and ceases to act as a gentleman, I forgive him. Mr. Speaker, having made these preliminary observations, I would move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICE OF MOTION.

Mr. ROGERS moved the adjournment of the House. He said: I would like to read a message of even date which I have received and which is as follows:

> Please state in House that I have removed resolution from Order Paper so that Government may have clear right of way for war measures.
>
> (Signed) J. H. Burnham.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

Wednesday, January 19, 1916.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Sergeant-at-Arms has, with my approval, appointed Louis Charles Panet as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms for the present session.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for the year 1915.—Sir Robert Borden.

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. W. J. Roche.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, January 18.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the House proceeds with this debate, I want to refer to an incident which happened last night between the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). Rule 19 of the House of Commons says that "no member shall use offensive words against any member." I see in Hansard, on page 79, that last night the hon. Solicitor General used the following words:

> Mr. Meighen: I am satisfied of one thing only, and that is that the hon. gentleman is absolutely unfair and has deliberately misstated the facts.
>
> Some hon. Members: Order, order.
>
> Mr. Speaker: I—
>
> Mr. Pugsley: Mr. Speaker, do not ask the hon. gentleman to take it back.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. gentleman is satisfied—

Mr. Pugsley: Perfectly satisfied. If the hon. gentleman forgets himself and ceases to act as a gentleman, I forgive him.

According to the rule which I have just read, every member of this House will understand that the words used last night by the hon. Solicitor General were offensive, and at the same time I must say that the words used by the hon. member for St. John were also offensive. I see that the hon. Solicitor General is not in his seat; otherwise I would ask him to withdraw the words used, and I would ask the same thing of the hon. member for St. John. Both these two hon. gentlemen have the respect of this House, and no doubt in the future no such words will be used by them, nor by any other member.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John City): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that you have called the attention of the House to what was said last evening. I regret it very much myself, but I thought my hon. friend the Solicitor General had used the words which he did in the excitement of the moment, tho' I think he is not quite correctly reported in Hansard. I think he used the words, "and I fear that the hon. gentleman has done it deliberately." His language was not quite as strong as it appeared in Hansard. I thought that the Solicitor General was very much excited, greatly worried, and I was disposed to forgive him for what I thought was a lapse on his part. However, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say most sincerely that I regret the incident. So far as I am concerned, I am very desirous that all discussions in Parliament should be carried on with due regard to that courtesy which members are always anxious to show to each other, and I shall be glad to act upon your suggestion, Sir, and withdraw the words which I used.

I regret for another reason that my hon. friend the Solicitor General is not present because last evening, when I called attention to the fact that Mr. Thomas had come out to Canada as the personal representative of Mr. Lloyd George to look into the question of the furnishing of shrapnel and high explosive shells in Canada, he made a careful investigation into conditions, and upon one occasion, in making a speech in the city of Montreal, he used the words, "If I raise the veil a little." The Solicitor General at once challenged me to produce a newspaper report of that remark of Mr. Thomas. I now, Sir, produce the newspaper, which is the Montreal Gazette of, I think, October 9, 1915, and those are the very words Mr. Thomas used as a preliminary to some other observations he made. I will read the whole of the paragraph containing those words. He said:

If I raise the veil a little, it will be on my own personal responsibility, and do not take it as coming from the Minister of Munitions; but naturally from my official position I must have considerable inside knowledge of what is going on in Canada in the manufacture of munitions.

Those words are very significant as coming from a gentleman in the position of Mr. Thomas. You will bear in mind that he came to Canada at a critical time, when there were vast orders being placed. He came to consider a question of enormous importance to Canada and to the Empire. He would necessarily be very diplomatic, very careful; he would take his time to look into matters, and it is significant that when he made his speech at Montreal he used those words, "If I raise the veil a little, it will be on my own personal responsibility." Mr. Thomas said more than that. In the same paper he is reported to have made the statement to which I called the attention of the House last night with regard to economy. He said:

That must be considered, and I may tell you that the cost of shells in Canada has been higher than in competitive countries. It is complained that fat orders have gone to the United States, but I can assure you that a big slice will be reserved for Canada as long as the price is fairly satisfactory. The prices so far have been higher than in the United States or in Great Britain, where any extra profits have been commandeered by the Government.

In another place Mr. Thomas is reported to have said that up to the preceding June the deliveries from Canada were behind, and that only about two per cent of the orders had been filled.

Mr. HAZEN: What is the date of the Montreal Gazette?

Mr. PUGSLEY: October 9, 1915, as near as I can tell you. It is covered with a rubber stamp which is not very plain. While Mr. Thomas was, of course, very careful, very diplomatic, very desirous of not offending anybody, he was still very firm in his determination to get rid of the old Shell Committee. I have here the report of an interview with Mr. Thomas in the Montreal Herald—and of this also I cannot give the exact date because the record made with a rubber stamp upon the clipping is not clear. The report states as follows:

He believes that there is more "politics" in Canada at the present time than there is in England, and that it is a bad thing for Canada.

Big political interests here, at the present juncture, who are intimately connected with manufacturing concerns, are out after orders. Orders come first—the making of munitions being a secondary outcome. Mr. Thomas repeated that it was a bad thing; but added that, in so far as he was able, the British taxpayer came first, and that much as he liked to see the golden stream pouring into Canada, to the benefit of her industries and individuals, that he was guided by no other thought.

That the matter was one of very great importance will be apparent from the fact that up to December 16 last, the total contracts for shells and shell boxes—and I suppose the contracts include also fuses—amounted to the enormous sum of $265,000,000, or about $80,000,000 more than the total expenditures by the Government of Canada for ordinary purposes. It is important to the British Government, as Mr. Thomas well knew, that shells should be supplied at the lowest possible cost. To the people of Canada also, this is an important matter. It appears from the statement made by the Prime Minister on the day of the opening of this debate, that this Government is advancing a share of the cost of the munitions on the basis of the forces sent from Canada. I take it from the statement which the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has made that this is merely a temporary advance to be adjusted with the British Government when they come to determine Canada's proper proportion of the expenditure. If we take the forces that Canada has at the front relatively to those that Great Britain has at the front, this would mean that Canada would be bearing one-thirteenth part of the expenditure for shells. If I am right in my figures, then, in addition to the vast sums which Canada is expending in other directions, she will have to bear an expense of more than $20,000,000 for shells. If there has been paid out, as I am informed is the case, millions upon millions of dollars more for shrapnel and high explosives than these munitions could have been produced for, had business methods been pursued, Canada must bear her share of this loss. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), to whom I am obliged to refer again for a moment, is reported to have made a speech recently in which this subject was referred to. I speak of that hon. gentleman because he is a prominent member of the Government, and I refer to his speech because it particularly attracted my attention. That speech, if I remember correctly, was made either at Port Arthur or at Fort William. He stated that excessive amounts were being paid for munitions of war. And what was the remedy that he suggested? He suggested that Parliament should impose a war tax upon these excessive profits. In my judgment that is no adequate remedy. While it would bring into the Canadian treasury a part of the excessive profits, the whole amount of these profits would be taken out of the Imperial and Canadian treasuries respectively in the proportion of about thirteen dollars to one. If the Solicitor General knew as a member of this Government that excessive profits were being taken, that unreasonable profits were being paid for shells and other munitions of war, it was his duty to inform his colleagues and to take the necessary steps to compel the Shell Committee—which, as I have said, was a creature of this Government, a body with whose appointment the British Government had nothing to do except in a nominal way—to cease allowing excessive profits to be made. There are some who blame the manufacturers of Canada. I do not blame them at all. Under the Shell Committee they were not asked to tender; they were only asked if they could manufacture shells at the prices fixed. They would be more than human if they refused to take the profits which this Government, through its Shell Committee, offered them.

I think I yesterday called attention to the fact, and I desire to repeat it to-day, that the constitution of this Shell Committee was entirely contrary to the public interest, and this Government ought to have known it. This Shell Committee fixed the prices which one company, of which the Shell Committee's chairman was vice-president, and another company of which Mr. Carnegie, another member of the committee, was manager, were to receive for shells. In other words, the Shell Committee fixed the prices in the benefits of which some of its members were to share. This was clearly not in accordance with business principles, because to that extent incentive was taken away from these men to make the prices fair and reasonable. A portion of every extra dollar paid for shells went into the pockets of these gentlemen who were directing heads of the Shell Committee. What did General Bertram say

on that subject? This was after he had received the honour of knighthood, which, as I said yesterday, was a very good way to get rid of General Bertram, and to afford opportunity to change the constitution of the committee. He gave an interview in which he said that the other members of the committee had nothing to do with the fixing of prices or giving of orders, that he took upon himself all these things and never consulted his fellow-members regarding such matters. Did the Government know that General Bertram, the vice-president of John Bertram & Sons, Ltd., which, besides manufacturing, is the selling agent of shell making machinery made in the United States, was carrying on the business of this Shell Committee without consulting his fellow members ?

Although this country was supposed to have guarding its interests a committee of eight members, four of them civilians and four of them military men, General Bertram says that really nobody but himself was looking after those important interests. Well, Sir, I am told that General Bertram has not entirely stated the facts, or the whole facts. I am told that Mr. Carnegie, whose company was receiving a large number of orders, was the only member of the committee who was acting with General Bertram; that it was these gentlemen who, in large measure, distributed these favours and, as I have said, to the amount of a vast sum of money, distributed them among themselves. Surely the House will see at once that that was entirely irregular. These gentlemen, who were directing the contracts; who were selling these munitions to the British Government, which was the partner of the Canadian Government in connection with the procuring of them, were both sellers and purchasers. As the vendors they fixed the prices; as the purchasers they took the prices which they themselves fixed. As I have said, my information is that millions upon millions of dollars have been taken out of the British taxpayers and out of the people of Canada by reason of the payment of these excessive prices, and by reason of the lack of ordinary business methods in connection with the appointment of the Shell Committee and its operations.

I stated in the House yesterday that there was an insistent demand from the people of Canada that an investigation should be had into these matters. There is no doubt that Mr. Thomas did investigate. There is no doubt that he came to the conclusion that this Shell Committee, the creation of the Government through my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, should go. He took his own time to have them go, but he made up his mind that go they should, and go they did. A new committee was appointed, with Mr. Flavelle at its head. Let me now read to you, Sir, and to this House, some extracts from leading newspapers bearing upon this subject. I do this because I think the House will agree with me that, speaking generally, the newspapers of Canada may be relied upon to give a fair idea of public opinion, and to express also the honest views of the editors, based upon the information which they have the opportunity of obtaining with regard to the matters of which they write. But before I proceed to that I should like to call attention to another remark which Mr. Thomas is reported to have made. I am now quoting from his public statement in both the Montreal Star and the Montreal Gazette. After stating that the cost in Canada had been greater than in the United States or Great Britain, Mr. Thomas is reported in these two newspapers to have further said:

> In June last Canada was, frankly, rather behind in making good in point of time on the orders that had been placed—only two per cent of the orders had made good. Public sentiment would not be met by retirement of the manufacturing members of the shell committee.

Mr. Thomas must have discovered facts of very great importance to have induced him, coming to this country as a stranger, to make these observations. And his remarks are evidence, I think, that he found the conditions very serious, and that the only way in which the interests of Canada and of the Empire could be served; the only way in which the public sentiment could be satisfied, was by completely disorganizing that Shell Committee and appointing a new committee, which should be directly under the control of the Imperial Government. Mr. Thomas made an important change in another respect. He did not approve the conduct of the Canadian Shell Committee in themselves fixing the prices and giving the contracts at those prices; he believed in and adopted the principle of competition.

Let me read, first, from the Toronto Saturday Night, a journal which has devoted a good deal of attention to this subject, and which, I believe, recently expressed some dissatisfaction with the new committee as well. There are some people who almost believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia shares the views of the Toronto

Saturday Night as to the new Commission. In its issue of October 23, 1915, that journal said:

> The shell committee was no place for a gentleman directly connected with the shell-making plants—corporations, be it noted, with directorates having wide ramifications.

I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is not in his place, because I am going to quote from a newspaper with whose views I think he is very thoroughly in accord. He will, perhaps, be able to impress upon his colleagues the desirability of giving attention to those views. I quote from the Winnipeg Telegram of November 1, 1915:

> The greatest of Welsh humorists is D. A. Thomas. No one suspected that the hard-headed Welsh coal magnate had as strong a sense of humour as the author of Sam Slick. His farewell announcement has convulsed Ottawa with laughter. He spanked General Sir Sam, told him he was a good, active little boy, but to keep his fingers out of the jam-pot; gave General Bertram a fine dish of soft soap, but warned him that business was not his forte; praised the Canadian manufacturers for their energy and enterprise, but suggested that smaller profits would show greater patriotism; and kicked out Colonel Cantley, general manager of the Nova Scotia shell game, with such a grace, that this gentleman thinks he has been promoted.

A quotation appeared in the Ottawa Citizen from the Grain Growers' Guide of November 24—I assume that it is a correct quotation. The Grain Growers' Guide says:

> There certainly should be a thorough public investigation of this matter. If it is true that Canadian shell manufacturers have been robbing the British treasury of millions of dollars in these ways, they are guilty of assisting the enemy, and no punishment would be too severe for them. They belong to the plutocratic class that has always claimed for itself a monopoly of patriotic sentiment, and if they are guilty of what is charged against them their disgrace is all the deeper. Perhaps these charges are not true, and if so the manufacturers should be given an opportunity to prove their honesty. Let the public have the facts and let all concerned take the consequences.

As I have already said, I disagree with anybody who says that the manufacturers of this country are to blame. I say, if there is any blame; if there is any offence against the public, or any impropriety which ought to be condemned, it is upon the part of the gentlemen who were created a shell committee by this Government, and who themselves fixed the prices which they were willing to pay to the manufacturers.

The Ottawa Citizen, under date of November 29, makes reference to an editorial which appeared in the Toronto Telegram. It says:

> The Telegram publishes the followng editorial demand for investigation of the late shell committee by the Davidson Royal Commission:
>
> Is Sir Charles Davidson to squander all the time and energy on his inquisition upon drug clerks, vendors of aged and spavined equines or thrifty gentlemen who short change the country in the supply of oats for war horses?
>
> The work of the shell committee in the purchase of munitions for the British government should be lit up with all the illuminating power of Sir Charles Davidson's lanterns of truth.
>
> The worst sort of quibble travels in the suggestion that the shell committee was spending the money of the British taxpayers, and the work of that committee is therefore none of Sir Robert Borden's business.
>
> The shell committee was acting on behalf of Sir Robert Borden just as Sir Robert Borden was acting on behalf of the Canadian people. The shell committee was not the steward of Canada's money. The shell committee was the steward of Canada's honour. The procedure that keeps the work of the shell committee outside the zone of the Davidson inquiry is not worthy of Sir Robert Borden. That procedure is no fulfilment of Sir Robert Borden's promise to institute and prosecute a full and searching and impartial inquiry into all war expenditures.

That article appeared in a newspaper which is owned and controlled by a very prominent member of the Conservative party, who formerly sat in this House. It is one of the most influential papers in the city of Toronto, and I shall ask hon. gentlemen whether the argument which is made in favour of an investigation is not a sound one. He calls attention to the fact that the Prime Minister promised a full and complete investigation into the war expenditures. But here is a matter of expenditure running far and away beyond any expenditure in connection with ordinary war supplies. He asks why the work of the Davidson Commission should be confined to an inquiry into purchases of horses, drugs, and matters of that kind when these vast expenditures made in Canada by a commission appointed by this Government go uninvestigated. When the editor of the Toronto Telegram wrote that article he did not know what we in this House know to-day, from the statement which the Minister of Finance has made, that in the final accounting Canada is to pay her proportion of the cost of all these war munitions, including shrapnel, high explosive shells, and all kinds of equipment. If the editor of the Toronto Telegram had known that, he would have said that in these purchases of war material Canada and Great Britain are in partnership; Canada is to pay her share of all these expenditures relatively to the number of men she will have at the front; that, when the Shell Committee was pur-

chasing shells for the British Government, it was purchasing shells for the Canadian Government as well, and, therefore, that for every million dollars of excessive prices which have been paid through the unbusinesslike and improper methods adopted by this Shell Committee, Canada is paying her share. When this Government advanced during the summer a good many millions of dollars to the British Government to enable payment to be made for these war munitions, she was giving to the British Government her own share of these expenditures, the amount of which has to be determined when the account comes to be finally adjusted. Therefore it is absolutely clear that if this Government is going to allow Parliament to investigate any war expenditures made by Canada, this is one subject of the very greatest possible importance which demands investigation at the hands of this Parliament; and in submitting the matter to Parliament I claim that the hon. gentlemen who occupy seats behind the Treasury Benches and those of us who sit on this side of the House have a duty to perform as trustees for the people of Canada, just as much as those who sit on the Treasury Benches; and we would not be doing our duty if we did not, by every possible, every legitimate means within our power, insist upon the fullest, the most complete investigation of these vast expenditures.

Why, what took place during the Boer war? While the then Minister of Agriculture refused to answer some questions with regard to purchases of hay in the province of Quebec, this House adopted a resolution requiring the Government to bring before the House all correspondence which had taken place with the Imperial Government in reference to the purchase of hay and other military supplies which were going to South Africa; and when there was some delay in the bringing down of the return, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who was then a leading member of the Opposition, rose in his place and informed the then Minister of Agriculture that he must understand that his estimates could not be passed until those documents were laid before the House. That is the attitude which the Minister of Trade and Commerce took even in reference to the bringing down of correspondence regarding the purchase of hay. But, Sir, how different were the circumstances then from what they are to-day! At that time all that Canada was doing was to send to the front the Canadian boys who volunteered for service in South Africa, and all the equipment, all the supplies, all this hay about which inquiries were being made, were being paid for by the British Government, and Canada had nothing to do with the expenditure. How different it is to-day with regard to the shells and other war munitions for which this Government has entered into a solemn obligation with the Imperial Government to pay its proper proportion, so that Canada's proportion of this expenditure is disbursed through the Shell Committee appointed by this Government, just as is the money of the Imperial Government.

The Ottawa Citizen of November 16, 1915, says:

> Britain has been charged $5.15 for machining 18-pounder shells, though they could be machined profitably at $1. By steps the British authorities succeeded in getting the price down to $2.90. Even though a responsible contractor offered to machine the shells at $1.40, the Dominion Shell Committee ordered the shell-machining at $2.90. Certain Canadian shells have been costing more than United States shells to the Motherland.

Again, on December 4, the Toronto Saturday Night says:

> If Canadian manufacturers will get down to brass tacks, eliminate the stock ticker from their considerations, and if the "profiteers" will bend their energies to shell the German trenches instead of shelling the public with stock at ridiculously artificial prices, Canada as a nation will keep all its idle and semi-idle plants busy for as long as the war lasts, and will come out bettered financially.

Then, the Montreal Daily Mail, a paper which has the sympathy and enjoys the confidence of prominent members of this Administration, is quoted in the Toronto Globe of December 24 as making the following statement:

> It is with real reluctance that the Daily Mail suggests the incompleteness of what is termed General Bertram's "valedictory." A public duty, however, cannot be evaded, and it is a public duty to remind General Bertram that his statement, utterly lacking in detail and definiteness as affecting the criticism of the work of his committee, does not allay suspicion but tends to strengthen it. Major-General Bertram has been accused of enriching his private interests from business placed by the shell committee under his direction. He has been accused of showing favoritism in the distribution of shell orders, and of allowing prices to the manufacturers (including his own concerns) out of all proportion to the cost. Not one of these charges did he deal with in his valedictory, except in relation to the price of shells, and in this particular matter he witholds from the public the very information it desires.
>
> Major-General Bertram would have been well advised to say more or say nothing. His latest statement, padded with information which is

of no material interest to the public, would appear to be a crude pretext for putting the public off the scent in regard to the operations of the late shell committee. The public is ready to be convinced that General Bertram can justify every transaction consummated under his official auspices. While it will not jump to any half-baked conclusions, it will accept definite answers to definite accusations. General Bertram, in his utter lack of frankness in defending the work of the committee, has done poor service to himself, and has very materially strengthened the demand for a public investigation of his direction of the shell committee.

That is a strong editorial, the editorial of a newspaper not only friendly but zealously friendly to this Government. Surely that is a statement which this Government, and this Parliament, cannot afford to throw lightly aside.

Then, the Hamilton Spectator—I do not know whether that paper supports the Government, or whether it opposes it.

Mr. MURPHY: It supports it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am told it supports it, a Conservative paper, strongly supporting this Government. The Ottawa Citizen of Dec. 11, quotes the Hamilton Spectator as saying:

> For the most part manufacturers in Canada as in Great Britain, have thrown patriotism to the winds, and allowed themselves to be governed solely by the law of supply and demand, to the extent of becoming extortioners when supply is greatly exceeded by demand. In other words—they have, while skilfully keeping within the law, robbed the commonwealth in which they live, and piled a load of debt on their fellow-citizens, to glut their private coffers. Their 'Stand and deliver' methods savour of the days of Robin Hood. In Great Britain this kind of profiteering has been curbed by the imposition of a special tax of 50 per cent on all profits beyond £100 in excess of the average profits of each concern during the past three years. In Canada no corresponding action has been taken.

Now, the fault I have to find with the Hamilton Spectator is, that while it states strongly, and states truly that vastly excessive prices have been taken out of the pockets of the British people, and, I would add, out of the Canadian taxpayers' pockets, it blames the manufacturers, whereas it should blame this Government and its appointees, the Shell Committee. These manufacturers did not, as the Hamilton Spectator seems to think, fix the prices. The prices were fixed by the Shell Committee, members of which, as I have said, were themselves supplying shells, shrapnel and high explosives, and had no motive to reduce the prices, whose self-interest indeed led them in the other direction.

Then, The Ottawa Journal, another newspaper strongly supporting the Government, said on Dec. 7:

> No doubt exists that undue profits have been made in Canada, as elsewhere, upon the first lot of orders for munitions of war. While a part of the increased cost may be due to the war conditions which result in more expensive materials and more expensive labour, there seems no reasonable doubt that also extortionate and discreditable profits have been taken in Canada and everywhere by the persons or corporations doing the work. Excessive profits in such a matter are discreditable to the beneficiaries—if not even criminal—in any country engaged in a defensive war. They injure the ability of that country to carry on vigorously a struggle essential to its welfare. The government which pays for the munitions does so with money which it must borrow; nobody at first can tell how much money will be needed and have to be borrowed by the government; and the possibility is that lack of money available by the Government may in the end cause defeat in the war. Any person, therefore, who in his own country is unfairly bleeding the Government is really playing the part of an enemy to his country. Any person or corporation who can be shown to have taken unquestionably excessive profits, all things considered, in any war contract merits public contempt, and should also be made to feel the force of public opinion not merely that way, but in his or its pocket. There should be, and we have no doubt there will be, government investigation of the matter; and there should be retroactive legislation which will enable the Government to confiscate any proven undue profits.

The Ottawa Journal suggests Government investigation. Sir, this country will not be satisfied with Government investigation. The people of this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific are to-day demanding that this investigation shall take place by Parliament, or by a committee of Parliament, in the full light of day, so that they may know the facts and will be able to decide who is to blame for what has taken place in regard to the purchase of shrapnel, high explosive shells, and other munitions of war.

Then, the Vancouver Sun, of December 10, quotes from a leading Conservative paper, the Toronto Mail and Empire, as follows:

> It is palpable that with the prospect of a long struggle ahead, Britain and each of the dominions must strive to settle to an economic war-basis. In Canada we know only too well that most makers of munitions and furnishers of other war supplies to the Canadian and British Governments have striven to get large profits out of their contracts. Mr. David Thomas, Lloyd George's representative on munitions, who was in Canada recently, said that he had had an offer from a Hamilton manufacturer to make a great quantity of shells at cost. This was most praisewo thy, and in striking contrast to the attitude of the general run of 'profiteers.' In the United

Kingdom munition manufacturers must contribute to the state 50 per cent of the profits they make in excess of an amount of £100 above their average annual profits for the last three years. While prices are still up, as Mr. Bonar Law says, so much of the excess over a reasonable margin above cost comes back to the state. In Canada, manufacturing industry is far from being in the closely-organized state of British industry. Strong pressure has been needed to work down prices of munitions to a fair-profit level, and in some cases they are yet far from meeting the requirements of economy set forth by the British colonial secretary. As we begin to bear our own financial war burdens we must necessarily see that far from being in the position of mere vendors of war wares to an outside government—with a vendor's privileges—our manufacturers are a part of the Canadian war economy, as well as of the imperial, and that patriotism requires munition contracts to be figured, not to make the greatest stroke for profits, but to give most benefit to the state.

Then the Vancouver Sun comments:

When the Mail realizes that it can not defend, much less acclaim the proceedings of the shell committee and the manufacturers, the News-Advertiser should understand that thick and thin support of its party under such circumstances is clear indecency.

Now, Sir, I am not sure that I am correctly informed as to the manufacturer in Hamilton who offered to Mr. Thomas to place his factory at the disposal of the Government so as to make shells free of charge; but I am told—probably it is the same gentleman—that there is a manufacturer in Ontario who, under the prices which had been fixed by the Shell Committee, and to which, as I have said, the manufacturers were not a party, made a profit of half a million dollars, and who, thinking he had got enough, then offered his factory to the Government to turn out munitions of war free of charge. He had been surfeited with the enormous profits which the Shell Committee had enabled him to make.

Mr. CARVELL: Did they accept his offer?

Mr. PUGSLEY: They did not accept his offer. And why, Mr. Speaker? What I told you yesterday showed that this Government, through its Shell Committee, did not take hold of this business with a view to supplying munitions of war for the armies of the Allies at the lowest possible cost. They took hold of it rather with the view of relieving industrial depression in this country, and they were guided by the thought that, as the result of the demand for army supplies, including munitions of war, they would be able to start small industries all over this country; that they would be able, I regret to say, to give much encouragement to political favourites and turn much money into their pockets. Probably my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will resent that statement. Still, Sir, I say that if that was their motive, they could not have gone about carrying it out in a more direct fashion than the way they did. Therefore, if they had started a factory themselves and turned out these munitions of war at actual cost, they would have had to reduce the price to these other factories throughout the country, many of which were merely the creations of mushroom companies which had started by reason of the giving of these war orders.

Then, the Manitoba Free Press in an article on Dec. 28, said:

It is beyond all question that the people of Canada will be more than glad to have it proved that the shell contracts have been honestly awarded and are being carried out with reasonable efficiency. There is not a Canadian worth discussing who would not prefer to believe that Canadian manufacturers are innocent of exploiting the unbottomed misery into which this war has plunged practically the whole human race. And, although much less important, because merely material, there is not a Canadian who would not prefer to believe that Canada's industrial capacity was equal to present war emergencies.

There is, however, a fundamental thing upon which decent Canadians of every stripe and colour are adamant. This fundamental thing is that beyond ordinary and reasonable profits on the supply of necessary and honestly manufactured war materials, private parties shall not derive advantage and that family fortunes shall not be founded, to be spent no doubt after the war in easeful and luxurious living.

With all respect to General Bertram his Toronto interview, reported in yesterday's Free Press, is just as weak as the uplifted hands of the Canadian weekly published in the same city. Mere assertions of virtue are entirely out of court. Whatever a full and fearless inquiry may disclose, grave suspicion as to extortion, and even graft, in regard to the shell contracts is at this present warranted.

The Montreal Herald, on November 30, said:

The humiliating thing is that this is the work of a "Dominion" Shell Committee—

Let that never be forgotten. I say that this was not the work of a committee appointed by the British Government; this was the work of a committee appointed by this Government, and for whose actions this Government must be held responsible to the people of Canada. The Herald says:

The humiliating thing is, that this is the work of a "Dominion" Shell Committee, and therefore represents the national policy regarding the manufacture of munitions. This is how our industrial resources have been 'mobilized' to

meet the supreme need of the Empire and of civilization itself! Compare this with the policy in force with the rest of the Allied nations. Compare it with a statement for instance, of the chairman of the Steel Company of Scotland, in an address at the annual meeting of the stockholders in October:

Then follows the address, which I will read:

"You are aware that on more than one occasion I have in this place denounced government legislation as it affected the country's industries, and I may be permitted to say how heartily I approve of the principle (the special taxation of war profits) which has now been set forth in Mr. McKenna's budget, although I am not at all sure that its application is adequate. To my mind, there is something absolutely revolting in the idea of anybody making profits out of the nation's agony—and especially so in the case of a man or company who had no extra labour or anxiety, but whose opportunity has come solely because of an artificial scarcity created by the Government on account of the nation's need. The ideal principle of taxation is, of course, equality of sacrifice. . . . When we think of those splendid men of ours in Belgium, France, the Dardanelles, and elsewhere. . . who have sacrificed home, kindred, health, comfort and ease. . . . we must feel how paltry and insignificant is any monetary sacrifice which we, who must remain at home, can lay on the altar of patriotism. . . It may be, indeed, that before the war is ended, the Government may find it necessary to take not 50 but 100 per cent of those extra profits, and if they do, I hope none of us will complain."

In Canada some of the favoured companies are counting profits by the millions; they are gloating over prices that will run, it is declared, all the way up to 150 per cent profit on their entire capitalization. They see nothing revolting, apparently, in profiteering to the full out of the British nation's agony.

I want to pause for a moment to repeat here that the taxation of extra profits will avail nothing in so far as the relief of the British Treasury is concerned. It will present the anomalous spectacle of the members of this committee having fixed the excessive prices which will be paid to the manufacturers, including those companies of which they were the directing heads, and then by the imposition of taxes, taking the money back again, not giving it to the Imperial Treasury, but putting it into the treasury of Canada. That would be no remedy. The remedy was for this Government to have watched the work of the Shell Committee from the beginning, and have seen that they discharged their duty to the country, that they did not pay excessive prices, and that they did their duty by Canada and the Empire.

There is another very important article in the Toronto Telegram of December 22, which I trust I may be pardoned for reading. I do it because of what I conceive to be the vast importance of the subject, and because of the necessity of placing before the House the views of the public of Canada as represented by its leading newspapers. The Toronto Telegram published an article on this subject on December 22, 1915, which I will read in full:

Exploiting War Orders—Doings of Middlemen —Proposition is up to Premier Borden, Declares the Contract Record of Toronto.

Down New York way they're still sending out circulars that tell of desirable investments created by filling war orders in Canada, says the Contract Record in this week's issue. One of the latest comes from Gilbert Elliott and Company. It advises clients to invest in Canada Foundries and Forgings Company, which has shops at Brockville and Welland.

Then there is a quotation of the figures. If I am not mistaken, Sir Henry Pellatt is president of that company.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

3 p.m. Mr. PUGSLEY: I may be mistaken as to that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I saw that there had been some denial of a statement of profits which had been put forth by a company with which he was connected. I will read the article from the Telegram, not knowing, of course, whether there was any contradiction of it or not:

"We are advised from sources upon which we can rely, that earnings for the past ten months ending November 1, 1915, are over $900,000, and that the monthly earnings are now running at the rate of $150,000, or equal to $1,860,000 per year, which after taking care of fixed charges, will amount to over 150 per cent per annum on the outstanding common stock."

That is prefaced by the statement of Gilbert Elliott & Co., who, I assume, were brokers endeavouring to dispose of the stock of the company. Their information may or may not be correct. I cannot vouch for it, and I do not expect that the paper vouches for it either. It would not know, but the editor, or whoever wrote this article, saw it in the financial circular which was sent out by these brokers.

Sir Sam's Speech.

The circular also stated that the company has within the past year filled large orders for shells for the British government, in addition to its commercial business.

Right on top of this comes Sir Sam Hughes with a speech to Ward 4 Conservatives, Toronto. From a newspaper report of that speech the following is clipped:

"Sir Sam related how, when the first order for 200,000 shells came to Canada, there were

only four men in the whole of the Dominion who had the courage to tackle 'that little twopenny ha'penny order.' It had taken a week and a half to even get them to face the issue.

"Since then we have delivered four million shells," declared Sir Sam. "Upwards of $350,000,000 from shells alone has been placed in the pockets of the workmen."

Who are the "Workmen?"

Now, taking the circular from Now York with the story told by Sir Sam, who would you take "workmen" to mean—the men who "worked" the Shell Committee or the men who work in munition factories? If Sir Sam means the latter he is evidently talking arrant nonsense. If the workmen have got-$350,000,000 in wages Canada must have shipped at least a billion dollars' worth of shells, for the cost of material and even reasonable profits would make the difference between the sums mentioned. Every body knows that Canada has not shipped either a billion or half a billion dollars' worth of shells. Cabinet ministers should be required to know some little thing about what they are talking.

Real Plants Ready.

Another excerpt from the report of Sir Sam's furious speech reads as follows:—

"S r S m said that men had gone to him with a white sheet of paper, in some cases with their sisters tagging on behind, and not a cent of capital, asking to get orders.

"And these are the men who are making the complaints. I threw them out of my office as fast as they came in and some of them were good friends of mine. Some of them were Tories, too."

That is the condition which Mr. Thomas found when he arrived in Ottawa; he found that politics and munition orders were mixed very thoroughly together. Then the Telegram proceeds:

And within a block of where Sir Sam spoke was a foundry capable of turning out thousands of shells daily, lying almost idle.

That is typical of the condition of affairs throughout the country, that there were scores and hundreds of shops which were not utilized. The Telegram proceeds:

And I can furnish Sir Sam with a list of men who have the factories and who could not get orders. If they are not complaining too loudly it is because they still have hopes of securing orders.

A Pet Organization.

These attempts to belittle the manufacturers who have been wronged by the shell committee are unworthy of men of cabinet size. But the shell committee was a pet organization of Sir Sam and he is only following the policy of his party to minimize those mistakes which lost to the manufacturers of Canada the greatest opportunity of a century.

Why did the Government lease the Transcona car shops to a private company for the manufacture of shells? Well, perhaps you had better ask D. A. Thomas. The shell committee was the part of the Dominion Government with which he came in contact. So when the Government proposed to start in to manufacture shells without saying anything about price you can imagine him throwing up his hands and exclaiming "Heaven forbid!" However, what he said to the Government was, "put in a tender." Well, you know that shell committee never did care for tenders, anyway. It just shied off and the Government with it.

Now, I need not read the whole of the article, but I come down to the last part of it in which a positive statement is made with regard to a clerk getting a contract, which is an instance of, the newspaper says, how the shell committee handled contracts. The Telegram says:

Clerk got Contract.

This story has been investigated and can be vouched for, as can the others that have from time to time found place in this column. The owner of a planing mill in an Ontario town went out after a shell-box contract. His application brought the usual answer that all contracts had been let. Imagine his surprise when a shipping clerk in a dry goods house in his own town secured a contract, put up a building, completed his contract and got a renewal. The shipping clerk had no plant, no experience and no business rating. But he knew a man who knew something about how contracts were got. Pretty wise man, wasn't he? Thrifty, too. For he still retains his job as shipping clerk, though he occasionally finds a few moments to run over to the shell-box plant and figure his profits.

How did he do it? Ask the average box manufacturer and his answer will be: "Search me." For, strange to say, this shell game does not appear to have run along purely political lines. There are instances given where Liberals secured contracts and Conservatives could not get within hailing distance of them. Truly that shell committee moved in a mysterious way its wonders to perform. It might be put on as a movie mystery with a contract as a prize for the nearest guesser of its methods.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the Solicitor General says, hear, hear. I have never stated that no Liberal got a contract. What I have been referring to is the apparent object of the organization of this committee, and the apparent object and methods which were pursued. That is what I have complained of. But let me say that so far as I am aware, any Liberal company or any Liberal individual who got a contract, had the experience, had the capital, and in most cases had the plant ready with which to do business. That is the information which I have, and I state it from what has come under my observation.

I do not want to weary the House by quoting all the extracts which I have, but there are four more which I will quote. The Toronto Globe of November 2, 1915, says:

The higher price paid by Britain for smaller shells was due in part to the distribution of orders in lesser quantities over a wide field. The purpose of this was to relieve the prevailing industrial depression over as large an area as possible. No honest Canadian will hear this without a blush.

I also say that, I say that while the Government ought ordinarily, where it can properly do so, have the encouragement of industries in view, and while it ought ordinarily to be influenced by the desire to relieve industrial depression, yet this is a question of the safety of the Empire and the production of shells, and the production of shrapnel and high explosive shells with the greatest rapidity, ought to have been the first consideration, in order that Canada might do her share towards enabling the armies of the allies to secure victory, I agree entirely with the Globe when it says that no honest Canadian will hear of what was done without a blush. The Globe goes on to say:

It was our duty to endure the depression by our mismanagement brought on us instead of seeking relief by taking unfair advantage of Britain's predicament. Mr. Thomas is willing to regard this, too, as ancient history, but we can never view it in that light until we redeem ourselves by restitution or heroic devotion. Until this shame is wiped out no one will have the effrontery to ask that British people be burdened to pay us more than the cost elsewhere, either directly by awarding contracts or indirectly by obstructing their trade. It is but right to let Mr. Thomas and the British people know that some Canadians are ashamed of what has taken place.

Then, the Toronto Star of November 19, 1915, has this article:

How much business has been taken by the Dominion Steel Company, Limited, has not been announced, but it is known that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, one of its principal subsidiaries, is running at about full capacity on orders for shell steel and shells, and also for toluol, benzol, and other coke by-products. The Dominion Coal Company, which in the past has been a large earner, is engaged in filling heavy orders for the steel mills and for exports. Foreign shipments of coal by this company are at a record rate, and difficulty is being experienced in obtaining bottoms for its transportation. It is estimated that earnings are now running at the rate of $8,000,000 a year, or 13 per cent on the common stock, after the payment of the accumulated dividends and all charges.

Steel of Canada's share.—Steel Company of Canada is another concern that has benefited very materially from war orders. This company is said to have a contract for all the shells it can make for two years, and to be now running at the rate of $500,000 monthly. Profits are running at the rate of over 26 per cent on the company's entire capitalization, the $6,466,300 preferred stock sharing equally with the $11,500,000 common in all profits over 7 per cent on both.

National Car has large orders.—National Steel Car has large orders for cars and shells. The company is machining 2,000 shells a day, confining itself entirely to machining the steel forgings, which are supplied by Steel Company of Canada. No definite information of monthly earnings is obtainable, but it is understood that they are running at the rate of over forty per cent on the common stock.

Scotia Company at capacity.—Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, which has just increased its capital by the sale of $2,500,000 of stock, for the purpose of putting it in a position to extend its scope for taking war orders, is also operating at about full capacity on contracts for munitions.

From the west comes this article in the Regina Leader of November 20, 1915:

With hundreds of thousands of the best and bravest of Canada's youth risking life and limb in defence of the Empire, with some thousands already filling graves in France and Flanders, with an ever increasing stream of wounded and disabled men returning home, with men, women and children in the humblest of homes all over the Dominion making willing sacrifices in order that the cause of liberty may triumph, it will stand to the everlasting disgrace of the men of vast wealth connected with the great manufacturing industries of Canada who took advantage of the nation's necessities to extract extortionate profits out of war contracts and thus amass additional and enormous fortunes.

As evidence that many of these influential newspapers, some of whose views I have presented to the House, have shown too strong a disposition to blame the manufacturer and too little disposition to blame the Government, and its appointees the Shell Committee, let me refer to one incident which has been recorded in the press by reporters who had the opportunity of obtaining the facts. Not long ago Mr. Jones, the energetic manager of the Canada Cement Company, made up his mind that his company, which had a large capital, could make reasonable profits by going into the manufacture of shells. He went to the Shell Committee. He did not ask for their prices, but offered to manufacture shells at a lower price than that committee were giving. The Shell Committee refused him the order. According to the newspapers, Mr. Jones went to the Prime Minister and received sympathetic consideration from that right hon. gentleman. The Prime Minister evidently thought Mr. Jones' request of the Shell Committee was a reasonable one and, so far as he could properly do so, assisted him to secure for the Canada Cement Company a contract at a lower price.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I never had anything to do with fixing the prices. Mr. Jones did come to see me. I thought my

duty was fulfilled by at once arranging over the telephone an interview between Mr. Jones and Mr. Thomas who represented the British Minister of Munitions, and that interview took place at once.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, I was giving to my right hon. friend a little too much credit. What I sought to do was to convey the impression I had, that the Prime Minister did assist Mr. Jones by getting the Shell Committee to give him a contract at a reduced price.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I wish to make the matter plain. Mr. Thomas was here fully representing the British Minister of Munitions. I thought that information on the subject should be conveyed at once to him. During the time that he was here, as I understood the matter, he regulated the price.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should have thought that the Prime Minister, having information from a gentleman of Mr. Jones' prominence that these munitions could be produced in Canada at a much lower price than the Shell Committee were giving, and bearing in mind that the people of Canada must pay their share of the cost of these munitions, would have felt it his duty to endeavour by all the means in his power to secure the manufacture of these shells at this lower price. I am quite satisfied with the right hon. gentleman's explanation. Evidently he thought that if he introduced Mr. Jones to Mr. Thomas, under these favourable auspices Mr. Thomas would listen respectfully to Mr. Jones, and that this might be the means of lowering the price. Mr. Jones is a very prominent man, manager of one of the greatest manufacturing plants in Canada. He was very indignant, very persistent and determined to obtain a contract for his company. And instead of asking the price which the Shell Committee had been paying, and which no doubt they would have continued to pay, he submitted a lower price, and after much persistence he did secure a contract. It is stated that the result of Mr. Jones' persistence is to save the people of Great Britain and Canada something over twenty millions of dollars. And I believe that any one who will take the quantity of shells, and figure out the reduction effected by Mr. Jones' tender, will realize that my statement is within the mark. I am told that Mr. Jones has gone about this matter in a businesslike way. He had his workmen go to other factories to gain experience. I am told that, though it is only a few months since he got the contract, in a few weeks hence his company will be turning out shells.

Evidently the question of utilizing these magnificent workshops called the Transcona shops, near Winnipeg, came up. Let me repeat, from my meagre knowledge of the manner in which these things should be done, that it would have been the proper thing, the patriotic thing, for this Government to have utilized these workshops as well as other workshops to turn out munitions for the use of the Allies. But I find that in June, 1915, one of the Cabinet ministers, I am told that it was the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) was reported as saying:

> There could be nothing madder than to push our Government shops into the manufacture of munitions of war at the cost of competing with Canadian private firms.

Sir, the minister does not seem to have realized that this is a contest in which the safety of Canada and of the allied nations may depend on an adequate supply of shrapnel and high explosives. But later on, in October, 1915, we find a statement by Mr. Thomas reported in the Montreal Gazette of October 9, as follows:

> "In the same spirit Hon. Frank Cochrane, Minister of Railways, had placed the Transcona railway shops at the disposal of the Imperial Government for the manufacture of munitions. They have done that," he said, "without provision for profit to any one, and I thank the Canadian Government for the splendid spirit they have shown."

Sir, that was a splendid spirit. I do not wonder that Mr. Thomas, returning home, would declare that at last the representatives of the Canadian people, the Ministry of Canada, had made up their minds to do their duty by the Empire and to engage in the turning out of munitions of war in the Government shops at actual cost. But, was that done? Not at all. It is a fact that when these workshops were taken over by the Government, the Grand Trunk Pacific were actually making shells. These shops have a splendid equipment. I doubt if there are any finer machine shops in the Dominion of Canada—indeed, in the whole of North America—than the Transcona shops near Winnipeg. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was utilizing a part of that plant in the manufacture of shells. The shops were there, and the Government was in a position to use them to carry out the promise which the Minister of Railways made to the representative of Mr. Lloyd George. Did the Government carry out its promise?

No, Sir. The next thing we find is that this Government has leased the shops to a private company—organized, I am told, by a member of this House—for the purpose of carrying on the manufacture of shells for their own advantage as a private company. That is the way the splendid promise made to the representative of Mr. Lloyd George by this Government has been fulfilled: they have leased the shops for the purpose of organizing a private company to engage in the manufacture of shells at a profit. And what is the reason given at last by the Minister of Railways for not carrying out this promise? He has said that it would cost the Government about $125,000 to equip the shops with the necessary machinery, and that the Government could not afford to do that. This Parliament having voted money, not only by the millions but by the hundreds of millions, to enable Canada to do her share in the defence of the Empire; this Government having available these magnificent shops for the carrying out of their reassuring promise to the representative of Mr. Lloyd George, is it not inconceivable that the Government should go back upon their promise because it would cost the paltry sum of $125,000 to equip the shops with the necessary machinery to turn out shrapnel and high explosive shells? Sir, this Parliament and the people of Canada should demand from the Government a satisfactory explanation of the reason which induced them to adopt this most extraordinary and, to my mind, most unpatriotic course.

Let me read from an influential paper, the Winnipeg Voice, which represents the labour interests of Canada. The article is headed "Dominion and Shell Profiteering," and it reads:

> In leasing the Transcona shops to a private firm for the production of munitions, the Dominion Government not only neglected an opportunity to make a saving for the Empire, it tacitly confessed that it will make no effort to reduce the excessive profits of the war contractors. Business, it virtually announces, must not be harassed no matter what issues may be involved. This is clearly an unpatriotic attitude. Anything that tends to increase the cost of the war manifestly adds to the difficulties of the Empire, and a truly patriotic government would have this truth vividly in mind. It would be as keen about limiting the profits of the munition men as it would be about recruiting. Excessive war profits could not exist in a country which really believed itself to be in grave danger. All considerations of private interest disappear when the community is threatened. If therefore the governments of the United Kingdom and Canada still tolerate the extortions of the army contractors, they do so because they have not felt the pressure of the war as Belgium and France have felt it. There is no profiteering to speak of in France. Men do not haggle for pence when their entire possessions are at stake. They pitch in and help the common cause. Canada senses the realities of the war far less strongly than England. Distance no doubt accounts for this fact tolerably well. Nevertheless, the Government ought to understand the situation pretty well, and set an example in patriotism to the rest of capitalist Canada. If it fails to do so it will not be heard with any respect should it chide the workers when they begin to demand a share of the "prosperity" which this country has enjoyed as a result of the war. As the wheels of industry gather speed in Canada the workers will be encouraged to demand increases in wages. And they will not be restrained from doing so by the charge that they are unpatriotic. The sufficient reply to that charge will be to recall the fact that the Federal Government itself refused to lift a finger in order to cheapen the cost of munitions.

This is a well-written article, and one which should commend itself to the judgment of hon. members of this House.

I said yesterday that I was going to call attention to the manner in which the Australian Government had proceeded in connection with the providing of war munitions. If hon. gentlemen will read the January issue of that very interesting and reliable journal known as the Canadian Liberal Monthly—which I would commend to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House by reason of the very valuable and instructive article which it contains headed "Australia and War Munitions"—I am sure they will agree with me that Australia, in this as in other respects, so far as taking her position in the defence of the Empire is concerned, is leading the way and has set an example which Canada might well have followed at the beginning of this war. Sir, one of the great hopes I have in bringing this matter to the attention of Parliament to-day is that the Government will realize that even now it is not too late to emulate this splendid example. The war is not yet over; I fear that it may last for some years. Even the most optimistic of us fear that the end is not yet in sight. It is not too late, therefore, for this Government to do its duty: to mobilize the industries of this country and to proceed to furnish munitions of war to the Allies at actual cost. This is what Australia did; you will see how different was her course and how businesslike were her methods compared with those of the Canadian Government:

> Little or nothing has been told in Canada as to what has been done in our sister Dominions of Australia and New Zealand in the manufacture and delivery of shells and other muni-

tions of war. It may therefore come as a surprise to many to learn that, despite many natural difficulties not known in Great Britain nor in Canada, the Federal Government of Australia has grappled energetically and successfully with the problem and that the resources of the Island Continent are being worked to their utmost in order to render the maximum of aid to the Mother Country. When the call for shells came from Great Britain in the early summer of 1915, the Federal Government immediately appointed a Federal Munitions Committee, and co-operation with the different states of the Commonwealth resulted in each of these forming State Munitions Committees which at once got actively to work. Munition Bills were passed by the Federal Parliament, giving the Government the power to manufacture and contract for the manufacture of munitions, and the different states also passed similar regulations giving them similar powers. The work was thus entered upon in a public and official and thoroughly systematic manner.

Serious Difficulties Overcome.

The great difficulty encountered from the first lay in the fact that Australia, unlike Canada and unlike the United Kingdom, is not a mechanical manufacturing country. The necessary tools and machinery did not exist in that country and the tremendous distances from countries where these necessary supplies could be secured caused much vexatious delay. While this problem was being solved, however, active preparatory steps were taken in all other possible directions.

The leading engineers of the Commonwealth were called into conference to canvass the situation and supply all possible information on which actual progress could be based.

A Metal Exchange was established by the Federal Government to arrange for the control of metals produced in the country, so that all supplies would be readily available as required.

The Munitions Committee was instructed and proceeded with the formation and enrollment of a Munitions Workers Corps, to include all men of military age who are indispensable for the manufacture of munitions, and these men were given certificates to indicate that they have performed their full share of work in defence of their country.

Steel Supply Quickly Found.

The Federal Defence Department early made arrangements for the first supplies of steel for shells, contracting for the necessary quantity at the lowest price from the Broken Hill Proprietary at its Newcastle works.

Early in November, 1915, the first steel, after exhaustive Government tests, was shipped to the different states. Samples were also sent to England with a view to supplying Great Britain and her Allies, and arrangements were also made for shipment to New Zealand, where there is no steel available.

After due inquiry and consultation with the British War Office, the Federal Munitions Committee decided that the Dominion of Australia could best serve the needs of the Empire by the manufacture of 18-pound high-explosive shell bodies. A price of $5.05 per shell, including the cost of the steel, was set, and all contractors willing to accept this price were given open contracts to supply all the shells they could manufacture up to June 30, 1916, with the provision that this price might be revised, if so decided by the Government, on or after March 31, 1916. It was also undertaken that the British Government should give three months' notice when no more shells were required.

I pause to ask why this Government did not, at the very outset, make an arrangement of that kind with the manufacturers of Canada? Why is it that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, when he is seeking to excuse these high prices, says that the orders from the British Government were spasmodic, and that they acted as if they thought—and some of their officials did think—that the war would end in three months; and that it was that which caused these enormously high prices to be paid. If this Government had gone about the matter in the right way why could they not have made the same arrangement as was made by the Australian Government? That arangement was that these contracts should run until March of the present year, and that while the Australian Government had the right to revise the figures at any time, still the contract would run, and if the British Government decided to terminate the contract the contractors must receive three months' notice.

Let me speak also of the price. Large quantities of these 18-pound high explosives have been manufactured in Canada. That was the shell which the Australian Government decided it would be best to manufacture. I believe it was regarded as about the most useful all-round munition which could be produced. What was the price that they paid? It was $5.05 per shell, and that was away off in Australia where the manufacturing industries are not at all in the advanced stage that they are in Canada; in Australia where the difficulty of obtaining steel is very much greater than in Canada. Australia is not like Canada, situated side by side with a great manufacturing country like the United States, where all the materials which could not be obtained in Canada might very easily be obtained. And yet, Sir, the Australian Government fixed the price for these 18-pound high explosives at 21 shillings sterling, which is equal to $5.05. That included the machining of the shell and the steel billets which would be used for the shell. What was the price fixed by this Shell Committee in Canada? It was $5.70 for the mere machining, and the steel billets were supplied by the Shell Committee free of cost to the manufacturer; and the steel for those shells would cost an average of pretty close to $2 apiece or perhaps $1.40 or $1.50, or somewhere between $1 and $2. At all

events, it made the price of these 18-pound high explosives nearly $2 apiece greater in Canada than in Australia. That was the price fixed, as I said, by the Shell Committee, and fixed, evidently, out of all proportion to the cost of manufacture. Sir, no man who looks at this subject dispassionately can come to any other conclusion than that some of the gentlemen on the Shell Committee, engaged as they were in large manufacturing concerns themselves, being directing heads of large manufacturing concerns to which they themselves gave the making of vast quantities of steel shells, were quite content that the country should pay these enormous prices and that they made no honest effort to get low prices because—and this is a hard thing to say of any gentleman who was considered of sufficient importance to be appointed on this committee—because, of every excess dollar paid for the shells, a certain portion was going into their own pockets and into the treasuries of the companies of which they were the executive heads. A pretty situation for this Government to place the people of Great Britain and of Canada in, that this Commission, whom they appointed,—this Commission whose work they should have kept under their eyes from day to day, because the Imperial Government were trusting this Government to safeguard their interests as the people of Canada have trusted them to safeguard their interests—a pretty situation this, that these sixteen gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury Benches and whose duty it was under those circumstances to guard the interests of the Empire, including the interests of Canada, should have allowed this thing to go on from month to month, knowing that these gentlemen on the Shell Committee were buying shells from themselves and buying them at these exorbitant prices. I say it is a lamentable situation that they should allow this to go on for months and months, and that it was only after dissatisfaction had reached, apparently, to the Mother Country and after Mr. Lloyd George's representative, Mr. Thomas, had been sent out to this country to investigate, that these things were discovered, which nearly all men in Canada knew, and of which every honest Canadian was ashamed; and that it should have remained to Mr. Thomas to put an end to these scandals which ought long before that to have been put an end to by this Government.

Then this article proceeds as follows:

On this basis 31 tenders had been received—

That is, at the price of $5.05.

—up to November 1, of which 19 had been formally accepted, the balance being still under consideration.

Shell-making at actual cost.

These tenders revealed one very significant difference between shell-making in Canada, which is apparently inseparable from huge and unreasonable profit-making, and shell-making in Australia, where national service and the good of the Empire is apparently the first consideration.

Four of the tenders were from the State Governments of New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Queensland, the contract for the latter state being undertaken by the State Government Railways Department. In each of these cases the larger part of the work was to be done at actual cost in Government owned and Government operated shops, most of which are part of the equipment of the Railways Departments and other government departments. As all the railways of Australia are owned and operated by the state, the extent of the work undertaken in government shops can be readily understood.

I shall not trouble the House with the remainder of the article, but I may mention this very important matter: that the Government of Australia also undertook, early in the history of this war, the making of machine guns for the use of its soldiers at the front. And I would like to say just a word with regard to machine guns. I believe that this Government sent its boys to the front supplied with machine guns to a very small proportion as compared with the number in the hands of the Germans who stood in front of them upon the battlefield. I have been told that men have written from the front, that by reason of the want of machine guns they were mowed down as wheat is mowed down by the harvesting machines. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia went across to Europe and was said to have gone to the front, and when he came back he reported that all was well upon the front, when he ought to have known, and this Government ought to have known from week to week, from the reports of their officers at the front, that the equipment of the Canadian troops was lamentably deficient, so far as machine guns were concerned. No word of that came to the public's ears, and apparently the Government itself took no action to remedy the defect; and it was not until Col. Currie and Col. Meighen returned from France and addressed public meetings, and called attention to this lamentable state of affairs, that there appeared to be any waking up on the part of the Government to the necessity for properly equipping with machine guns our soldiers who are fighting the

battles of the Empire. Then what happened, Sir? When the people of Canada were confronted with the fact that although this Parliament voted $100,000,000 for the proper equipment of our soldiers this Government had failed in their duty, all over the country there arose a wave of indignation, as well as a wave of intense patroitism, and from almost every hamlet and town, from almost every municipality and every city, from almost every man and every woman, came contributions for machine guns in order that our soldiers might be properly equipped. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Militia (Hon. J. A. Lougheed) made an announcement through the press that the Government would be glad to receive these contributions, and would see to it that the money was devoted to the proper purpose. Sir, I think that every thousand dollars which was contributed by the people of this country for machine guns constitutes a strong indictment against this Government for its neglect to provide proper equipment for the soldiers. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence may say that the officials of the British War Office did not think that any more machine guns were necessary. But, Sir, for what do we have such an experienced soldier as the hon. Minister of Militia, for what purpose has he been selected, for what purpose did he go to the front, if not to see to the equipment of our soldiers? Surely he knows as much as the ordinary official of the British War Office; surely it is no answer to the people of Canada, no answer to the mothers and fathers of the boys whose lives have been sacrificed on the European battlefields, to say that the Minister of Militia did not know, and that he ought to be excused for not knowing, because the officials of the War Office in England did not realize the necessity for greater equipment. I say it is no excuse. The Minister of Militia must have known, or he ought to have known, of that great deficiency, and steps ought to have been taken earlier in the war to provide the necessary equipment in the matter of machine guns. The people of Canada want to know what has been done with the $2,000,000 which they subscribed—whether it is not to be used for machine guns, whether the assurance of Hon. Mr. Lougheed that the Government would be glad to receive contributions for machine guns and would apply the money received to that purpose, is to be carried out. If the money is not to be used for that purpose, then some explanation should be given to the public and more especially to the donors. The only explanation I have seen was in a letter written by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister a few days ago, in which he said that the money could not be returned because several machine guns had already been purchased. I am told that the total subscriptions were $2,000,000, and that that sum would purchase 2,000 machine guns. The Prime Minister says that several guns have been purchased up to this time, and that consequently the money cannot be returned. Sir, I think we ought to know why that money was not devoted to its proper purpose; we ought to know how much of it is on hand; we ought to know what is intended to be done with what is on hand; and we ought to know whether our soldiers are now properly equipped so far as machine guns are concerned. We ought to be informed as to how they were equipped when they first went into the trenches. The people of Canada, let me tell my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, are terribly keen to know that when our boys go to the front they have every possible protection which men can have, that they are well equipped, and well armed, and that they are fully supplied with big guns, machine guns, high explosive shells, and other munitions of war.

I am not going to detain the House any longer. I have already taken up longer time than I ought to have done, and I desire to express my thanks to the House for listening so patiently to what I have said. The subject seemed to me to be of the greatest possible importance. It seemed to me to be a question affecting the honour of our country and the honour of this Parliament, and to be of the very greatest possible importance to the people, not only of Canada, but of Great Britain.

I have been careful to make no charge against the manufacturers of this country. Before I take my seat I desire to bear testimony to the fact that they stand in the very front rank of the manufacturers of the world. I believe that there is nothing which is turned out in any part of the world that cannot be turned out by the Canadian people. Give them the contracts and they will supply the money, and the material, and the brains necessary to fill these contracts. But the Canadian manufacturers were not asked to fix prices for the shells, shrapnel, or high explosive, or any other munitions

of war which were under the control of the Canadian Shell Committee. Prices were fixed entirely by that committee, and if anybody is responsible for any wrong-doing which may have taken place it is the Shell Committee, it is this Government through the Shell Committee, which they appointed, and for whose actions they are responsible.

All that I ask, Sir, is that there be a full and complete investigation by a committee of this Parliament in order to determine whether excessive prices have been paid, and if they have been paid to fix the blame upon the right shoulders. I have been careful not to say anything because I do not know as to the extent of the responsibility; but I do say, and I repeat it most emphatically, that, so far as my information goes, that blame does not rest upon the shoulders of the manufacturers, but upon the shoulders of those who fixed the prices. It rests upon the shoulders of the members of the Shell Committee, who were paying themselves these excessive prices, who stood in the position of both buyers and sellers, and who could not reduce the prices to outside manufacturers without reducing the prices to themselves. The whole business was of the most objectionable character, and one that demands the fullest and most complete investigation by a committee of this Parliament.

Mr. OLIVER J. WILCOX (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to extend to you, Sir, my congratulations upon your promotion to the dignified position which you now occupy. If I had been guilty of the tirade of unwarranted accusations, insinuations, and statements which have been made by my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) I would have at least convinced myself that I was more anxious to undermine the Government of this country than to undermine the Kaiser. I cannot conceive of a speech that has been delivered in this House since the great world crisis has faced the people of Canada that has been so unbecoming, so out of place, as that which has been delivered by the hon. member for St. John. It had for its basis purely political motives and its object was to weaken the position of the Government which is to-day sustaining a responsibility the like of which no government has had to bear before in Canada. I regret the attempt of the hon. gentleman to lay a charge where there is no charge, bolstered and backed up by a lot of old newspaper clippings which are not admitted within the confines of Parliament as proof in support of any contention, in an effort to make out a case against a government whose skirts are clear and who are recognized by the people of Canada as being worthy of the position which they occupy.

It does seem to me to be a peculiar thing —yes, a wonderful thing—in this young country in which we live, and which has made such vast strides along all avenues of human activity in the past forty years, that in every great crisis the country has seen it has been guided by the representatives of the great political party with which I am to-day affiliated.

We are always delighted to hear from my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). Oh, how I wish that the sentiments which animated the hon. member for St. John this afternoon had been as high and as noble as the sentiments that animated the hon. member for Red Deer the other evening, a man who has the proper idea of what it means to be a British subject and to live under British institutions, whose son is at the front doing his duty—

Sir SAM HUGHES: And doing it well.

Mr. WILCOX: —and who has another son, I am informed, going to the front. Contrast that speech of the hon. member for Red Deer with the heckling, with the wanderings, with the meanderings of the hon. member for St. John. He landed once or twice in Vancouver, jumped from there to an elevator in Halifax, got over into St. John and landed in the Shell Committee in Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER: High explosives.

Mr. WILCOX: All high explosives and the biggest explosion that has taken place in this House is the speech of the hon. member for St. John. This was all done with the object of trying to figure out if he could not by some hook or crook convince the people that this Government are not worthy of the trust that has been committed to their care in this time of stress and trial. I have commended the hon. member for Red Deer and from my place in this House I want to say, because I believe it, that a proper spirit animates my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If I take his words to mean that which they appear to mean, I believe that I can put him, whatever transgressions he may have committed in past years in regard to loyalty and adhesion to

the policy of Imperial defence, amongst those Canadians who desire to pursue a patriotic course in this great crisis. I trust that the principles contained in the speech which he delivered here the other day will be acceptable to patriotic Canadians. But the party of hon. gentlemen opposite at this moment is at the parting of the ways on this question. Who is going to be the leader—the hon. member for St. John with his measley politics and who is always playing the game? You would think we were living in times of the most glorious peace and not in times of war. We do not mind that from the hon. member from St. John; we expect it; we know that politics permeate his very being. I hope my hon. friend from St. John will not imagine I am casting any reflections upon the great ability 4 p.m. which we all recognize he possesses. But in this time of stress and trial it might have been expected that he would have employed that great ability in proper channels and that he would have given to the country that assistance which I believe every patriotic Canadian desires it should receive, thereby strengthening the hands of those who are endeavouring to uphold the British cause.

After the outbreak of war, when Sir Robert Borden, the distinguished Canadian who leads the destinies of this country at this hour, called the war session of Parliament, my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a speech from his place in this House, and in clear and distinct terms laid down the policy of the party which he leads. On page 8 of Hansard of the special session of Parliament of 1914, my right hon. friend had this to say:

> This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed, to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the mother country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her. Speaking for those who sit around me, speaking for the wide constituencies which we represent in this House, I hasten to say that to all these measures we are prepared to give immediate assent. If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. WILCOX:

—or should be differently done.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Wilcox.]

Mr. WILCOX:

—We raise no question.

Let my hon. friend say "hear, hear," now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is all right.

Mr. WILCOX:

We take no exception, we offer no criticism.

Let him say it now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. WILCOX:

And we shall not offer any criticism as long as there is danger at the front.

We took those words as coming from the leader of a great party, and we believed what he said.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not in regard to wrongdoing.

Mr. WILCOX: My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has not transgressed to any great extent; but, Sir, there is an hon. gentleman on his right whom I would advise my right hon. friend, if he would take my advice, to take into his inner counsel, into that private office where he has put up so many political games in the past, where he devises those schemes to put it over us bad Tories. Let him take him in there and have a talk with him; and in the interest of the cause, and of the liberty and freedom of our institutions of which my right hon. friend spoke the other day, let us cut out this haggling and making political capital, which is nothing but political buncombe for the back concessions of the country.

In my constituency, when a man gets up and speaks a lot of what I call "hot air," we call it up our way "bull talk." Some ingenious business institution up there has got out a barometer as an advertising scheme. I have one in my hand. It has an indicator, and the first point on it is "blarney." Then, as the indicator rises a few degrees higher, the next point is called "hot air." If it reaches up a few degrees higher, it is called "stable talk," and if it goes to the top it is called "bull talk"; and I am inclined to think that if I had applied this test to my hon. friend, the indicator would have been at the top now.

As I listened to the words of the hon. gentleman, I thought of the words of Richard the Second:

> Of comfort no man speak:
> Let's talk of graves, and worms, and epitaphs;
> Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes
> Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.

My hon. friend quoted papers ad nauseam. I hold in my hand the Ottawa Free Press of to-day, January 19, which is the leading Liberal paper in the capital and one of the leading Liberal organs of the Dominion of Canada, and it laughs at the hon. gentleman and puts him in his proper place. I desire to place this editorial on Hansard. I do not usually read from newspapers, but I am sure that my hon. friends will bear with me on this occasion, because it is such a complete answer to the arguments which my hon. friend tried to make in his speech of one hour last night and two hours to-day. The Free Press says:

The "Shame" that Mr. Pugsley Sees.

The Dominion Shell Commission, appointed by General Sam Hughes within six weeks of the outbreak of the war under the chairmanship of General Alex Bertram, practical mechanic, manufacturer and soldier, established in Canada an entirely new industry that has brought to and distributed throughout the Dominion, hundreds of millions of dollars.

Six weeks after the opening of the war, and six months before Britain compelled by her necessities decided to do the same thing, Canada proceeded to organize its privately-owned industrial resources for the manufacture of the shells that General Sam Hughes correctly predicted would be demanded in appalling quantities.

It was a tremendous task—one for which there was no precedent, one which meant generally and largely a groping in the dark. It was a task for practical men, for captains of industry particularly connected with the metal trades, for those familiar with the manufactories of the country and their equipment, for tactful and essentially honest leaders.

In Messrs. Bertram and his associates General Sam Hughes found men of extraordinary suitability. They were practical machinists and inventors, had captained huge industries, and wide knowledge of Canadian manufacturing conditions, and had the confidence and respect of all who knew them.

Remember this is what a Liberal newspaper says.

These men accepted what from the first seemed a thankless, if not impossible task; they served continuously night and day without a cent of remuneration; they achieved against tremendous obstacles a wonderful thing—the organization, on a gigantic scale, of an industry entirely new to Canada, that has kept thousands of Canadians in employment, and that has driven away the distress that threatened our cities and towns.

* * *

That is the record which Hon. William Pugsley, from his place in the House of Commons, declares "will bring shame to the people of Canada," and which, he asserts, has "produced scandals which were reeking from the Atlantic to the Pacific." His condemnation will be printed in a hundred Canadian newspapers to-day, and in brief telegrams and cables people in the United States and Britain will be told of this horror that has come to the Dominion.

* * *

Why does Hon. William Pugsley make this startling statement?

The Commission had given large orders to firms in which its members were interested, for instance John Bertram and Sons, of which Sir Alex. Bertram was vice-president, and to a concern with which Mr. Carnegie was connected.

The Commission had fixed an unduly high price to be paid for shells.

A Canadian had quoted $4 for fuses that had been bought in the United States for from $4 to $4.50.

The Commission had been animated by a desire to distribute orders to friends of the Government.

Bernard Hepburn, M.P., had been given a contract which had been turned over to a Montreal firm.

E. A. D. Morgan, a Conservative candidate in Richelieu, had got an order at higher than an Ontario manufacturer, as having been told the rates recently paid, that he might expect to get an order, spent $15,000 in installing additional lathes, but was subsequently waited upon "by two gentlemen, one of them closely connected with the Chairman of the Shell Committee, who told him that he could not obtain a contract unless he paid a commission of 1½ per cent to them;" declining to pay, he got no order.

Men without plants got orders for shell boxes, while others with plants did not.

We believe this is a fair summary of Mr. Pugsley's charges, as reported in the newspapers.

* * *

Hon. Mr. Pugsley, so far as we can see, provides no evidence other than rumours that have been circulated by disappointed manufacturers, or distorted statements and half truths that have appeared in certain newspapers. But, supposing all his assertions are true, are they of a nature to make Canadians forget the real and wonderful achievements of the Shell Commission and bring shame, instead of pride, to the Canadian people?

Firms with which the Commissioners were connected were given orders at the outset because they were included among the few willing to try the experiment of making shells; Sir Alex. Bertram has denied that he has any but a nominal connection with John Bertram and Sons; comparatively high prices had to be fixed in order to tempt Canadian manufacturers into the new industry, and at that the total we are assured, was $15,000,000 less than the amount allowed by the War Office; oftentimes date of delivery offset a lower offer in price; many Liberal firms have handled contracts from the Commission; it was not such a heinous offence for a member of Parliament, or for a candidate for Parliament, to bring the war facilities of certain firms to the attention of the Shell Committee; many scores of firms who at first refused to have anything to do with the experiment flocked to Ottawa when they discovered that others had tried it and had succeeded well.

How trivial is all this compared with the essential fact that the Shell Commission established in Canada an industry that has brought hundreds of millions of dollars to the Dominion, besides materially helping in the prosecution of the war.

* * *

The assertion that there are in the country men, politicians possibly, mean enough to sponge on manufacturers who have received

orders from the Shell Commission and bold enough to pretend that only upon payments to them could future orders be obtained, is quite believable after some of the revelations in connection with the horse purchases; but that men of the stamp of General Bertram, who, despite the rumours which Mr. Pugsley now gives voice to, was created a Sir Knight by his King a few weeks ago, would be a party to such contemptible tricks is unthinkable.

And the editorial goes on all the way through condemning the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) for the attitude he has taken in this House with regard to this matter.

Owing to the extraordinary growth of the munitions business in Canada, which started with so small an order that the difficulties of its inception were added to, the work of the original shell commission may not have been conducted with the complete system that the great task demanded; but the fact remains that results have shown that the Bertram Commission was one of the most efficient that has ever been appointed by a government of this country.

* * *

The Free Press regrets to find itself in opposition to so clever and distinguished a member of the Liberal party as Hon. William Pugsley, but we cannot help thinking that he has been led astray by the atmosphere of the chamber which has been the scene of so many gallant party fights in which he has been a leading antagonist.

From the speeches of the men on both sides who had preceded him, from the speeches of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Dr. Clark, and Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, we had been led to expect that the element of petty partisanship was to be eliminated from this war session, and we had obtained visions of a real drawing together of the two political parties for the prosecution of the war, beside which everything pales into insignificance.

If Mr. Pugsley's lead is followed by other Liberals, our hopes are shattered and Canada, we believe, will suffer.

So I make allusion to the fact that to-day is the parting of the ways. Will hon. gentlemen opposite follow the lead of the hon. member for St. John city, or will they follow the lead of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who said that there would be no criticism of the conduct of this Government so long as the war lasted, because the interests at the front were too great?

In connection with the development of an industry on the scale to which the munitions output has attained, it is too much to expect that there has been nothing deserving of condemnation, but to, deliberately and in a wholesale way, blackwash men like Bertram and his associates who have accomplished so much that counts in the successful carrying on of the war does not seem patriotic.

The. fishing expedition upon which Mr Pugsley would have Parliament embark might result in the exposure of some grafters; but it would probably be more prolific in valuable information for the enemy.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the view of the leading Liberal newspaper of the city of Ottawa with regard to the statements made by my hon. friend this afternoon. There is, however, one satisfaction: my hon. friend, session after session, has brought charges against this Administration which have been proved to be absolutely groundless; consequently the people are beginning to know my hon. friend. Oh, they say, that is Pugsley—and there is a great deal in that. I want to say to my hon. friend—though in best of spirit, because I am in just a good a temper as he was when he spoke—that he should consider the words which I have quoted. I think he has made a great mistake, and I want to put him on the right path, if I can. Mr. Blaine a great statesman in the United States—

An hon. MEMBER: Here, too.

Mr. WILCOX: Yes Mr. Blaine, the American statesman, said in one of his books:

It never pays to be a blue-ruin man in the United States. The people are not influenced by that sort of tactics. They have an abiding confidence in the future, and when dismal accounts are spread broadcast, they simply lose confidence in the authority thereof.

I think that throughout the Dominion of Canada these words are beginning to apply fairly well to the hon. member for St. John city, because the hon. gentleman has said so many things in the past that the people have found to be untrue that they do not pay any attention to him now. For that reason, therefore, we do not look upon the matter as seriously as we would if conditions in that regard were different.

The hon. gentleman last evening tried to make a case against the Government by asserting that enough had not been done for the farmers of Canada. Why, he said the Government sent out a pamphlet telling the farmers to produce more, with the result that the farmers dragged the ground three times where, if they had not received the pamphlet, they would only have dragged it twice. Providence smiled on them and they got a great crop. You have neglected the question of transportation, he says. You ought to have built shipyards; you ought to have built a fleet of ships to carry this grain across the Atlantic. You ought, he says, to build elevators at St. John and Halifax—though I understand that there is an elevator at Halifax and that it is not half-full at the present time. I understand also that through the actions of this Administration in safeguarding the interests of the farmers of Western Canada, greater progress has been made in the movement of

the crop to its destination than was made in any previous year.

Look at the freight rates, said my hon. friend; they are too high. Well, what makes the freight rates high? Is it the Government? The Government has been doing everything in their power to adjust the freight rates, but it should be remembered that conditions exist to-day upon the high seas over which no government has control. When the war broke out and the enemy's ships made their appearance upon the Seven Seas, it became risky for the great transports to carry their cargoes through the arteries of trade to the distant markets of the world, and no company in the world would insure that cargo at the rate at which they would insure it in times of peace. Is the Government responsible for that? If my hon. friend had not made so vigorous an opposition we might to-day have three dreadnoughts upon the great trade routes of the world, and probably the freight rates would not now be so high.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who ever thought of doing that on your side?

Mr. WILCOX: The next point to which my hon. friend referred was the extension of the life of Parliament. I tell you, he said it is a serious thing—you know how he draws it out; I cannot do it like he can—I am practising. It is a serious thing to change the British constitution! You would think it was the rock of ages he was going to change. But it is not. It would be done just as simply as the King approved letting the soldiers vote, which my hon. friend said His Majesty would not do. It is only a matter of form, and if it is approved by the Parliament of Canada it will be done. This Government will directly urge it, we hope, hon. gentlemen opposite, with your assistance. We want it. We do not believe that we can use our best energies in this great conflict, and bring the force of this state to bear to the fullest possible extent without your assistance, and we plead for it. But if you, hon. gentlemen, are to take the course which is directed by the hon. member from St. John, then it means a weakening of the character of the citizenship of this country, and the ability of our citizens to uphold those principles of liberty and of freedom which have been handed down to us by the glorious ancestry from whose loins we have sprung.

But, Sir, speaking a few months ago, my hon. friend thought there was going to be an election. He thought that, but he thought wrong. You know I am inclined to think that although my hon. friend is clever and astute, polite, smart, all the rest of it; although he possesses all those essential qualities, he pays too much attention to newspaper scraps. Perhaps he is trying to keep in with the press. It may be that it would pay us all to do that. I have no charge to make against the press or against young men who grace the dignity of the position which they occupy. But, you know, in recess time they have got to write up editorials, and the hon. member for St. John seems to believe them all; he brings them back to this House and reads them. But he was in Winnipeg when there was talk of an election in that great city, which is the home of his friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), and he gave out an interview. He says, now, it is a serious thing to extend the life of Parliament, a serious thing to change the constitution. But it is only paper, it is not rock or stone. You simply go to the House of Commons in England and ask for an amendment of our British North America Act, and it will be passed just as any piece of legislation would be passed here. It is not so serious as my hon. friend would like to make the country think it is. I have here the interview which he gave out in Winnipeg. It is as follows:

Charges of Liberals.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley, Liberal member for St. John, N.B., and for years Minister of Public Works in the Laurier Cabinet, in the course of an interview given to the Manitoba Free Press, Winnipeg, on September 15, declared as follows:

Here is what he says, but he has had a new vision since then:

> The present circumstances are so grave from the standpoint of Canada and the Empire that it would be deplorable, in my opinion, to have the people divided upon party questions.

The first paragraph is all right.

> Another of the reasons why I favour putting off an election until after the war is because I think it would be a great pity to hold one just when the energies of all the people of Canada, especially the members of the Government who are primarily charged with the duty of attending to the recruiting and equipment of the soldiers, should be devoted to this one end.

That is the way he talked a few months ago. I have watched the course of my hon. friend ever since I have been in this Parliament, and upon many occasions I have admired him for his cleverness and his shrewdness; but since this Government came into power he seems to think that they have no right to govern the destinies of this country,

and that he is the dictator and the all-powerful of us all. Why the change in his position to-day? The extension of the life of Parliament is not serious, and the Government has taken that position. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to take another course, in my judgment they are not taking a course which is in the interest of our country, or of the Empire to which we belong.

My hon. friend said: Why, when this war broke out we all knew it was going to be a long war. But only a little while before that he did not know that there was going to be a war at all, notwithstanding the fact that he had the advice and counsel of the chief executive of the Imperial forces, and the knowledge of the conditions that existed in our own Empire, and of the history of other states and peoples that have been predominant in the world. The British Empire is not very old. Our history, since the British Empire has become pre-eminent and predominant in the world, does not date back very many centuries. But, Sir, in the past there have been other empires, the Phœnician Empire, Carthage, Rome; and the history of three thousand years points to the fact that all the good things of this life, home, land, commerce, trade, belong, not to the feeble or to the weak, but belong to the energetic and the strong. What did my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) say? Was he inclined to accept the advice and counsel of the chief lords of the Admiralty, who knew what they were talking about? Here is what he said on March 12, 1913, speaking in this House:

> I can say that the ignorance displayed in that memorandum of Canadian conditions and of Canadian people is enough to make a horse laugh.

My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) also said something. He was a transgressor too, but he made a very fine speech the other day, a speech true and loyal to British institutions, and because of that speech I am not going to criticise him now. I would a hundred times rather raise the member of St. John to the elevated plane which my hon friend (Mr. Lemieux) has now reached.

I have some more quotations here, but they are a matter of past history. There were also many other points to which I intended to allude, but I must not weary the House. This great struggle in which we are now engaged, is recognized by all within the confines of this House and of this country to have been due to the most titanic crime ever committed against humanity and civilization. It has been written that our civilization, as we have it to-day, is based on the law of Moses, and since Moses handed down the law upon the flags of stone, and men forsook the worship of the golden calf and took to worshipping God who created them in his own image—since that primitive period in the history of the world, the unpeopled plains have become hives of industry, and hives of industry have become unpeopled plains as we see in Belgium, France, Poland and in other countries ravaged by the war, which has wrought such wonderful historic and geographical changes. To-day we are confronted with a doctrine, with a system that is absolutely opposed to that under which we have lived. We have been permitted to live, Sir, in a century of great achievement, and we boast of all we have accomplished. Wealth has been piled up in every avenue of our industrial and national life. But who accomplished all that? I ask you, Sir, was it not our forefathers who left the distant shores of France and England and Scotland and other countries and came and settled upon the rock-bound coasts of this country. They were men who endured untold hardships, who made great sacrifices, and who wrought many days that they might hand down to us the great heritage which we possess to-day. Mr. Speaker, the great races living under British institutions have been the torch bearers of civilization in past centuries. Other empires in the past in their day and generation made advances in civilization, but not since the world began has any empire been recognized as a more beneficent, humane, uplifting agency than the great British Empire to which you and I belong. The races who live under British institutions were the torch bearers of civilization because they enjoyed liberty and freedom and because they possessed the character to uphold these principles.

I have this to say as my last word to the House this afternoon: in my humble opinion, anything that tends to weaken the character of the citizens of this country at this time is unpatriotic. In my judgment nothing will have a more unfortunate effect than the stirring up of strife over a few horses and a few shells. Let me remind my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) that wealth after all does not constitute the power of the state; it is the individuality and character of the citizens. If we are to have wrangles in this House upon political is-

sues; if this Government is to be attacked for reasons which are no reasons at all, and which are only a repetition of the old political game over which our hearts were sore in times of peace; if that is what we are going to have, I say that when these speeches are read in the constituencies by the Liberals and the Conservatives they will declare that we want to be one. What effect will the speech delivered this afternoon and last night by the hon. member for St. John have? He tells the country that the Government are a bunch of grafters and bunglers. What effect will it have upon the honest citizen of the country who desires to see honest work done during this great crisis? I say to my hon. friends opposite and I plead with them—I mean it; it comes from the bottom of my heart—I say let us for goodness sake throw this old political game into the ditch. It is rotten. Let us remember that the country and the institutions under which we live are at stake, and that everything that was won for us by our forefathers must go if Germany wins. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the success of the German doctrine that the life of the citizen is measured only by its value to the state.

That is to be spread over Canada, accompanied by the hatred that has been implanted in the breast of the German race with, I am sorry to say, the wrongful assertion that we are their natural enemy. Statements have appeared in the German press to the effect that the German people in Canada are serfs, that they are downtrodden, that they have no rights here. Why? To stir up a spirit of enthusiasm in their own country and to carry out the wishes of the high military caste. Imagine a German race with such ideas as those in their minds. What would you expect if they became predominant over us? That system involves making such a hell of the country that the Allies, that every citizen, will accept anything in order to get away from its baneful influence. Let us, regardless of politics, be brothers for once in this game. Let us act all together and we will proceed to do our duty as God gives us to see our duty. Then we will proceed to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him that has borne the brunt of the battle, his widow, and his orphans, and to do all possible to achieve a just and lasting peace.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Government are to be congratulated on the choice they have made of a champion of their cause on this occasion. We have certainly been entertained by the expressions of my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), and we are bound to assume that he speaks with authority as representing the ideas of the Government in regard to the important matters that have been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), as well as by other hon. members on this side. We are at one with him in desiring unity of action in this great world crisis, but the people of Canada who must pay the price in money and in blood, ask at the hands of those who for the moment have the administration of our affairs, that the handling of our money, and shall I say, the direction of our blood, shall be characterized by honesty and efficiency, to the end that the cause in which we are engaged shall triumph. Are we to understand that the policy of the Government is that their friends—their party friends—shall profit unduly out of the supply of the necessary requirements for this war, and that their champions shall stand up and say to the House and the country, that they are not to be criticised, that to criticise them is disloyalty?

In my humble judgment this is the parting of the ways. If the Government propose, instead of honestly meeting an honest statement of fact, and placing before the House and the country such reasonable explanation of that condition of fact as may be possible, to declare in the most imflammatory style that they are to have the divine right to do as they please, and that those who question them in the doing of that are guilty of treason against the state and the Empire, then I, for one, will certainly take issue with them, and I think that a large majority of the people of Canada will do the same. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox) was anxious to include all of us in this House and in the country in an embrace of brotherhood from which party politics would be altogether eliminated. May I ask how my hon. friend arrived in this House, may I ask in what interest he has cast every vote that he has ever cast in this House, may I ask in what interest he made the speech which he did to-day, if it were not in the interest of party politics? Is he to declare that there shall be no party politics in this Parliament, when, if there were no differences of opinion and if those differences were not crystallized into the forms of party allegiance, this Parliament would

in effect have no reason for existence? That a member of the House of Commons should declaim against partyism in the discussion of public affairs can only be considered as an evidence of insincerity. Instead of the address of my hon. friend having been of a character tending to the elimination of party discussion in this Chamber, and from the platforms and press of the country, I cannot recall a more deliberate, a more unqualifiedly partisan utterance ever having been made in this House.

I did not desire to deal with the question of the supply of munitions to the British Government by the manufac-
5 p.m. turers of Canada. It was not my purpose in rising to address the House to deal with that question, and I do not go any further now than merely to say, that accusations of disloyalty against those who are sent here for the purpose of guarding the interests of the public because they ask in a most respectful way for information for the benefit of the public in regard to the expenditure of the moneys of the public, cannot be maintained. If there is disloyalty, the disloyalty is on the part of those who either have their hands in the public treasury themselves or are desirous of protecting those who have their hands in that treasury. This is a time when I see in the newspapers the motto "save and serve"—a good motto, necessary to be observed in this country as in every part of the British Empire as a means to success. But we have heard in this House that not tens of thousands, not hundreds of thousands but tens of millions of money have been improperly expended in the production of munitions for the actual prosecution of the war, and when my hon. friend says "he who criticises is disloyal." the disloyalty is on his side, not on ours.

May I deal now with a matter which was alluded to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), and also by the Prime Minister. It is something that has a very important bearing upon the interests of the West, and I think the conditions should be thoroughly understood. The House is no doubt aware that, notwithstanding the bountiful crop of the West and the high prices that prevail in Great Britain for foodstuffs, the prices to the producer in the West this year are little, if any, higher than the average prices of the past number of years, and in some cases much lower. The reason of that is not because the railroad charges are higher, not because the elevator charges are higher, but because the cost of ocean carriage is so much higher, as my hon. friend from St. John says, 1,000 per cent higher, than it was a few years ago. The ocean carrier is to-day receiving for the transportation of Canadian wheat across the Altantic fifty per cent as much as the farmer receives for producing that wheat and putting it into the elevators. This has arisen no doubt in large measure because of war conditions. It is a matter which was brought to the attention of the Government during the past session. While the crop was in process of being harvested and before it was put upon the market, attention was drawn to the fact that the ocean rates were abnormally high, and the Government was urged to take some action towards bringing them down. The Premier and his party of friends spent some time in the old country last year, and if I remember aright, it was announced in the newspapers on behalf of the Prime Minister, that he was there for the express purpose of securing a reduction in those ocean transportation rates. When he came back he appointed a committee, of which the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) was chairman, for the purpose of dealing with this question with a view of securing for the western farmer a fairer share of the Liverpool price for his product. At the time of the return of the Prime Minister the ocean rate was quoted at 33 cents per bushel. After the appointment of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and his committee, I noticed that the ocean rate increased to 34 cents, to 35 cents, to 36 cents per bushel. Recently I saw in the newspapers that the ocean rate at that time was approximately 42 cents per bushel. I am not able to establish the connection between the Minister of Public Works and his committee and that increase in the ocean rates, but I will suggest this, that in view of the fact that the rates have continued to increase ever since his appointment, he would do himself a great deal of credit if he would resign and then he could not at any rate be blamed for that increase in the rate.

The Prime Minister dealt with this matter of rates in his speech the other day, and he showed that the Government had been able to secure ocean transportation on favourable terms for the munitions

made in Canada. He informed the House that the Government had been fortunate in being able to secure the services of Mr. A. H. Harris, formerly connected with the Canadian Pacific railway, and he gave a statement of what Mr. Harris had been able to do. I will read the last paragraph in regard to that :

> The Overseas Department is now being called upon to provide for about 125,000 gross tons of munitions, war material, and supplies per month, or approximately one and a half million tons per annum and the tonnage is still growing.

As the Premier pointed out, there is now at the disposal, as I understand it, of this Mr. Harris, on behalf of the Canadian Government, forty transports which have been commandeered by the British Government, and which have been placed at the disposal of the Canadian Government for the transportation of Canadian munitions to England. Twenty of these transports sail from St. John and twenty from Halifax, and the Prime Minister says they will be able to transport one and one-half million tons of munitions in a year. Now, one and one-half million tons is equivalent, if I figure it correctly, to about fifty million bushels of wheat. Of course, we are glad to know that the Government have been able to make such a satisfactory arrangement for the transport of munitions made in Canada. But the question naturally arises: if they were able to do so well for munitions, why were they unable to do approximately as well for wheat? Why should it be that it is possible to get munitions taken across the ocean at a fair rate and with fair convenience and not possible to get wheat taken over under the same conditions? That is a matter that was brought to the attention of the Government, as I have said, by their own newspapers last fall, and so far the response has been of the character indicated by this statement from the Prime Minister:

> We have continually been in communication with the Admiralty, both during my visit in the past summer and by correspondence as well, in regard to the necessity of releasing as far as possible tonnage for the North Atlantic service; and we did secure, by the efforts I made during the past summer, and by the correspondence which has taken place from time to time, the release of several ships for that service.

My understanding of this is that the British Admiralty had commandeered a large proportion of the North Atlantic merchant fleet for the purposes of that Government, and that this Mr. Harris and the Canadian Government were able to secure from the British Government forty transports for the carrying of munitions. But, instead of going on to secure forty more transports for the carriage of wheat, what I understand the Prime Minister to say here is that they were able to induce the British Government to release from the condition of being commandeered certain of these vessels usually employed in the North Atlantic service, so that they could go back to their old employment. That is to say, while vessels commandeered by the British Government were held to carry these munitions, when it came to the carriage of wheat, instead of similar action being taken, the vessels that had been commandeered by the British Government were asked to be released so that they might carry wheat on their own terms; these terms being a thousand per cent over what was a fair rate two or three years ago. Mr. Speaker, I make this statement, I hope, without prejudice. I hope I have interpreted incorrectly the statement of the Prime Minister, but if I have interpreted it correctly—and I do not see in what other way it can be read—then certainly it is for the Government to give to this House and the country very definite information as to why the same consideration was not given to the farmers of Canada who have produced that which is even more necessary than munitions for the carrying on of this war, as has been given to the producers of munitions by this Government, as stated by the Prime Minister.

I may say, I was not one of those who clamoured for the Government to take control of the North Atlantic transport situation last fall. I was satisfied that we should take our difficulties as they came, the difficulties that naturally arose out of war conditions. I did not wish to urge upon the Government action that would be embarrassing in any way. But when I find in the statement of the Prime Minister himself that he took the action on behalf of munitions, that his own supporters asked him to take on behalf of wheat, which action he did not take on behalf of wheat, I certainly would be doing less than my duty if I did not bring to the attention of the House, and as far as possible of the country, what appears to me to be an absolutely unfair discrimination.

Dealing with the Address, I find two paragraphs referring to proposed action. We are promised " a resolution authorizing and requesting the enactment of such legislation as will extend the life of this Parliament

for the period of one year," and also "measures will be submitted for your consideration to further the effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire and in the maintenance of this war waged for liberty and lasting peace."

These two suggestions are of the highest importance and are entitled to the fullest and most careful consideration of this House. When we consider the urgency of the conditions in which our country and the Empire is placed at this time, I must say I am somewhat surprised to find these suggestions in the sequence in which they appear. The proposal to extend the life of Parliament comes first, and the proposal to take measures for the further effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire comes second. It would seem to me that the first duty of Parliament would be to provide, under direction of the Government, for the effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire and then, when that had been done, if it were thought wise and necessary, to bring forward legislation to secure the extension of the life of Parliament. However, the Government has seen fit to put the extension of the life of Parliament first, and co-operation in the defence of the Empire second. I assume that that is the relative position that these two matters occupy in the mind of the Government. I hope I am not unfair in making that suggestion.

Dealing with the proposal to extend the life of Parliament, I am quite aware that in conditions such as we have at this time, the mere fact that it is unusual and unprecedented does not seriously militate against its favourable consideration or against its being given effect to. We must understand that we are in the midst, as my hon. friend, the member for Essex, said of world-shaking conditions, and that we must be prepared to take extraordinary measures from time to time, as the circumstances require. So that merely on that point there is no reason for refusing the suggestion that is placed in the Address. While I put the matter before the House in that form there is another side of the question, however, that strikes me, and I will take the liberty of placing it before the House. There is no doubt that the extension of the term of Parliament and the avoidance of the turmoil of a general election for another year, is something that will naturally appeal to the minds of those who sit in this House; at least it would be very unnatural if it did not do so. We are here; we are clothed with a certain measure of authority, and naturally we cannot look with direct disfavour upon the proposal to continue that authority in us for another twelve months' period, not only without expense to ourselves, but also in some cases with actual profit. And when that can be done in the name of loyalty to and in the defence of the Empire, there is not very much to be said; the proposal is naturally a winner. I am not so sure that the country at large will look on it quite as favourably, but we only hope that it will. After all, I will follow the lead of the hon. member for St. John City, and I will take the liberty of disagreeing with the hon. member for Essex in intimating that the constitution is merely a scrap of paper, to be disregarded whenever Parliament sees fit. The constitution, it seems to me, should not be lightly amended; should not be amended without good reason. No doubt when the Government comes forward with their measure for extending the life of Parliament, they will be able to show good reasons. They certainly can scarcely contemplate following the idea of the hon. member for Essex, whom they have chosen as their champion, and treat the constitution of the country simply as a scrap of paper. They will, no doubt, have good reasons, and we shall be prepared to consider them when they are brought forward. The vastly more important question is in the words of the address:

> The question of the effective co-operation of Canada in the defence of the Empire and in the maintenance of this war, waged for liberty and lasting peace.

I am sure that we can support both the idea and the words in which the idea is expressed. But there may be difference of opinion as to what are the best measures, or as to what is the best method of carrying out those measures. As it appears to me, the members of this House, gathered from all parts of this Dominion, met here in Parliament at this time for the express purpose of giving their best advice and knowledge as to these measures, would be doing far less than their duty if they did not point out wherein—if such be the case—measures taken in the past have not been as effective as they should have been, in the hope that measures taken in the future will be more thoroughly effective.

The first consideration in connection with the carrying on of the war is naturally the question of finance, the question of money.

Without money munitions cannot be purchased, food cannot be supplied, men cannot be paid, transportation cannot be secured. Therefore, if we are effectively to take part in the prosecution of this war, it is necessary that our expenditure of money shall be economical as well as effective. We have not a dollar to waste in connection with this war. We need every dollar we have, and we shall need every dollar we can raise in order to carry on our share in the war to a successful conclusion. There may have been a time when members of this House, as well as people throughout the country, looked lightly upon the responsibilities of this war. I judge from the utterances of the Prime Minister, as well as from those of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, that that condition of mind does not now exist; that it is thoroughly understood in this House and out of it that we have to meet a tremendous responsibility and that it will need the best that we have in money, in men, in judgment and in efficiency if we are to come out of this struggle victorious. I am compelled to say, Mr. Speaker, that having regard to what has been placed before the country as the result of parliamentary investigation, as well as of judicial inquiry, we have not had that economy or even honesty in the administration of our funds in connection with this war that we were entitled to, that we ought to have had, and that, speaking of the future, we must have or we cannot expect to succeed. When the last session closed—I think it was on the day on which the session closed, or the day before—the Prime Minister made a statement bearing on the transactions that had been made public before the Public Accounts and other Committees of the House, and he reached the conclusion, as set down in Hansard, that as the results of these transactions, the country had lost a matter of $12,000. That was an insignificant loss, and if I could agree with him that that was the limit of the loss it would not be desirable or necessary to take the time of Parliament to refer to it. But, having gone into the matter somewhat carefully, it seems to me that the utterance of the Prime Minister was so far wide of the mark that it was unfair to the country, and it is not right that that utterance should go unchallenged.

Let me put the case as shortly as I can and in words that, I hope, will be understood. When war broke out the Government of Canada borrowed from the Government of Britain—they did not borrow it on the money market, but borrowed it from the Government of Great Britain—a sum of $50,000,000 for the purpose of equipping an expedition of 33,000 men. This money, you will remember, was not an ordinary loan, it was an extraordinary loan for an extraordinary purpose. It was, in fact, a loan in trust for one purpose and one purpose only. The investigations of the Committee on Public Accounts and other investigating committees which have already been published in blue-book form, convey the information, as I read them, that of all the purchases made out of that $50,000,000 for the equipment of that expeditionary force of 33,000 men, in no case was the article bought direct by the Government from the manufacturers or from the wholesale dealers, and in every case the price paid was from 25 per cent to 100 per cent higher than the fair wholesale or manufacturer's price. Of the sum of $50,000,000, at least one-half or $25,000,000 must have been used for the purchase of munitions and supplies; and if we can place the average overcharge at not more than 25 per cent, we find that the people of this country paid $6,000,000 out of that $50,000,000 of trust funds in undue profits distributed amongst the political friends of the Government in power; that Government on whose behalf the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wilcox) demands, with all the eloquence of which he is capable, that they be not criticised for their conduct of affairs since war began, on pain of the accusation of disloyalty against whoever ventures such criticism. I hope, that what occurred in those early days of 1914 has not occurred since, that it is not occurring now, that it will not occur in the future, because I say that this country of Canada, with the backing of the credit of Great Britain, cannot successfully prosecute its part in this war to a conclusion and stand such an enormous strain of improper expenditure which, after all, are the moneys of the people, upon which they must pay interest and principal to the last cent.

There is a matter that is even more directly important than that of money, and that is men. We are proposing to put in the field 500,000 men. It is not a man too many. Every man is needed, and he is needed now. We have already enlisted something less than one-half that number. The country has responded marvellously, when we consider the pacificist principles under which many of us were reared. It is marvellous

that our people have responded as they have to the call to war. But when we have taken one-quarter of a million of our men we have cut fairly deep, and to get another quarter of a million we will have to cut to the bone. I assume from what has been said here that there is no intention on the part of the Government to introduce the principle of conscription. I am not going to discuss that point seriously. I do not intend to find fault with the Government on that ground, because I realize that in the situation in which Canada is there would no doubt be serious difficulties in introducing that principle. But I hope I may be permitted to express my own individual opinion as to the matter of national military service, and I wish to say that in my humble opinion, with the world in arms and with the world having adopted the principle of universal military service, for a single nation to refuse to adopt, or to fail to adopt that principle, is to leave itself at a very serious disadvantage. My own opinion is that when world conditions are as they are —and we have the evidence that it does require the last man and the last dollar— it is the part of wisdom to make preparation for that condition in good time. And while I do not suggest at the moment that it would be advisable for the Government of the day to undertake that policy, for it is a dangerous business to swap horses while crossing a stream, this condition must be kept in mind. We entered this war on the voluntary principle, and, as I see it at present, we had better see it through on the voluntary system. But my opinion is that if we are successful in seeing it through we then ought to adopt the principle of national military service.

My own opinions and views are not, however, the important question at the present time. The important point is that we have undertaken to find half a million men for active service in this war, and that as I said, we will have to cut to the bone in order to get them. There have been complaints about difficulties in recruiting. There certainly have been difficulties in securing that measure of enlistment in certain parts of the country that is absolutely necessary. I have seen in the newspapers arguments, speeches, editorials, in which those who did not enlist were held up to abuse and discredit. Recruiting meetings have been held, and recruiting compaigns carried on in various parts of the country. It is not for me to criticise what has been done by other people. I will just say this: that that part of the country from which I come is I believe conceded to have given the largest number of enlistments in proportion to the population, of the Dominion, and in that part of the country, so far as I am aware, there has never yet been a recruiting meeting held; there has never been any abuse of men who do not enlist; there has been none of those extraordinary efforts which I see are being put forth in other parts of the country. May I say this: at such a time as this when men are being asked to engage in a war such as the world never saw before, it is necessary that they should feel and realize the tremendous issues that are at stake, and their personal responsibility in regard to these issues. We have had a very gratifying response I say, to the demand for enlistment in our part of the country. That, I believe, is because those who have gone west, who have separated themselves from their families at home are, first of all, away from family ties; next they are men who have a sense of individual responsibility, otherwise they would not have struck out for themselves. The pioneer, necessarily, has a greater sense of individual responsibility than the man who is not a pioneer; and because of that fact, because of that sentiment, we have been able to get the response that has been made in our part of the country. What I think is necessary throughout the country—if I may be pardoned for saying so— is to impress upon the minds of the young men that sense of personal responsibility, to impress them with the tremendous character of the issues, and to secure their appreciation of the fact that it is upon the shoulders of the young men that the burden of war must necessarily rest.

Besides that, there are material considerations which affect the case. When you say to a young man who has no ties, and is free to go as a soldier, "it is your duty to enlist," he may say "I am willing to go, but first of all I sacrifice my present employment or expectations and next, if anything happens to me and I survive, to what extent will this country show its gratitude to me for the sacrifices I have made."

I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by certain people in Toronto, Frank Darling, chairman; Hume Blake, C.A. Bogert, Ven. Archdeacon Cody, Pres. R. A. Falconer, U. of T.; J. J. Gibbons, Col. Gooderham, W P. Gundy, Col. W. C Macdonald, Most Rev. N. McNeil, Alexander McPhedran, M.D., Hon. Mr. Justice Masten and E. R.

Wood. This document is issued for the purpose of arousing public interest in the matter of securing adequate provision for disabled soldiers. The title is: "A plea for just provisions in the Pension Act for totally or partially disabled Canadian soldiers, more especially those in the lower ranks." I shall not weary the House by going into details more than to point out that here is a committee of most responsible men in the chief city of the province of Ontario who feel so strongly on this subject that they have issued this pamphlet at their own expense calling for the assistance of members of the House of Commons or of anybody else who may have influence in securing more adequate consideration for the soldiers who have gone to the front and have been disabled. They say:

> The scale of pensions as now fixed by the Government is too low for the rank and file, particularly in regard to those totally incapacitated from earning a living. . . . The case of the single man is much less satisfactory than that of the married man.

Then they go into details with which I will not trouble the House. But there is one feature to which they draw attention, and to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. They say:

> Another plan, which some have had in mind, is that the inadequate pension now contributed by the Government should be augmented by means of public subscriptions. Such action, however, would be a mistake in every way. It would be an admission that the Government of Canada is unwilling properly to maintain the wounded and disabled soldiers who have made the utmost sacrifices to serve and defend the Empire. It would, besides, place upon a portion of the community a burden which should be borne by the whole. There would arise, moreover, a tendency to regard it as a charity, whereas the payment of a pension honourably earned is a matter of public justice. It is therefore, necessary to state with emphasis, that the duty of supporting the disabled men should, and must, be undertaken solely by the Government, and that whatever is necessary for this purpose must be paid out of the revenues of the country.
>
> We should at once face the fact, that while the burden will be cheerfully undertaken by a grateful country it will not be a light one. It could not be left to the chances of public appeals from time to time on behalf of men who have established a permanent right to public support. For twenty, thirty, forty, and in some cases, even for fifty years, this support must be given, and it must be drawn from a source absolutely stable and secure. We owe our defenders no less than this. We must save them from both the humiliation and the uncertainty of public charity, and give them permanent and adequate security from want, paid them not as a favour, but as a right, for it would be an unpardonable insult to a body of brave men if the payment of a pension carried with it the faintest trace of charity or the least suspicion of patronage.

Now, Sir, I regret that the Government should have issued a scale of pensions for disabled soldiers that calls for such comment as is here made by the Toronto Committee. I endorse every word that I have read, and I wish to point out that, if we are to deal fairly with our young men, before we call them slackers or shirkers, we should convince them that we are prepared to do what is right and fair by them in case they suffer the terrible sacrifices that must necessarily come to many of them under the conditions of modern war. We have a duty to perform here as well as they have there. Ours is just as important as theirs.

There is at the present time the matter of dealing with the disabled men as they come from the front. I am prepared to question the Government's policy in regard to that. They have seen fit to call together representatives of the different provincial governments and to make some sort of an arrangement that certainly does not appeal to me, evidencing as it does a disinclination to take that responsibility on the shoulders of the National Government that should be taken in the case of national service. There seems to be an attempt to shoulder the responsibility off on to the provinces, on to the municipalities, on to somebody or something else than this Federal Government. Canada is a nation. These men have served and sacrificed for the nation as well as for the Empire and the Government of this nation has no right, and should under no circumstances attempt, to shoulder off any part of their responsibility to these men. It is not fair and it is not in the interest of securing that enormously greater enlistment that we must get if the proposals of the Government are really made in seriousness.

I have one or two cases that I will mention that have appealed to me very strongly. A private of the Tenth Battalion named Fox, it was reported to me, had arrived at Stettler. He had lost an arm. He had been given transportation from Quebec to Stettler. He was discharged at Quebec, and at the time I was informed in regard to him he was not in receipt of any pension, and he was an object of charity to the people of the town of Stettler. Another man named St. Pierre who had volunteered from the town of Vermilion, or some town east of Edmonton, was given his ticket from Quebec and $7. He had a brother resident at Vermilion, or at the town to which I have referred. He was

able to reach his brother, and at the time I heard of him that was all the consideration he had received at the hands of the Government. I saw a boy, not more than twenty years of age, a great big fine-looking fellow, who was blinded. He was at Lloydminster. He told me that he had begun to study the Braille system for the blind in the old country and that he had been given $100 and shipped home to his father. That was his position when I saw him. Probably these things are being remedied now—I hope they are—but there are such cases to be found all over this country. This is a condition that is inexcusable, that is not to the credit of the Government, and that must militate seriously against recruiting for the contingents that are required.

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

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

Thursday, January 20, 1916.

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

WRECK OF THE PILOT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: I would ask the attention of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a telegram which I received last night. The matter will be more interesting to the Postmaster General perhaps, as he was a party to changing the ships that cross the St. Lawrence between Riviére du Loup and Tadousac. The Telegram is as follows:

Rivière du Loup, Jan. 19, 1916.

C. A. Gauvreau, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

The pilot grounded on Red Island last night and the Mahone has gone to her rescue.

Dr. Parrot.

I should like to know if the Postmaster General has any information on this subject, and especially whether the Mahone has been successful in her mission.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): Up to the time I left my office to-day my attention had not been called to any news having been received in the Department on this subject, but I have just had placed in my hands a despatch from Mr. Thom, one of the members of the Quebec Ferry Company, the owners of the Pilot, as follows:

Quebec, 20th January, 1916.

Hon. T. Chase Casgrain,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Pilot wrecked Tuesday, Red Island. Very important immediate action. See telegram to Mr. Johnson, Deputy Marine, for particulars. Please hurry them. Passengers and crew in danger. Forced to hire Mahone as they did nothing and she was dismantled.

John S. Thom.

Immediate action will be taken, of course, to afford every aid that is possible.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I hope the Postmaster General will give us the facts later, especially as to whether there has been any loss of life.

SUPPLY OF MUNITIONS FROM CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): I desire to ask a question of the Prime Minister. Among the press despatches in yesterday's Canadian newspapers there appeared the following:

New York, January 19.—A cable to the New York Sun from London under yesterday's date says that in reply to a question in the House of Commons this afternoon, Lloyd George, Minister of Munitions, said that American munitions were still coming to England. He added that the fact that American munitions were still coming to us is a triumph for the Morgans and not for Canada.

In view of the very meagre nature of the despatch, and because it seems to carry with it some reflection upon Canada, I would ask my right hon. friend if he is in a position to amplify it, or to give the House any information in regard to it.?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I have not seen the despatch and do not know anything about it. I should greatly doubt the accuracy of the report. It is not in consonance with what Mr. Lloyd George said to me during my visit last summer.

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Year Ended 31st March, 1915.—Hon. Martin Burrell.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, January 19.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I observe in Hansard that at your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) retracted an expression he had used. It was suggested by you that I make a similar retraction and I take pleasure in doing so.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): When the House adjourned last evening I was discussing the measures mentioned in the speech from the Throne to be brought forward by the Government in relation to the prosecution of the war. I presume, of course, that these measures will have reference to the increase of Canada's war contributions to half a million men. I desire to place before the House to the best of my ability the views I hold in regard to the best means to be followed to assure that increase of our overseas forces. I am bound to take for granted, and the House is bound to take for granted, that when the Prime Minister made the announcement that Canada's overseas forces would be increased to half a million men, and made that announcement only twelve days before the opening of Parliament, he did so because of the recognized urgency of the proposed action. We must all recognize the propriety of the increase of Canada's overseas forces, and the immediate and urgent need of that increase. These things also we must recognize: that if increase is to be effective, it must be made for the coming summer, and that the rate of enlistment and of preparation must be greatly accelerated throughout this Dominion or that expectation cannot be realized.

I hope that the conditions of last winter will not be repeated. At the beginning of last winter in Canada, and I am afraid throughout the allied countries, the impression was that we were winning, and the winter passed without adequate preparation for the spring campaign. On the other hand, the alliance of the central powers spent the winter in active organization and preparation, so that when they took the field in the spring the condition was absolutely changed. In the fall there was a disrupted and defeated Austria; in the spring, there was a thoroughly reorganized and effective Austria, and the combatant forces of the central powers had been increased to that extent. With the beginning of the present winter direct communication has been established between the Germanic and the Turkish allies, and we may be very sure that, as last winter was spent in reorganizing Austria, so this winter will be spent in reorganizing Turkey; and we must expect that with the spring the allied powers will have to face an enormously augmented and comparatively efficient array. It is in the last degree necessary that we and our allies should meet that contingency, which we are certainly assured of, by adequate preparation, in the increase in the numbers of our men, in the supply of their munitions, and in the efficiency of their arms. When we recall the speeches made by the Minister of Munitions in Britain, Lloyd George; when we recall the urgent utterances of Lord Kitchener, Minister of War, and, above all, when we refer to the apeal of the King himself to his subjects throughout the Dominions, we must realize that this is a case of the utmost urgency, and that if Canada's aid is to be effective it must be promptly rendered. I am bound to assume, therefore, that it is not the intention of the Government to continue warlike preparations at the rate that has been followed during the past months. As I said yesterday, if we are to have this increase in our forces, we must go deep into the body of our people; we must arouse their souls as they have not yet been aroused. The campaign that has been made in the past will, in some way or other, have to be increased in effectiveness, or the promise made by the Prime Minister of Canada, without the responsibility of Parliament, will not be implemented at the time when it must be to be effective. So, Mr. Speaker, as it appears to me, it is desirable, in the discharge of the duty that every member of this House owes to his country and to the Empire, that we should freely and fully state the conditions that seem to tend against a more rapid enlistment, and, at the same time, speak on behalf of conditions that would tend towards that more rapid enlistment.

In order that my own position may be clear, I may say that I took occasion yesterday to speak of the proportion of enlistment in the province from which I come. May I be permitted to go further, and to say that, so far as my information goes, the constituency that I have the honour to represent has sent into the overseas forces of Canada a larger number, and a larger

number in proportion to its population, than any other in the Dominion. I spoke yesterday of some of the reasons for this being the case so far as our new settlers were concerned, and, for fear that I be misunderstood, may I also make mention of the fact that whatever may be the case in other parts of the Dominion, in that constituency and vicinity the native-born population have not been behind any other section of the community in their response to the call for service. Twenty and twenty-five years ago there was only a small resident population in Edmonton and vicinity, and, as is natural in the development of a new country, there have been many changes in that resident population. That part of the resident population, therefore, that was there twenty and twenty-five years ago is necessarily very limited, and of that small population I recall that six families have sent three sons each, that fifteen families have sent two sons each, and that of the handful of native-born people who are there, at least one hundred have up to date given their services to the Empire overseas. So that, Mr. Speaker, the House will understand that any remarks I make are not made because there has been any lack of response to the call up to the present time in that part of the country from which I come. But that response has been of such a character that perhaps I may claim to realize more thoroughly than some other members how deep the cutting will have to be in our remaining population in order to meet the demand for another quarter of a million men.

I was speaking yesterday of the hindrances, as I understood them, to recruiting that arose because of the inadequate pension list that was provided in the case of maimed or disabled soldiers. I brought to the attention of the House the opinion of a committee of very responsible men in the city of Toronto. There could be nothing more clear or distinct than their expression of opinion—an opinion that must be coincided in by every man who gives the matter fair attention. While we may use patriotic language and flamboyant expressions, we must recognize that if we call on the young man to give his prospects, his limb, possibly his life, to the cause of the country, it is only right and fair that the country should acknowledge its share of the obligation and deal with that man liberally, fairly and ungrudgingly. I spoke of cases where maimed men had been discharged at Quebec, cut off the pay-list, not put on the pension-list, given a discharge, a railway ticket and a few dollars to take them home, and made a charge on their friends and relatives for the time being. I hope that that condition has been remedied. It was not fair to allow that condition to exist and to have the slur thrown upon the young men of our country that they are not doing their duty, when this Parliament or this Government has not done its duty by them. Let us have fair play on both sides.

In this connection let me say that I saw in the newspapers a short time ago something that was very discouraging to me. It is a fact that in a war waged as this present war is being waged, by new means and new methods such as never were used before, there have come into existence new conditions of disablement; and among those conditions is what is called shock, physical or mental shock, resulting in a greater or less degree of insanity. It must be assumed that if a thoroughly robust man, as these men are thoroughly robust before they enter the service, has, by reason of temperament or special conditions suffered from mental or physical shock so that his mind is to some extent deranged, there ought surely to be every reason that under proper treatment, with fair consideration he will in time make a complete recovery. I was astonished to read in a newspaper just the other day that it was contemplated that these men should be consigned to lunatic asylums. I hope that the Government will realize their responsibility in this, and will see that other arrangements are made than to simply treat these men as ordinary lunatics. They should not be placed in a position that, in the first place, is degrading and not warranted, and in the next place, would in all probability prevent the ultimate recovery that under fair circumstances, may reasonably be expected.

There is no doubt that whatever pension list may be provided, in the case of helpless men who have no relatives—and we are appealing for his services to the young man who has no relatives—the country should assume the responsibility of absolutely caring for those men in institutions properly equipped and properly conducted. We knew nearly eighteen months ago that we were at war. It is more than a year since our men began to be maimed and killed. We have had a session of this Parliament since that time, and although at the last session of Parliament, at the suggestion of the Govern-

ment, we voted many many millions for public works in this country, so far as I am aware there was not one dollar voted for the establishment of institutions of the character I have mentioned, and which it is certain are a first necessity to meet the conditions that must arise out of war, and in some measure discharge the obligations of this country to these men who render such public service at such awful cost. The erection of such institutions would show to our young men, to whom we look for military defence, that the country recognizes sacrifice made and is prepared to deal with them honourably and generously in consideration of their sacrifice, doing the best that can be done—and even that best is but a poor return—for the sacrifice they have been called upon to make.

There is another branch of this subject with which I propose to deal, and in relation to which I may find myself not in accord with a majority of the members of the House. But I am here, on my conscience, to deal as best I can with the conditions that surround us, and I propose to deal with that question as well. There is something that is dearer to a man than his own life or limb, dearer to him than his country, and that is his wife and children. If we were able to secure our military requirements from amongst those of our people who have not either wife, or children, or other dependents, that would be well. We have not been able to do that in the past, and much less will we be able to do it in the future. We have had to accept the services of married men in very large proportion in order to secure the requisite number of enlistments. If we are going to call for another quarter of a million men we must certainly depend more and more greatly on those who have the ties of wife or child. If we are asking a man who has dependents to give his services, his limb, or his life, for his country, then his country, in fairness and in common sense, is called upon to make reasonably adequate provision for those dependents. That the country has not done up to the present time. A scale of separation allowance and assigned pay has been made out, which, from the day it was made out, was admitted to be inadequate for the purpose that was intended to be met. It never was considered to be adequate to the proper support of the dependents of the soldiers who had enlisted. From the beginning it was intended that this sum supplied by the country should be supplemented by what is called the Patriotic Fund, that is to say, sums of money raised by public subscription. I am quite aware that the demands of the Patriotic Fund have been generously, even enthusiastically met. All credit to those who have contributed to that fund. That is not the point. It is not the individual citizen who owes the soldier the maintenance of his dependents, but the country, and the country should discharge that debt. It should not be left to the individual citizen, his benevolence, his generosity, his patriotism, or whatever other word you may see fit to use.

I am quite aware that no matter what amount of separation allowance had been fixed, there would always arise incidents in which there would be room for the exercise of benevolence and patriotism in assisting dependents of the soldiers who might be specially unfortunate. In cases of sickness, in cases of fire, in cases of many accidents, there would always be a call for the benevolent and patriotic to go to the assistance of dependents of the soldiers. There is, therefore, good reason why there should be a patriotic fund, but there is no good reason why the patriotic fund should have had from the very beginning to bear a definite portion of that burden which properly rests on the shoulders of the country. It is not creditable to this country that we should take that position. I have heard the hon. gentleman who is the president of the patriotic fund give reasons for that fund, stating that the scale of living was different in different provinces, and that the patriotic fund, under non-Governmental administration, permitted an elasticity that was to the benefit of all concerned. I do not agree at all that it is necessary to take the matter out of the hands of the Government in order that the allowances for dependents may be fitted to the conditions of the province in which they live. It is surely a well-known fact that the cost of living is greater in some provinces than in others. The Government is as well aware of that as any body else, because to-day in the scale of pay allowed by the Government to many of their employees, a difference is made to meet that very condition. Now, what can be done in the case of the employees of the Government can be done just as well in the distribution of maintenance allowances for dependents now undertaken by the patriotic fund.

There is a feature of this case which is difficult to deal with without possibly giving offence. I wish to be understood as not de-

siring to give any offence, but as desiring to get at the very bottom of the motives that govern men when they are offering their services to their country. I say, and it cannot be contradicted, that the man who leaves a wife and family is not as well satisfied to leave that wife and family partially dependent upon the benevolence, the generosity or the patriotism of the individual citizens of the country as he would be to leave them to benefit by a fixed allowance coming directly from the treasury of the country. Perhaps you think that that makes no difference; that if they get the money it makes no difference where it comes from. That is the very point, Mr. Speaker; they are not getting the money. The allowances that were fixed when the first contingent was enlisted, the allowances from the patriotic fund, and the method of distribution that was adopted when the first contingent was enlisted having, for good reason or bad, I know not, been changed, so that the man who enlisted and was told that his dependents would get a certain separation allowance from the Patriotic Fund, finds to-day that they are not getting that amount, and that they are not getting it on the same conditions which obtained in the first place. I can only call that a breach of faith with the soldier, who, when he gave his services and signed the book, had no string attached to his service. His service had to be to death if he were called upon, and I say that the needs of his dependents should be met according to the terms arranged at the beginning, and that there should be no withdrawal for any reason whatever. This country has the money to pay for munitions and arms, and surely it has the money to pay for the support of the dependents of the men who use these arms and munitions. If it has not the money, or if it has not the generosity to employ the money in that way, then we in this Parliament of Canada are not the men who should call in question the loyalty of our citizens because they do not volunteer in larger numbers.

I am suggesting, and suggesting very strongly to this House and to the Government, without desiring to make charges of any kind against the Government, or to hold them responsible particularly for what has taken place—I am pointing out to them the desirability of revising, and revising at once, the conditions in regard to allowances for the disablement of soldiers, the conditions in regard to soldiers when they have returned from the front, and the conditions and allowances in regard to the support of the dependents of those soldiers. When they are calling for another quarter of a million of men, my suggestion to them is that the first thing they should do is to establish beyond any question the attitude of the people of this country at large as represented by the Government and by Parliament; to establish their appreciation of, and gratitude to the men they are calling upon to serve. It is not fair, Mr. Speaker, that such a large proportion of the support of dependents should rest upon benevolence. because it comes to this, that the benevolent or patriotic citizens carry the burden, and those who are not benevolent and who are less patriotic do not carry the burden. That is not fair, and that should be adjusted so that whether they will, or whether they will not, the population of Canada generally will bear their share of that burden according to their means under our system of taxation.

I have here a most illuminating document on that point. It is bulletin issued by the Canadian Patriotic Fund on October 15, and it gives a list of places in the province of Ontario that have contributed to the fund. It gives the name, the population, the amount of the contribution, and the amount per head. I think nothing could make it more clear that the support of the Patriotic Fund does not rest equally upon the shoulders of our people, as it should. Collingwood contributed $1.12 per head; Barrie contributed 28 cents per head; Oshawa contributed $2.63 per head, while Walkerville contributed $11.18 per head. Not to weary the House, I need only say that the variation in these contributions per head at the different points establishes beyond question the point that I make, that this is a levy absolutely unfair by which the unwilling gain, and the willing pay the cost. When we are increasing our enlistment of men so enormously as we are proposing to do, in the first place, we must change the conditions in regard to the Patriotic Fund or we will not get the enlistment and, in the second place, I am afraid that those who have been bearing the burden so far will become weary in well doing, and that the Patriotic Fund will actually fail of its purpose when it is called upon to meet the enormous charge that it must necessarily be called upon to meet if this enlistment is successful.

There is another feature of the case that I think should be drawn to attention, and

it is that while nominally these contributions are contributions of patriotism and good will, in a very large proportion of cases they are forced contributions. In a number of cases, the city or the county levies a tax upon the people in order to raise the whole or a portion of the money that is expected from that town or county. That is fair as far as it goes, but if it is fair for the county or the city to levy a general tax for its contribution to the Patriotic Fund, why is it not just as fair and just as right for the Parliament or the Government of Canada to levy the necessary amount by the ordinary process of taxation? There is another way in which money is raised and it is this: An employer of labour will call his men together and will say: We are called upon to make a contribution to the Patriotic Fund. The men are expected to contribute so much out of their pay. Of course, they do not have to contribute, but they can lose their positions if they do not contribute; and I am under the impression that if this contribution from the town of Walkerville were looked into carefully it would be found to be identically, or in a large measure, of that class. Certainly there are many other cases in which this is the fact. It is not, as it is represented to be, a free contribution, the evidence of patriotism or benevolence; it is in large measure, a forced contribution and certainly it should not be levied in that way.

There is something besides the maintenance of the soldier himself or the maintenance of his dependents. There is the question of the efficiency of the soldier and of his weapons. We may enlist 500,000 men before the spring, but unless these men are adequately armed and unless they are trained in the use of the arms put into their hands, their assistance in the struggle during the coming summer will be of little value. This is a matter of the highest and greatest importance. It may be that what I desire to say will be resented and it will be said that I am giving information to the enemy. At this period of time and in this condition of affairs, it is important that we should know what our position is. That we should see that optimism is replaced by efficiency and if there is no other way to arrive at it then inefficiency must be exposed. We have 50,000 men on the battlefield in France and Flanders, we have 60,000 men training in England, I believe, to take their places on the battlefield, and we have 120,000 men in Canada also preparing to take their places on the battlefield. Unless these men are armed and equipped and trained in the use of their equipment and weapons they are not of value in deciding the conflict that is now in progress. It was not long after the first great battle had been fought that it became known to Canada that their men went into that battle inefficiently and insufficiently equipped as compared with their opponents. We lost an enormous number of men in the early battles in Flanders and we lost these men in large measure because they had not an adequate equipment of machine guns. The battle of Langemarck took place in April. I read in October the statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in the city of St. John, in which he said that machine guns which had been ordered at the beginning of the war were then being delivered, and I read shortly afterwards a statement by the hon. Minister of Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) in which he said that they were about to be delivered. Have these machine guns been delivered yet? Are our 50,000 men in the trenches in Flanders properly equipped with machine guns, are our 60,000 men in Britain because they have not got machine guns to enable them to take their places in Flanders? Why is it that we have 120,000 men in Canada instead of over in Britain or Flanders?

I spoke a little while ago of the difficulties of recruiting. Let me say that when you appeal to the young man and you tell him that the fate of the Empire, in a measure, rests upon his shoulders, and you urge him to leave his employment, to enlist, to train for service, and when he sees a hundred thousand of his fellow-citizens who have left their employment, who have cut themselves off from their ordinary avocations, who are under arms, who are under orders, but who are not, as a matter of fact, doing anything for the effective decision of the contest, he will say: I will go when you need me, and you do not need me as long as you do not need these men whom you already have under arms. There is no question about the conditions being as I have said; we have it on the statement of the Prime Minister that that is the condition. And I say that such a condition does not tend to inspire our young men with the idea of the urgent need that exists for their services and their sacrifices, and that when we call for these men to leave their avocations, to give up their prospects, to risk life and limb in our service, it is surely necessary that they should understand that they are wanted and wanted immediately. Just let me mention an occurrence in my

own constituency. Some time in the month of August last, if I remember aright, authority was issued for the raising of two battalions at Edmonton. Recruiting officers were sent to Peace river, and on the Grand prairie of Peace river, while the harvest was ripening, young men, homesteaders there, obeying what they believed to be the urgent call of their country, left their harvest in the field, arranged with their neighbours as best they could to take it off, and came down to Edmonton and joined the 66th Battalion. That battalion is in Edmonton yet. What occurred in the case of these men has occurred in the case of hundreds of others. It is evident, on the face of it, that when representations were made to these men, if such representations were made, and I take it that they must have been made, that they were urgently and immediately wanted, because that was the reason why they left their harvests in the field, there was no reason why these men should have been called away at that particular time, why they should not have finished their harvesting, arranged their business, and left when the business of the season had been concluded. Now, we have the spectacle of these men, who have left their belongings, doing military drill in the city of Edmonton, putting in barrack life under conditions which are necessarily irksome to men who have been taking the part of pioneers, and we cannot consider that such a method of handling the recruiting of our regiments tends to the enthusiasm necessary to secure success. There surely should be more judgment exercised in the enlistment of men to make sure that they are not called from their proper avocations unless and until they are needed, and when they are needed, then they certainly should be made use of.

I am going to make a statement now that appears to me to be a very serious one. I have spoken of the need of machine guns, but it must be admitted after all that in the wars of the present day the rifle is the weapon that finally wins. The ability to use the rifle effectively is the first necessity of the infantry soldier, and is the decisive factor in any war. This summer there were 8,000 men in camp at Calgary for brigade manœuvres and target practice. I am credibly informed that for the use of those 8,000 men at target practice there was a matter of sixty service rifles, and that those men did not get target practice to any extent that would reasonably tend to their efficiency in rifle shooting; that those men were armed with rifles which have not been considered suitable for active service, but which are used merely for drilling purposes, and that, as a matter of fact, those men had not at that time, and so far as I know, they have not yet been provided with rifles suitable for active service and for target practice. There are three regiments in barracks at Edmonton to-day, and there is a rifle range at Edmonton within the limits of the corporation. I discussed with the Minister of Militia last session the use of that rifle range. There is no good reason why it should not be used; but it has not been used, and although three regiments have been there since the beginning of the winter, they have not fired a shot for the improvement of their rifle practice. Is that fair to the country? Is it fair to the soldiers that when the call does come, they are sent across the ocean and into the trenches without having had that opportunity to improve themselves in that part of their military service which is of the greatest necessity, not only to protect their own lives, but to destroy those of the enemy, which after all is the purpose of war.

4 p.m.

I have heard it said that we are getting men as fast as we can equip them. If that is the case, if we have not the rifles with which to arm those men, surely we ought to be busy making them or getting them made somewhere and somehow. We have had a rifle factory in Canada for many years. I do not know whether that is the only factory that is turning out rifles now or not. I do not know what the conditions in that respect are, but I do know this: that when we enlist a man for overseas service we should be prepared to put on his back a uniform, to put in his hands an effective rifle, and we should not lose a minute or an opportunity, from the day he enlists until the day he goes into the trenches, to render him proficient in the use of that rifle as well as in drill and in all military requirements. But we are not doing that, and I cannot consider it anything less than a crime against our soldiers, against our country and against our Empire, that the present condition exists.

If I am mistaken in what I have said, we are here in Parliament, and it is for those who know better to put me right and to put the country right. I shall be glad to know that what I have stated is not correct. But, Mr. Speaker, it is correct,

and I very much regret that it is so. We have to-day, as I have said, three battalions at Edmonton. It is surely a part of the business of these men, not only to become expert in the use of the rifle, but also certain sections should be expert in the use of the machine gun. But, up to the time I left Edmonton, there was only one machine gun upon which these men could drill in the use of that weapon. The 51st Regiment had a Colt machine gun, but the other two regiments, I am credibly informed, were drilling their machine gun squads with dummies—as effective, somebody has suggested, as if they were working a mouse-trap without bait. These are conditions that are terrible, and they should be remedied and remedied now. It is necessary that they should be remedied now if we are to meet the demand that is being made upon the Dominion of Canada for this largely increased force of men. We have now three battalions in barracks in Edmonton, and we are enlisting two more. I fancy that the enlistment will be made. When I left, the 138th Battalion was up to over six hundred strong, and the 151st Battalion was recruiting rapidly.

There is one thing I wish to say with regard to the system of recruiting that is being followed in many parts of the country this year, as I have seen it stated in the newspapers. A town is told that if they will recruit twenty-five or more men, the men will be billetted in the town during the winter, and the town will get the benefit of their expenditure during the time they are so billetted. This may appeal to those who are military men. I am not a military man, I never was, and it certainly does not appeal to me as being the means of building up as rapidly as the urgency of the case demands—and there never was so urgent a case in the history of the world—an effective army to do credit to Canada and to defend the Empire during the coming summer. How much further ahead will these twenty-five men be in military efficiency after having been billetted at Government expense for six months of the present winter? Will they have gained anything in military experience, anything that will be of advantage to them when spring comes? I should hesitate to characterize such a proposition in the terms in which it appeals to me. It does not appeal to me as being a serious attempt to actually increase the numbers and efficiency of our overseas forces within a reasonable time. If it is a matter of getting so many more names on the rolls; no doubt it is a good way, but names on the rolls are not good enough at this time and under present circumstances; nothing is good enough except a man whose heart is in his work, who is prepared to make the supreme sacrifice, who has a weapon in his hands and knows how to use it, and is where he can use it effectively.

Is it because we have not enough money that we have not armed and equipped our men, or is it because we do not want to arm and equip them? What is the reason? It is past the understanding of man that those who claim such a superabundance of loyalty to the Empire, and express such a strong appreciation of the obligations of our country, should permit, on their responsibility, the existence of such conditions. I believe that if the Government will take hold of this matter of sending men overseas as they should, and as their announcement on New Year's Day was intended to indicate, if they will properly provide for the men in case of disablement, if they will adequately provide for their dependents, if they will supply the men with arms and equipment promptly and efficiently, and if they will use the men when they get them, I believe we can get the men. But I do not believe that we can get them, under the conditions that have prevailed up to the present time, within the time that we need to get them if they are going to be of actual service. We may get them two or three years from now, but two or three years from now is not soon enough. We want them now, or certainly when the campaign opens in the spring. That is when they are needed, and anything short of that is a dereliction of duty on the part of those who are charged with the responsibility of the government of our country at this time.

When war was declared, we were a country at peace. We boasted that we had enjoyed peace for a hundred years. We knew nothing of war; we cared nothing about war, and we did not want to know anything about it. So, when we wanted to raise an expeditionary force we certainly had difficulties in finding experienced officers; and when we raised our second force the condition was much the same. We have been at war for eighteen months; we have been represented on the battlefields by many thousands of our men, and I would think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be the part of wisdom if to-day we made use, in very much larger measure than we are doing, of

the experience that has been gained by those men in the terrible ordeal of war itself. Surely a man who has gone through the crisis of an engagement has learned more of war in ten minutes than he could learn in ten years in ordinary civilian life. Surely the thousands of men that we now have in France and Flanders, rendering noble service to their country and to the Empire, men who answered the very first call of duty, surely these are the men to whom we may very well look to raise the battalions that we are now raising or are going to raise for the conflict of the future. I withdraw no credit from the man who, although he may have been in civilian life, desires to serve his country; who receives a commission, makes enlistment, and by reason of his position is able to secure the adhesion of other men to the cause. I have no fault to find with that man; I give him all credit. But at the same time we must recognize that what is wanted in this war is experience and efficiency, and when we have the men of experience and efficiency we are not doing justice to ourselves if we do not use those men, and use them to the limit. It certainly would be a graceful recognition of patriotism and merit if that were done. I respectfully urge upon the Government that they take this into their consideration, and that in the efforts they are to put forward in the future they take cognizance of the men of experience on the battlefield and use them here for the purpose of enlistment and the training of the new battalions.

I gathered from a statement made by the Prime Minister last session that it was the intention to keep in Canada as many men enlisted for overseas service as were on service across the ocean; that is to say, if we had 30,000 men across the ocean, we were to have 30,000 in Canada. I do not know what led the Prime Minister to that decision, but I want to say, first, that when a man enlists for overseas service he expects to go overseas; in all probability he would not have enlisted if he did not expect to go overseas. If it is a part of the policy of the Government to keep on this side of the water a portion of the men who have enlisted for overseas service they are not meeting the desires and hopes and intentions of the men who have enlisted, and, further, they are discrediting that spirit of sacrifice which was in the hearts of the men when they made their enlistment. It may be that it is considered advisable that there should be kept in Canada, while the Empire is in a state of war, a large proportion of the military force. I agree that it is desirable that while the Empire is at war there should be at all times a military force of considerable size in the Dominion of Canada, but I maintain that that force can be provided adequately and efficiently by the active militia, and that it is not necessary to keep on this side of the water a single man who has enlisted for overseas service. Every man who has enlisted for overeas service should, in due course, be sent overseas, and the active militia of the country should be given a status, both as to conditions and arms, that they have been deprived of since this war began. It has appeared to me that in the opinion of the Department of Militia, or of the Government, the men who formed the active militia were in some way shirking their duty, or preventing the enlistment of other men for overseas service. It is my view that that is an entirely mistaken apprehension; it is absolutely the opposite of the fact. When war broke out we had in Edmonton an infantry battalion and a mounted squadron. Those two bodies of active militia were the basis, first, of an infantry battalion and of a cavalry unit enlisted for overseas service, and, afterwards, of three or four other battalions enlisted for overseas service. We did not have less enlistment for overseas service because of these active militia regiments in Edmonton; we had more, because when the time came for the young man—who had acquired some little military spirit by reason of his association with the active militia—to enlist in another battalion for overseas service, he was ready to go into it, and we got another man in the local battalion. But the Government, instead of recognizing the service that these local battalions render, has taken away from them their arms; has taken away from them any recognition in the way of pay. They are there without uniforms; they are there without recognition of any kind; yet they have sufficient military spirit to meet for such drill as they can carry out without weapons. I say that when the Empire is at war, in the first place it is the duty of Canada to send every man to the theatre of war that it can send; and, in the next place, it is no less its duty to maintain on an active and efficient footing a sufficient body of voluntary militia in the country itself, properly armed, properly equipped, and ready for service in case service should be required. I take it that in a case such

as we are in, every man that can be depended upon for his loyalty and is ready to handle a gun should have a gun to handle, so that whatever may come—and no man can tell what may occur—we shall be prepared as well as we can be for that eventuality. As I see it, our military business is conducted as though we had no interest except what is across the sea. Of course, that is our paramount interest and our most urgent interest, but that interest does not in any degree detract from the necessity of having an active militia force in the Dominion of Canada on a proper war footing, with encouragement to rifle associations or other organizations that will accustom our people to the use of weapons and to the idea of self-defence. I say that our condition should be recognized as a country at war, and that it should be recognized that we need a military force in the country; that that force should be composed of active militia men, who, for the time being, or by reason of circumstances, are not desirous of going overseas, so that, although every man we have who can and will go overseas may be in the fighting line, we will still have a sufficient military force within the country to hold our country against any eventualities that may arise. We never know what may occur. To be unprepared is to invite injury, to be prepared is the best possible defence.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has been for most of his parliamentary career one of the most uncompromising fighters on the floor of this House; at all events, from the time he ceased to be a sturdy, independent pioneer from the West and became a member of the late Government, and extending, I think, to a period as far advanced as the time when the clouds of this war appeared in Europe. Uncompromising though he has been as a party warrior, and forceful though he has been as such, I say, and I say cheerfully, that his speech in the House yesterday and to-day did no discredit to his sense of duty now. It is either a fact or it is not a fact, that the character and tone of parliamentary discussion and of public discussion in general should be modified by the dangers and disasters that enthral us, and hang above us from Europe. I am glad that the hon. gentleman from Edmonton has ranged himself among those members of the Liberal party who agree that these considerations should have an effect, and he has demonstrated this by the character of the speech he has just delivered.

I noted with interest his closing sentence. He stated that to be unprepared was to invite attack, and that to be prepared was itself one-half the battle. May I be forgiven if I express regret that that sentiment did not seem to animate him more forcibly eighteen months ago.

I remember, however, a speech that the hon. member delivered on the 18th of November, 1912, shortly after his return from Europe. He then stood in his place in parliament and, in words of singular force and significance, warned this country and warned the Empire against the day of German aggression. The language he used on that occasion is language of which he need not be ashamed. He pictured the peril under which our country lay as comparable only with the old Napoleonic days when Europe trembled under the rod of a colossus and when Bonaparte was encamped at Boulogne. I think he would have been a prouder man now if he had adhered to the convictions that animated him on that day, and if he had guided his conduct in conformity with those convictions, and had stood behind the preparations he urged on the 18th of November, had stood behind the character of preparations endorsed by both the Government of his own country, and the Government of the Empire.

However that may be, those days are passed and I am prepared to remember now that, behind the errors and the vagaries that we think have characterized his public life, there has always appeared a firm foundation or background of British fidelity, exemplified, confirmed, and emphasized now by the fact, of which we are all proud, that two of his sons stand to-day enrolled as combatants under their country's flag.

I shall not undertake to comment as a member of the Government, on much of what the hon. member has said with regard to the conduct and equipment of the forces of Canada. An answer, in so far as an answer can be given to the specific complaint he makes, having regard to Imperial interests, can be better made by some member of the Administration more closely in touch with our military forces. I am aware that there are regiments in Canada whose men and officers feel that they have been unwarrantably delayed. I have in mind the very regiment mentioned by the hon. member, the 66th of Edmonton, which I had the honour to see myself only a few weeks ago, and which, so far as I could judge, appeared

to be a regiment excellently well prepared. I know that they themselves would like, as many another, to be hurried more rapidly to the scene of conflict. But, we cannot forget that though complaint has been laid against the Canadian authorities in this regard, complaint in vastly greater volume has also been laid against the British authorities for the same thing, and we observe across the water men by the thousand, yes by the million, delayed month after month in England for one reason or another. I think it can be shown in Canada, as there, that the reasons that are behind that delay are good and sufficient, and, under the circumstances, unavoidable.

The hon. gentleman stated that the scale of pensions and the scale of allowances in Canada were inadequate, and he urged upon the Government, not only the enlargement of that scale, dealing more liberally with the dependents of the soldiers who fight our battles, but also that the funds from which that support is given should be afforded by the Canadian Government, and that we should not rely on public subscriptions for that purpose. Now as to the first phase of his complaint, that the scale of pensions and allowances is too small for this country, I have only to observe, as my information is, that the scale is the largest of all the twelve belligerent nations, that it is the most generous of them all. I observe this also, that the scale as fixed was laid on the table of this House some time before the close of last session, so that it was open to the observation and criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the pages of Hansard will be searched in vain for a single question or a single criticism offered then. If hon. gentlemen thought that the scale was too small, that was the time to say so. Of course, if they now feel that it should be enlarged, it is only their duty to point it out; it is a matter that should engage the attention of the Government, and doubtless will, at the request of hon. gentlemen.

I was not present when the hon member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) referred yesterday to certain matters that particularly concern our part of the Dominion. However, I have had an opportunity of reading his remarks, and it may be worth while that I should make a little comment upon them. The hon. gentleman, in the opening part of his speech yesterday, called attention to the high ocean rates, which seem also to have disturbed the soul of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). The hon. member for Edmonton complained that although provision had been made, through the joint action of this Government and the Imperial Government, for the carriage of munitions of war in commandeered vessels to the Motherland, we had not pushed through the matter of procuring from the Imperial authorities the commandeering of vessels for the carriage of our wheat. It would doubtless be a considerable advantage—yes, an advantage amounting to millions of dollars—if by any action on our part, or by any action on the part of the Imperial authorities, we could have succeeded in reducing the rates on Canadian grain, and also on Canadian imports over the North Atlantic. But when the hon. gentleman complains that we should have insisted upon the British Government commandeering vessels under their control for the purpose of carrying grain, so as to be consistent with our design in getting them to commandeer vessels for the carrying of munitions, he fails to observe that there is a very clear distinction between the carriage of Canadian grain and the carriage of British Government munitions. It has been the policy of the Imperial Government, as I understand it—and I think the records throughout this war and previous to this war will confirm what I state—to commandeer British vessels for the carriage of British Government supplies, for the carriage of Government property, and Government property only. They have never commandeered vessels for the carriage of private property. Whether they are right in taking that position, or whether they are wrong, it is, at all events, a matter over which we have no control. But if we are disposed to criticise, I venture to offer these observations to hon. gentlemen opposite, and, indeed, to members on both sides of the House. I do not offer them as having been advanced directly by the Imperial authorities, for I would not be the one to receive them, but as observations that will appear clear to any one who desires to understand the situation. Were the British Government to commandeer their vessels for the carriage of Canadian grain, to be consistent, they would have to commandeer them also for the carriage of all other Canadian commodities—that would be only just to the Canadian people—and they would also be compelled to commandeer them for the carriage of all the commodities of all the dominions of the Empire. They could not deny to one what

they granted to another, and to undertake that would be a very vast undertaking indeed. At all events, so far, it has not appeared to them to be their duty to do so. Furthermore, were they to undertake on behalf of the dominions of the Empire to commandeer vessels of British register, would it be any more than consistent to commandeer them for the carriage of private property belonging to or addressed to the British people. What would apply to one portion of the Empire would apply to all portions. I might go beyond that. Were the British Government constrained to utilize the sea power which has given them control of the waters of the globe and enabled them to protect shipping the world over, and enabled them also to commandeer vesels at their will—were they to utilize that sea power for the benefit of their own commerce, as opposed to the commerce of their Allies, it is not inconceivable that just complaint might arise. I shall proceed no further along that line, but I think I have suggested considerations which every one must think out for himself if he feels in any way constrained to complain of the treatment accorded to Canadian commodities in their passage over the Atlantic. It is of course too obvious to require expression that it is beyond the power of the Government of Canada to exercise a commandeering power over vessels on the North Atlantic.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question. I do not ask it in a partisan sense, but will the hon. member kindly tell us what the right hon. the Prime Minister accomplished along the lines of getting our wheat transported?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will refer to that shortly. I only mention now that the Prime Minister himself explained that two or three days ago, but I have no objection to repeating what he said. What I was saying was this, that no power rested in this Government to exercise a commandeering power. When hon. gentlemen talk—I do not now refer to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)—when hon. gentlemen talk about the high rise in ocean rates, about the robbing of the Canadian people of many millions of dollars by the owners of the transportation interests, it is surely obvious that they ought to remember that the people of the United States—a country not of eight millions but of ninety million people—are also labouring under the same disadvantages in that regard as we are labouring under; and if that country, which surely ought to have power in this matter far transcending the power we can exercise, labours under the same disadvantage without serious agitation, surely under the stress of the war it is no more than just to ask that there be no agitation raised because we are compelled to do the same. There is no country on the face of the globe at the present time that is not compelled, under the conditions which obtain, to pay exorbitant transportation rates. These rates are not arbitrarily fixed by the steamship companies or tramp owners; they are fixed by the owners of commodities who offer the rates, and a vessel owner, or a steamship owner, has ever right to steer his vessel from one port to another, and if offered a higher rate to go to another port to accept it. If he is offered a still higher rate, he perhaps takes that. It is his business to get the highest rate he can, so that it is more correct to say that the rates are fixed by the desire of shippers to get the boats. These being the conditions, we have simply to do the best we can.

Now, I have been asked what has been done in regard to this matter. The Prime Minister has stated that it has engaged the attention of the Government, and that it particularly engaged his own attention on the occasion of his visit to Great Britain. The British Government, taking the course they have, adopting the policy that they have adopted in the matter of commandeering, there was only one other line of procedure possible on the part of this Government, namely to secure the release for the purpose of the carriage of Canadian commodities of as many vessels as possible; that is to say, to augment the number of vessels competing for trade in the North Atlantic and in that way to secure the diminishing of the ocean rates, or at all events, to prevent an aggravated advance of ocean rates to the greatest possible extent. In that the Prime Minister has been successful; in that the Government has been successful. A number of vessels—the figures were given by my right hon. friend—aggregating six or seven have been so released and so utilized and as a result of his efforts I am proud to say—I cannot vouch for the figures now but I will give them later on

and have them right—Canadian grain this year—the year of the greatest production in our country—has been transported from the harvest fields over the railways to our ports, and through the ports of entry to the south, more expeditiously than in any previous year in our history. Thus the Government has secured transport to the markets of the world, resulting in a very considerable increase in the prosperity of this country.

While we complain of ocean rates, and while doubtless it is our duty to do everything in our power to have these rates reduced and to bring about conditions that alone will reduce them, it is only by the multiplication of vessels available that they can be reduced, until the time comes when it may be possible by the concerted action of the several countries to gain control of them. And while it is our duty to secure that reduction to the greatest possible extent, we must remember that it is impossible to say that the rate upon wheat means so much of a reduction in the price to the Canadian farmer. It is impossible to shut our eyes to the truth, that doubtless a part of the increased rate is paid b the consumer himself. The conditions that obtain in the trade are complicated, they vary from day to day, and it is only putting it moderately to say that without any question whatever a large share is paid by the consumer in European countries. I observed, during a period of two weeks the progress of prices in this country, and I noted in that two weeks that while the increase in the price in Great Britain was 15 cents a bushel the increase in ocean rates during the same time was 5 cents per bushel and the increase in the price in Canada was 10 cents a bushel. At all events, this evidence would clearly indicate that a very considerable portion of those high ocean rates are borne by the consumers of Great Britain. Doubtless a proportion of the extra cost of freight on traffic coming from Great Britain to Canada is also paid by us. They know that as well as we do, and in the face of that they adhere to their policy of leaving this matter to the general play of competition.

There is this consideration also that it is worth while for the people of Canada to bear in mind. Great Britain is supplied from Canada, the United States, Argentina and Australia. These are the chief sources of supply now because of the prevailing conditions as to Russian wheat. Canada and the United States are the nearest to the consuming markets; the Argentine and Australia are much farther away. Under ordinary conditions we have an advantage in ocean rates over our competitors of three, four, or five cents a bushel. Under the conditions that obtain to-day we have an advantage over these competitors of not three, four, or five cents a bushel, but of twenty, thirty or forty cents, per bushel. We are not the only ones to suffer. We have no desire to procure an undue advantage at the expense particularly of our sister colony of Australia, but we are not the only ones to suffer, and we suffer in far less degree than do these competing countries. It is no more than the truth to say that the very fact that these rates have been so high, and that we have had such an advantage over other countries that compete in the British market, that fact has been a factor not inconsiderable in enabling this country to secure the sale of a large part of its surplus in good time in the British market. It has not been an unmixed evil by any means. But let me be not misunderstood. I do not argue that high ocean rates in themselves are good, nor do I argue for a moment that it is not the duty of this Government in these times and at all times to exert the utmost of its power to secure a reduction. This is a year, however, when the world's crop of wheat transcends the records of the past, and when, consequently, the problem of securing an early market for the tremendous Canadian surplus is an aggravated problem, and therefore the advantage that we have secured by reason, indeed, of the high ocean rates is an advantage that we should appreciate and not minimize.

Having said that, I pass to make a few comments on the speech delivered yesterday and the day before by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I regret that he is not in his place in the House. I was present throughout his address, except during a very few minutes when I was called out of the chamber, and in the course of it I came into collision with the hon. gentleman on several matters of importance. I am afraid it would be impossible, with any deference to truth at all, to say that the hon. member for St. John had conducted himself in Parliament with any regard whatever to the tremendous and appalling character of the events that overhang this country. He has delivered in this House not only the most bitterly partisan speech that we have heard in it since the war began, but he has

delivered a speech that, proportionate to its length, has less foundation in fact than any speech that I have ever heard in this chamber. I am going to endeavour to expose to the House the artifices to which the hon. gentleman descended, and the devices which he adopted in order to secure what he thought was a party advantage, and I shall ask the House whether, in the exercise of these arts and devices, he conducted himself in a manner befitting an hon. member of this House in these times.

The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, made an attack on what is called the Shell Committee of Canada. He made a bitter personal attack upon the members of that committee, particularly upon the chairman of it, and upon Mr. Carnegie. I want it to be distinctly understood before I enter upon this subject, that I do not stand here as a sponsor of, or as one responsible for, the conduct of this Shell Committee. I am not here to attack the Shell Committee; I am not here to defend the Shell Committee; I am here to offer some remarks in regard to what they have done, in regard to their status and character, in regard to their responsibility, and in regard to our duty towards them. The members of the Shell Committee were named by the Government of Canada, and that was at the request of the Imperial authorities. It was done for the purpose of securing the manufacture of shells in this country for the Imperial authorities. The naming of them was done by this Government. They were constituted, on being so named, and having been constituted, they were placed at the disposal of the Imperial authorities and became a committee answerable to the Imperial authorities alone. Now, have I stated that emphatically and clearly? Upon their being named by us at the request of the Imperial Government, they became an Imperial Government committee, responsible to and answerable to the Government of this Empire. They conducted their business directly with the Imperial authorities. Communications passed from the Shell Committee to the Imperial Government and from the Imperial Government to the Shell Committee. Had they been in a position where we had authority over them, had they been constituted as a committee under a department of this Government, they would have been answerable to this Government; we would have had authority over them and we would have been responsible.

When the matter of contracts for shells in Canada came up, and when at the initiative of the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), the manufacture of shells was undertaken by this country, two courses of procedure were plainly available to the Government. One was to proceed directly under governmental authority or under agents of the Government in one way or the other, by a commission or otherwise, but directly under Canadian governmental authority, and take control of the shell manufacturing in this country and take the responsibility therefor. The other was to appoint a commission independent of this Government and to constitute that commission a British commission for the manufacture of shells in Canada independent of the Canadian Government. I apprehend from the speech of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that he thinks, when the parting of the ways confronted us, that we took the wrong course; that we made a false election, and that we should have taken in hand and made it our business to control the manufacture of shells in Canada, and that we should have made the commission, or department which undertook that control, responsible to the Government of this country. Well, if we had done so, if we had made that election and taken that course, then we doubtless would have been responsible. Then if errors were committed, we would have been the ones to answer for them; but at the same time we would have had control, and we would have been in the position to prevent errors from taking place. But had we taken that course, I think I can hear the speech that would have been made by the hon. member for St. John. I think I can hear the scraps that he would have read from the Liberal newspapers of Canada. I could write myself the article for the Liberal Monthly, that would be very appropriate if we had made such an election. Oh, they would have said, here is a Government that utilizes the war and the manufacture of munitions for its own advertisement; here is a government that takes under its own control the disposition of contracts, that has kept under its own arm the power to dispose of a contract here and a contract there at prices fixed by itself, that utilizes its power as a government to aggrandize itself politically to the disadvantage of the people, and with the purpose, at all events with the result, of splitting in twain the unity of this country in the cause of the Empire. Why, they would have said,

any government that had the slightest regard for Imperial interests, any government that wanted to be fair between the two parties of this country, would have done what? Why, they would have selected experts; they would have selected business men; they would not have taken this thing under the eye and under the hand of politicians; they would have put business men into control and made them independent of government, and given them the disposition of the shell contracts. Would not that have been the speech of the hon. member for St. John? I have heard that speech from him time and again on other subjects. I have heard the Liberal press of Canada over and over again call for the very course that we took in regard to the manufacture of shells. We divorced the shell committee from the Canadian Government in the matter of responsibility; we made them a committee of the Imperial authority. I am not here to say whether they did wrong throughout or whether they did right throughout; they are answerable to the Imperial authorities for what they did. The Imperial authorities have so recognized; they have acted upon it; they have conducted investigations; they have made reports; they have
5 p.m. exercised their sovereignty over that committee; they have given their verdict. But the hon. member for St. John is not satisfied with the verdict. Why? Because it does not satisfy his own partisan ends for advantage in the politics of Canada.

Mr. PROULX: Does the hon. gentleman believe that the Shell Committee was divorced from the Minister of Militia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have stated so. Why does the hon. gentleman doubt my belief?

Mr. PROULX: I am informed that the Minister of Militia procured a contract of $700,000 for the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Hepburn).

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was it the hon. Minister of Militia who procured a contract for the firm of which the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is a director? The evidence on these matters is too plain for any man, however dull, I may say, however stupid, to mistake. Whatever may be said about the conduct of the Shell Committee, this at all events can be said, that they have not conducted the distribution of contracts on any partisan basis. I repeat that; I invite a challenge. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) shakes his head. Now I make this challenge. For every company or every man he names belonging to the Conservative party who has got a contract, I will name him another belonging to the Liberal party. My offer stands good just as long as there is a shell committee. Now we will wait for my hon. friend's answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Come on.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Speak loud.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The day before yesterday the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) said that in the very city from which the hon. member for St. John comes, 75 per cent. of the contracts went to the Liberals. When the hon. member for St. John asked for an instance, he gave the instance of McAvity Brothers and of the Phœnix Company. What was the answer of the hon. member for St. John? Oh, he says, you are out, the McAvity's got their contract from the Canada Car and Foundry Company, and, consequently, the Shell Committee had nothing to do with it at all; it was a Russian contract which they got from the Canada Car Company. Was that an honest statement to this House? The McAvitys got a contract; they got contracts aggregating over half a million dollars from the Shell Committee, and it was the same with the Phœnix Company. Was the hon. gentleman fair with Parliament? Was he fair with the country? Was he behaving himself in a manner befitting a member of Parliament at this time? I do not think the hon. member for St. John was unaware of the facts. There is no one who has lived through the last Parliament who does not know the close relationship that existed between that hon. member and the McAvity family. I have nothing to say against their getting contracts; but I have something to say against an hon. member who, from his seat in this House, tells us that an hon. member is wrong in stating that the McAvity Bros. got contracts of over half a million dollars but that the contract came from the Canada Car Company, when the fact is that they got contracts of over half a million dollars from the Shell Committee. Whether or not they got a contract from the Canada Car Company I do not know, and I have no way of finding out, but I do know that they had a contract of over half a million dollars from the Shell Committee.

The hon. member made another very interesting reference, too, in the course of his speech, and I am sorry that the hon. member for South Renfrew

(Mr. Graham) is not here to hear what I am about to say. This is really one of the most fascinating by-plays I have ever seen in Parliament. The hon. member for St. John quotes the Toronto Telegram. He has suddenly come to the opinion that the Toronto Telegram is a newspaper to be absolutely relied upon with regard to its political advice, and he presses that advice upon the Government. Here is the quotation he made:

Exploiting of war orders—Doings of middlemen——

one of the worst terms of contempt in the whole vocabulary of hon. gentlemen opposite.

—Proposition is up to Premier Borden, declares the Contract Record of Toronto.

Down in New York way they're still sending out circulars that tell of desirable investments created by filling war orders in Canada, says the Contract Record in this week's issue. One of the latest comes from Gilbert Elliott and Company. It advises clients to invest in Canada Foundries and Forgings Company, which has shops at Brockville and Welland.

I quote from yesterday's debate:

Mr. Pugsley: If I am not mistaken, Sir Henry Pellatt is president of that company.

Mr. Graham: No.

Mr. Pugsley: I may be mistaken as to that.

Mr. Graham: Yes.

Mr. Pugsley: I saw that there had been some denial of a statement of profits which had been put forth by a company with which he was connected.

Did you ever see hedging more skilful than that when he found he had been chasing the wrong animal? The hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) continued:

I will read the article from the Telegram, not knowing, of course, whether there was any contradiction of it or not:

'We are advised from sources upon which we can rely, that earnings for the past ten months ending November 1, 1915, are over $900,000, and that the monthly earnings are now running at the rate of $150,000, or equal to $1,860,000 per year, which after taking care of fixed charges, will amount to over 150 per cent per annum on the outstanding common stock.'

This is the instance selected by the hon. member for St. John as the greatest with which to denounce the iniquities of the middlemen, believing, as he thought, that Sir Henry Pellatt was president of that company, or at least as he stated he thought. But the hon. member who interrupted him, the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), could not let that go, because a director of the company is the hon. member for South Renfrew himself. The president of the company is a gentleman by the name of Weir, of whom I know nothing. But this is a company of which Hon. George P. Graham is a director, and it is the company which the hon. member for St. John cited as a hideous example of the conduct of middlemen, and as an example to demonstrate that the work of the Shell Committee brought shame to the cheeks of all Canadians.

I stated that I would have something to say about the devices adopted by the hon. member for St. John. I made a statement in opening this speech that the British Government had recognized from the beginning that this was their committee, and had dealt with it as such, and that at no time and in no sense was it an agency of the Canadian Government; that they had made investigations, that they had exercised superintendence, and that they were furnished with reports as a part of that superintendence. One of the men who came over representing the British Government, the personal representative of the Minister of Munitions himself, was Mr. Thomas, who was formerly a member of the Imperial House. Another representative since has been Mr. Hichens. Both of these gentlemen have made their reports. The hon. member for St. John referred to the verdict given by Mr. Thomas, and how did he do it? He stood in his place in this House and stated that Mr. Thomas had said that there were too much politics in the Shell Committee. Now, I affirm here—and the hon. gentleman has all this session to prove me wrong—that he cannot show that Mr. Thomas made any such statement. Then he went on to say that Mr. Thomas had said, "If I could lift the veil just a little." It is well to quote Hansard in these matters to get things right. Here is what he said, and I do not think that anything could better illustrate the parliamentary methods of the hon. member for St. John:

Mr. WILCOX: How did the Canadian price compare with the price that was paid in the United States at the same time?

Mr. Pugsley: I take the statement of Mr. Thomas, who says that the price was higher in Canada. Mr. Thomas is a gentleman who was sent out from England in consequence, I take it—

"in consequence, I take it."

—of the dissatisfaction which existed.

Mr. Meighen: Will the hon. gentleman take all of Mr. Thomas's statement?

Mr. Pugsley: I am quite willing to take all of Mr. Thomas's statement. Let my hon. friend take particularly Mr. Thomas's statement when he says that if he could raise the veil just a little—

There are no two inferences to be drawn from that—Mr. Thomas, the hon. gentle-

man said, had expressed the desire that he might be permitted to raise the veil just a little. I knew that Mr. Thomas had made no such statement, and so I said:

Mr. Meighen: Will the hon. gentleman quote that from Mr. Thomas's statement?
Mr. Pugsley: Yes.
Mr. Meighen: All right, bring it out.
Mr. Pugsley: I will do so.

And we all remember how he stood in his place so long trying to find it. I do not know whether he found it then or not. He went on:

I should like to oblige my hon. friend. I think it was in Montreal that Mr. Thomas made the statement; if my hon. friend will allow me, I will give it to him before I get through with my remarks. In that statement Mr. Thomas says also that he is a politician himself, and he rather conveys the impression that he found a great deal of politics in Canada in connection with the shell committee.

Making it clearer still that Mr. Thomas, the representative of the Government of Great Britain, had said in this country that he desired to, but could not, lift the veil, the lifting of which would show that there were a lot of politics in the Shell Committee, and that the result would be disastrous to the committee. No other inference is possible. Now a day passed, a day in which to forget the exact language that he attributed to Mr. Thomas. The next day the hon. member for St. John stands in his place and endeavours to fulfil his undertaking to quote these words from Mr. Thomas. I will read what he said on this subject on the 19th of this month:

I regret for another reason that my hon. friend the Solicitor General is not present—

That is just at the opening; I came in just as he got through with this paragraph:

—because last evening, when I called attention to the fact that Mr. Thomas had come out to Canada as the personal representative of Mr. Lloyd George to look into the question of the furnishing of shrapnel and high explosive shells in Canada, he made a careful investigation into conditions, and upon one occasion, in making a speech in the city of Montreal, I think—

There was no "think" to it before.

I think he used the words: 'If I raise the veil a little.'

Why did he leave out the word "could," after the twenty-four hours that intervened? He stated yesterday that the day before he had made the statement that Mr. Thomas had said," if I raise the veil a little." He did not say that Mr. Thomas had said, "if I could raise the veil just a little." It is just the difference between

black and white. Mr. Thomas was explaining that he was raising the veil just a little, and was going to tell what he saw. And he did tell what he saw under the veil; he told it to the people of the Canadian Club, and quoting from the Montreal Gazette, I am going to read what he told them:

If I raise the veil a little, said Mr. Thomas, it will be on my own personal responsibility, and do not take it as coming from the Minister of Munitions. But, naturally, from my official position, I must have considerable inside knowledge of what is going on in Canada in the manufacture of munitions.

Then he proceeds to raise the veil a little, not to regret that he could not raise it at all. He proceeds to raise it; he tells what is under the veil, and I am going to read what he tells, and all of it, on this subject of the manufacture of shells. I will read it from the very paper from which the hon. member for St. John city himself read. I wonder why it did not occur to the hon. member for St. John, when he spoke about Mr. Thomas raising the veil, to tell what Mr. Thomas said when he did raise the veil. It would not suit him to do that.

Mr. Thomas goes on at some length without referring in any way to the manufacture of shells or to the Shell Committee. Then the report says:

With regard to munitions, Mr. Thomas said: I am in a position to tell you the Government desires—

that is, the Imperial Government—

—to place further orders for the smaller shells, and also desires to place orders for larger shells, provided prices and conditions are satisfactory. The British Government was anxious to give Canada every preference, but had to consider three conditions: efficiency of ammunition, expedition in manufacture, and economy. As to delivery, Canadian manufacturers up to last June had been far behind, but had made great improvement since then, but even yet they were not always up to time.

A condition of affairs which the hon. member for St. John would doubtless attribute to the Canadian Government, and in respect of which he would entirely absolve the manufacturers.

As to efficiency of the shells, those which had passed inspection had turned out well. In this connection Mr. Thomas paid a warm tribute to the shell committee—

here is the veil lifted, and this is the verdict:

—a warm tribute to the shell committee, and particularly General Bertram—

the maligned of the hon. member for St. John—

—who, he declared, had placed the whole Empire in his debt for the manner in which he had devoted himself to the work. The committee had been criticised because manufacturers of shells sat on it, but he pointed out that if these were cut off it would be impossible to get experts on it at all.

The very feature of the Shell Committee which the hon. member for St. John denounced as corrupt and scandalous is the feature commended by the British representative, Mr. Thomas:

The shell committee is now about a year old, said Mr. Thomas, and I think the time has come when its work might well be revised. At my suggestion Sir Frederick Donaldson, perhaps the most distinguished expert on munitions in the Empire, is coming to Canada. He was chief superintendent of ordnance at Woolwich, but resigned to become Lloyd George's adviser. He will be here in a few days, and, I think, will be able to render a good deal of assistance in the manufacture of shells, and also in the manufacture of big guns.

Then, further, the report says:

With regard to economy, continued Mr. Thomas, that must be considered, and I may tell you the cost of shells in Canada has been higher than in competitive countries. It is complained that fat orders have gone to the United States, but I can assure you a big slice will be reserved to Canada as long as the price is fairly satisfactory. But prices so far have been higher here than in the United States or Great Britain, where any extra profits have been commandeered by the Government.

I want that sentence noted; this is from the Montreal Gazette, the paper from which the hon. gentleman quoted:

Prices so far have been higher here than in the United States or Great Britain, where any extra profits have been commandeered by the Government.

As a sample of the patriotic impulses of Canadian manufacturers, Mr. Thomas stated that recently Messrs. Baillie & Wood, of Hamilton, had undertaken to manufacture a million 18-pounder catridge shells at absolute cost. In the same spirit Hon. Frank Cochrane, Minister of Railways, had placed the Transcontinental railway shops at the disposal of the Imperial Government for the manufacture of munitions. They have done that, he said, without provision for profit to any one, and I thank the Canadian Government for the splendid spirit they have shown.

Mr. Thomas himself took the responsibility of raising the veil a little, and having raised the veil, in that speech he exposed to the people of Canada what was behind it—and I have read all that he said on the question of the Shell Committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us—I assume he knows—whether the Government's offer was accepted, and what was done in regard to these Transcona shops so far as the making of shells was concerned?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it was accepted at the time. As far as the Canadian Government was concerned, the statement of Mr. Thomas shows that it was made.

Mr. MACDONALD: What was done about it?

Mr. J. D. REID: There is a question on the Order Paper in regard to that; you will get the answer there.

Mr. MACDONALD: He might tell us now.

Mr. REID: You will get it when the question is answered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that it is a rule of order—the hon. member for Pictou likely knows this that one shall not refer to questions and motions on the Order Paper. However, I would tell the hon. gentleman myself if I were in a position to give the particulars, but I am not. That, however, will be answered; the hon. gentleman need not fear at all.

I turn from that to another quotation which the hon. member for St. John made. The House has heard me read from the address of Mr. Thomas before the Canadian Club at Montreal, as reported in the Montreal Gazette. I have read in the clearest language from that address that Mr. Thomas stated that the price in Canada was higher than the price in the United States and in England. That is exactly the way it reads. How did the hon. member for St. John place that upon Hansard? I am not going to say that the variation to which I am about to refer was deliberate on the part of the hon. member for St. John; I do not know whether it was or not, but the character of the error is remarkable. Here is the way it is put upon Hansard, doubtless for distribution throughout the length and breadth of Canada:

That must be considered, and I may tell you that the cost of shells in Canada has been higher than in competitive countries. It is complained that fat orders have gone to the United States, but I can assure you that a big slice will be reserved for Canada as long as the price is fairly satisfactory. The prices so far have been far higher than in the United States or in Great Britain.

Strange that that should be the way that it appears in Hansard in the speech of the hon. member for St. John, when the word in the quotation from which he

read distinctly say "that the prices have been higher than in the United States." It is a remarkable coincidence that the change is in conformity with the extravagant language of the hon. member for St. John himself.

I do not know that it is a matter that requires very much elucidation that the prices should at first have been higher in Canada than in the United States. It may be that the prices were higher than the conditions warranted; I am not an expert, and I do not know. But I do think it is worth our while to consider this fact: that when the orders were given, they were given at a price which amounted to compensation—and which was intended to amount to compensation—to the contractors for the machinery which they had specially to install for the purpose of executing the orders. At that time there was a more or less general belief that the war was to be of short duration, and that not a great deal of this shell production could go on, and as a consequence the only method that appeared to be at the disposal of the committee—so, at all events, the chairman has stated—of securing contractors to do the work was to include in the contract price an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the installation of the necessary machinery. Therefore the price was fixed at $5.70. The hon. member for St. John says: Here is the Commonwealth of Australia; they have gone about this thing in a business-like way, and have let contracts for $5.05 inclusive of the steel, which will be $2 less than the price in Canada—and he quotes from the Liberal Monthly in proof of that assertion. I am not going to attack the Liberal Monthly, but from the lips of an hon. member who still persists in looking on this Government as a mere partisan machine, I think it is worthy of note, as an evidence of his inner belief in the fairness of spirit of this Government, that he undertakes to convince them by quoting the Liberal Monthly. The Liberal Monthly makes the statement that the price in Australia was $5.05, inclusive of the steel, and says that is $2 less than the price of $5.70, exclusive of the steel, in Canada. But the hon. member does not emphasize the fact, that appears even in the Liberal Monthly, that the Australian contract covers all the shells to be made by the contractors up to June 30, 1916. This is the price fixed for all the shells to be made up to June 30, 1916, and no notice of cancellation can be given until the 31st of March; whereas in Canada, during all these months, the price has gone down from $5.70 to $4, and so on until it has reached $1.75. Is the aggregate price higher than in Australia? Will the average be higher? I venture to say that the arithmetic that already is at the surface indicates that the average price in this country will be the lower. But, however that may be, let me, in this matter of price, again emphasize this fact, that the Shell Committee, in fixing the price, acted under the authorization of the Imperial Government itself, and the Shell Committee fixed no price in excess of its authorization. That is the statement which is made to me and which I believe. And, furthermore, the Shell Committee succeeded in getting prices below its authorization, effecting a saving of a very large amount to the Imperial treasury. I am not saying, and I do not wish to be taken as saying, that there cannot be any attack on that committee. The committee may be open to criticism, nor will I say that, under proper authority and at the proper time, there should not be a review of the work at that committee. But I do say that in fairness to it and to the cause to which all our energies should be directed, it is only just that we remember these ruling principles that are plain to the eyes of all, and try to do justice to the men who did that work. We are asked: why did you not do as the Liberal Government did in the days of the late Administration? I am not going to make any attack on the Liberal Government, but I do think it is not going beyond the limit when I endeavour to reply to the intimation clearly given to the House by the hon. member for St. John (Mr Pugsley) that this Government set a notable example in the late Administration which we would do well to follow in the matter of investigation of Imperial contracts and purchases in this country. We made Imperial purchases in this country for the Imperial Government in the days gone by. They were made in the days of the South African war.. They were made by a department of the Government of Canada. They were made under the direct responsibility of the Government, and the matter came up in the Parliament of Canada. I invite the attention of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in this connection because I am without the honour of the presence of the hon. member for St. John. I can quite recall the warning hurled at the Government by the hon. member for Rouville, whose speech as a whole was not only patriotic but

highly creditable to himself; I remember the warning he threw out to us that this Government should never shelter itself behind the miserable quibble of saying that we were spending Imperial money and not Canadian, and that therefore the Government were not responsible. I know the lofty scorn with which he attacked that miserable quibble and held it up to the Canadian people as unworthy of the Canadian Government or Parliament. But what did he think of the quibble in 1903? In 1902, yes, I think in 1901 as well, but certainly in 1903, there was a discussion of that miserable quibble in the Commons of this country. A motion was made in 1903, not when the war was on, when there might have been high and Imperial reasons for the reservation of the information, but after the war was over and when all those reasons were removed. More than one motion was made in this House for inquiry into the purchases made by departments of the Government under the late Administration. And how was that demand for inquiry met by the late Government? Were they parties to a miserable quibble that it was Imperial money and not ours? Remember this, that that money was expended, not by a committee answerable to the Imperial authorities and divorced from the Canadian Government, not by a commission who were not under the thumb and under the influence of the head of a department and of the Government itself. Those moneys were expended by a department of the Administration; the work was done by a Minister of the Crown, through one of his officers in the department. They expended the money, first Canadian money in large degree, afterwards recouped by the Imperial treasury; and charges were made in the House that the expenditure had been made improvidently and that the interest of the people of Great Britain had not been conserved in the expenditure. The matter was brought up first when the war was on, and the Minister of Agriculture of that day answered that, inasmuch as they were Imperial moneys that were being spent and not Canadian moneys the Government were not responsible to the Parliament of Canada. That answer at that time was accepted. The war, however, had ceased in 1903. The matter came up again. There were no more hay and no more oats to be purchased for the war, and any information given could not have the slightest effect upon the prices, could not effect Imperial interests in any way that I could think of. It came up on the motion of the late lamented member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who moved for:

1. The total amount paid by the Government of Canada for hay and oats, purchased for the Imperial Government, for shipment to South Africa, during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902.
2. The names of the parties from whom hay and oats were so purchased.
3. The prices at which the said hay and oats were so furnished during the said periods, from each of the said parties.
4. The total amount paid to each of the said parties, both for hay and oats.

What was the answer? I commend it to the hon. member for Rouville. It is not his answer. I admit all that; but it is the answer of a member of the late Government for whom I think he had, and likely has still, the highest regard and respect, the late Minister of Finance. The Hon. Mr. Fielding said:

I think I am correct in stating that my hon. friend brought this matter before the House a year ago in the form of a question. And my hon. colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, said that it concerned only the Imperial Government, inasmuch as it did not affect the public moneys of Canada in any way, therefore he was unable to supply the information asked for. I think that we ought to take the same position to-day. For all expenditure of the public money of Canada, the ministers are accountable to this House and the House is entitled to every information, but this is an expenditure of Imperial money for which this Government is not accountable to this House.

Did you ever hear of a quibble quite so well expressed as by the Minister of Finance of the late Administration? Then he goes on:

The matter would be a proper one to be brought forward in the parliament of Great Britain, but not in this House. I hope my hon. friend will see the reasonableness of this view and will not press his motion.

The motion, however, was pressed, and the late Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself took a part in the discussion. Here I shall quote the words of the late Prime Minister:

I believe that everything in this matter was done fairly and well. We have no complaint from the British Government, and I therefore see no reason why this House should inquire into the expenditure of money which does not concern it.

Mr. Borden (Halifax): I would like to know whether the right hon. gentleman is willing or not to have these purchases ventilated in the Committee of Public Accounts, as they might be, if they were the expenditure of this country.

The Prime Minister: Certainly not.

That was when all possible objections were removed, and it went to a vote in the House. And who do you think voted to sustain the

miserable quibble but the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it not stated yesterday, or the day before, by the Minister of Finance that the Government of this country was paying part of the cost of the shells manufactured in Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a phase of the subject which I shall come to. I understand the point to which the hon. member refers, and I intend to comment upon it. Before I do so, however, let me press upon his mind this distinction, that those moneys were in 1902 expended by officers of the Crown, by a minister of the Crown or his subordinates in the department; that the work of expending it was work performed while such minister and the officers utilized were themselves in the pay of the Government of Canada. In the present case the Shell Committee, from its inception, has been answerable for its work to and has conducted its work under the guidance, jurisdiction, and superintendence and financial sustenance of the Imperial Government. There is that distinction.

Mr. MACDONALD: And the Minister of Militia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. The hon. member for Pictou seems to have a knowledge of the Minister of Militia that I do not possess. The Minister of Militia is a member of the Government of Canada, and in that capacity bears the same relation to the Shell Committee as any other member of the Government.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was he not a member of both committees, the committee that was retired at the request of this Government, and the new committee, which was named by this Government to take its place?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Militia was at two meetings, the first one and the one at which the committee disbanded, and he was at no meeting between.

Mr. MACDONALD: He was a member of both committees; it was so stated in the press.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my hon. friend send out and get the names of that committee?

Mr. MACDONALD: I can discuss my hon. friend's remarks at a later stage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have said that I have no knowledge that he was a member, and I would like my hon. friend to get the names of the respective committees and show that the Minister of Militia was a member. The committee, however constituted, and whatever its personnel, was, from the time of its institution, a committee acting under the authority of the Imperial Government.

Now I come to the point raised by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and a point which came just at the last minute to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I could see clearly that the debate and division of 1903 had been called to his attention in the interval, and he set about to dig out from his ingenuity some way in which he could possibly distinguish the Imperial moneys of 1902 from the Imperial moneys of 1915. So he asked the Minister of Finance whether it was not the case that we were paying our share of the cost of maintaining our troops at the front to the Imperial treasury. The Minister of Finance answered in the affirmative. It is our intention, it is our policy to pay our share of the cost of maintaining the men at the front which the Imperial Government is paying on behalf of our men. It is true that the Imperial Government is to be recouped for the share of expenditure, as nearly as can be estimated, that is being paid for the maintenance of the Canadian forces at the front. "Oh, then," they say, "we ought to review this expenditure which we have to meet." Well, that is either true or it is not. If we have the right to review part of the moneys that are payable to the Imperial Government we have the right to review all the expeditures in which we are interested. We are interested in the same degree in the money paid by the Imperial Government in the United States as in the money paid in Canada. We have to pay some part of that, and we have to pay some part of any money that may have been spent in Japan and in Great Britain itself, and if there is a duty upon the Parliament of Canada to investigate the expenditure of Imperial moneys for the munitions of Canada, the same duty must apply to all the moneys in which we are interested expended by the Imperial authorities. Furthermore, this Government has assumed a position not only consistent with, but strictly in conformity with its policy initiated long before the war: that in matters of defence we and the Imperial Parliament are on common ground;

that in matters of defence—until the time comes when this country shall have a seat in the Imperial councils—we trust to the Imperial Government for advice and for the disposition of our forces; we place the forces under their control, and we trust them in the expenditure of money for the common purpose. I do not think that if the Imperial Government is looking for examples as to how best to deal with the moneys of the British people, or if they are looking for improvements in the methods of handling that money, they are going to take the advice of, or look for inspiration to, the hon. member for St. John. I have parted with the question of the control of the Shell Committee; I am through with it, and I propose to deal with just one other matter that came up during the debate when the hon. member for St. John was speaking. He had occasion to refer to the question of submarines.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before my hon. friend passes from that point might I give him the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to the question put to him as to our share of the expenditure of moneys on munitions. On page 42 of Hansard, I find this:

Hon. Wm. Pugsley: I desire to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) if he will kindly lay on the table of the House, or if he can give now, information in a concise manner as to the arrangement between the Government of Canada and the British Government as to what proportion of the expense in connection with the carrying on of the war, in so far as Canadian soldiers are concerned, is to be borne by the Government of Canada. I desire to know whether all the expense of ammunition, guns, equipment, etc., is to be borne by the Government of Canada, or what the arrangement is.

Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance): The matter will be dealt with probably by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in introducing the war Appropriation Bill, which will provide means for continuing our participation in the war, or, if not, by myself in the Budget Speech, which will be brought down at a later date. In a general way, I may say to my hon. friend that the Government of Canada is bearing the entire expense of Canada's participation in the war. There will necessarily be certain accounts which cannot be adjusted until the war is over, or until a later date.

Then he gives the conversation he had with Col. Ward. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) then puts another question:

Mr. Pugsley: That means, of course, all the ammunition, all the guns, all the boots and shoes, and all the clothing used by the Canadian soldiers at the front?

Sir Thomas White: Our understanding is that the Canadian Government will pay all, but that an adjustment is necessary and will have to take place later.

I desire to ask my hon. friend in a friendly spirit, because I want to be right in this matter: whether he claims that, in view of that understanding that we are to pay our share of the cost of munitions and guns, no investigation can take place regarding the charges made. I quite understand his answer as regards the Imperial part of it, but as regards what is being paid by Canada, does he deny any investigation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I am certain of the object of the hon. member for Rouville in rising. In so far as his quotation from the Minister of Finance's answer is concerned, it is exactly as I stated to the House. His object could not have been to correct me in that regard. It is exactly as I stated; we pay in a general way our share of the expense of maintenance. Then, he says: Now, do you say that because of that there should be no investigation? I never said any such thing. I have only argued that the fact that we pay our share of the maintenance is no argument whatever why we should investigate any more than we should have investigated in 1903. It adds no point whatever to the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they have charges to make as to the conduct of any member of this Government in relation to the Shell Committee, or otherwise these charges will be investigated as they always have been investigated under this Administration. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) tried to get the benefit of making charges, but carefully refrained from making any in this House, shielding himself always behind a closing sentence that he was making no charge himself, but that he was only saying what was reported, or stated here, there, or somewhere else.

By the way, the hon. gentleman made one remarkable assertion which I think disclosed the whole purpose of his speech. He emphasized with tremendous force that no commission was going to satisfy his ambition. He did not want any judge investigating these things; he has lost confidence in judges. He did not want any judge but he wanted a committee of Parliament. That is the only thing that would satisfy him. He not only said that but he made the solemn statement that from the Atlantic to the Pacific they were crying for an investigation by a committee of Parliament.

Then he proceeded to wade through every newspaper that he could get from one end of Canada to the other, especially every Liberal paper, and he hoped by calling his own witnesses for opinions to make a case against the Government, I say now, having read them of every sort and character, that he cannot find in a single quotation from a single paper, Grit or Tory, that he quoted one demand that there should be an investigation by a committee of Parliament. He has raked the country with a fine tooth comb to support his assertion that he is voicing the indignation of the great Canadian people, and having made his quotations after doing all the raking, he cannot produce a single opinion concurring with his own.

He says that these papers reflect public opinion. We have quite as much respect as the hon. member for St. John for the opinions of the editors of this country, and for, on the whole, their exceedingly patriotic conduct during this struggle; still, it is a notable fact that after he got through with each quotation, which almost invariably laid the blame on the manufacturers, he was careful to say that this opinion did not agree with his own at all because in his judgment the manufacturers were all right and the Government all wrong. I do not know whether he was taking a sort of side dig at his rival for supremacy as the chief lieutenant of the Liberal party or not, but he was careful to lay bare to the House that the Canada Forging and something Company were among the arch middlemen, but when he was chided by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham) he became very appreciative indeed of the manufacturers of this country.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the House will bear with me while I make just another brief reference to the attack of the hon. member for St. John on the Shell Committee. I observe in the body of his address a reference by way of insinuation to an alleged visit of two men, whose names and identity are unknown, to some company whose name and identity is also unknown, representing somebody whose name and identity is also unknown, and asking for a commission of one and a half per cent. on some contracts they hoped to get from the Shell Committee. I observe also that in reference to that very specific and daring charge of the hon. member for St. John, he comments as follows:

> I said a commission of one and a half per cent on the contract price. I do not pretend for a single moment that any of this was to go to the Shell Committee. I do not pretend for a single moment to say that anything was given to any one associated in any way with the Government, or with this House.

In the first place it mystifies me what influence two men, who do not represent the Shell Committee or the Government or any one connected with either, could have in asking for a commission from any firm of contractors. Upon what ground would they expect their request to be granted? The insinuation answers itself on the face of it. But the reason I refer to it at this moment is this: the hon. member for St. John is asking for an investigation; he would like to get men like this exposed. His regard for purity is so high that he is not satisfied until these men are properly punished. Well, the method of punishing them is open to him. We have on the Statute books of Canada at the present time a law that will come directly down on the heads of men who ask for a secret commission from any firm of contractors. What is our Secret Commissions Act for? It has been on our Statute books for some time; and if any man claiming to represent any one wants a commission of that kind, he is liable to punishment and imprisonment, and all the hon. member for St. John has to do is to go to this firm of contractors that hopes to get the job, and either do so himself or get one of them to lay a charge against these two individuals, and the prosecution is bound to follow. If then he wants an investigation or punishment, why does he not take this step? I will tell you why he does not. That is not what he wants at all. He wants a select committee of Parliament—presumably selected by himself; at all events if it is not, he will not be satisfied with it—in order that he may have a chance for political pyrotechnics in the House of Commons. That is what animates him in making that reference, the same as in every other.

In the course of his observations he referred to a speech said to have been delivered by myself at Port Arthur or Fort William, in which I made the statement that I knew that excessive prices were being paid for shells. In the first place, I made no speech at Port Arthur or Fort William. I do not suppose there was any intention at all on his part to be incorrect there; I think he refers to a speech I made at Portage la

Prairie; but in my speech at Portage la Prairie I made no statement that I knew excessive prices were being paid. What I stated was in answer to a request to speak on a proposition as to war taxes, and I said that I believed there had been some cases of large profits. That is a very different thing from stating that I knew that excessive prices were being paid. It would be utterly inconsistent, upon the principle upon which the Commission acted, namely, that they were compelled to include in the initial prices the cost of machinery, that there would not be cases of large profits. Perhaps the matter was scarcely worth referring to. I want, however, just in closing this phase of the subject, to place upon Hansard the report that men and experts, who were representing the British Government, to which this committee was responsible, have made with regard to that committee. I have already read the verdict of Mr. Thomas. I now propose to put upon Hansard what the second man says. His investigation of the work of the committee is a very recent one; his report has been made, and the substance of it is embodied in a letter written by the gentleman in question to the Prime Minister of this country. The contents of that letter have been made public. I only make quotations. Mr. Hitchens writes as follows:

> The Shell Committee which was appointed in September, 1914, by the Minister of Militia and Defence to deal with the munition orders placed in Canada by the Imperial Government has, I think, met with remarkable success in dealing with a difficult task. In the early days the problem was to persuade manufacturers to undertake the work of making shells, which was quite new to them, and presented formidable difficulties that caused many of the leading firms to hold back. The orders at that time destined for this country were on a small scale; there was naturally no assurance of continuity in the work, and the prospects of success were doubtful. The readiness with which the Canadian manufacturers adapted themselves to a new industry is, I think, remarkable, and although, as in England, they have often been unable to live up to their original promises, yet they have nothing to fear from a comparison with the early efforts of firms of the highest standing in England.

Then later on he says:

> I should like to take this opportunity to point out, after a careful inquiry into the facts that the Shell Committee has been submitted to much unfair criticism. It was, as I have said, appointed to deal with orders of modest proportions, and from the nature of the case was intended to be educative rather than administrative. It was natural therefore that it should contain an infusion of steel manufacturers whose advice and experience was necessary to the proper development of the new industry. The measure of their success can be gauged by the remarkable results achieved. The facts speak for themselves. There are now some 320 firms in Canada manufacturing shells of their component parts and in the short space of 14 months the Shell Committee with the active encouragement and support of General Sir Sam Hughes have developed the largest industry in the whole of the Dominion. They have been the means also of bringing into being certain important industries subsidiary to shell-making which will have a permanent effect in developing the resources of the country.

Then he goes on elaborating on the work of the committee, and in closing these are his words:

> These far reaching and important results have not been achieved without the most exacting and strenuous labour, which has fallen more particularly upon General Bertram and Colonel Carnegie, and which a single minded enthusiasm for the cause has enabled them to sustain. Perhaps I may be allowed to add that these striking results owe their inception and a large measure of their development to the practical zeal and the active encouragement of General Sir Sam Hughes. To conceive a big idea is hard, but to give effect to it in action demands qualities of a rarer kind. I wish, therefore, to place on record that the shell committee have for the first fourteen months been carrying on a work of the most exacting and strenuous nature, and that they have fulfilled their task well. The changes therefore which are now being made are the logical development of their work—the necessary superstructure upon the foundations laid by them.

I wish now, Sir, to refer to another subject, and one with which I am confident I can deal without long engaging the attention of the House. Certain references were made by the hon. member for St. John to what is now popularly named the Davidson Commission, a commission appointed under the Inquiries Act to investigate the letting of war contracts. It will be remembered that the hon. member for St. John made what cannot be described otherwise than as a slighting slur or a savage attack, whichever he intended it, on that commission. It is known to every one that that commission is still in existence, and that it has not reported. Neither the evidence nor the report referring to the purchase of submarines, therefore, has been handed in. It is not desirable, therefore, that I should say anything anticipatory of that report. But it is worth while to bring the attention to the fact that before this commission—constituted of a retired chief justice of the province of Quebec, a man whose reputation from one end of Canada to the other, is not only unblemished but distinguished—has made its report, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in his place in this House denounces it as a whitewashing report.

Mr. CARVELL: I stand by that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He stands by that, before he knows what the report is. It will be remembered that about a year ago the people were startled—if indeed it is possible any more to startle this country by speeches of the hon. member for St. John—startled by a speech made by that gentleman referring to purchase of submarines immediately before the outbreak of the war on the 4th of August, 1914. At that time, as every one knows, the Government of this country was able to purchase two submarines completely constructed at Seattle by the Seattle Construction Co., and previously under contract for purchase by the Chilian Government, the price being $1,150,000. It pleased the hon. member for St. John to rise in his place in this House and, in a speech that showed many of the characteristics of the tirade delivered yesterday, to try to embed in the minds of the people of this country the insinuation that there was some graft or something crooked in connection with that purchase. He asked that the matter be investigated. The investigation was put under way, the matter being included in the subjects within the purview of the Davidson Commission. That commission sat in Montreal, it sat in Victoria, and in at least one city south of the line. These sittings, I believe, were held during several months. But from the commencement of those sittings to the end the man who was responsible for the charges that were made and who, if he had been the man that he should have been, would have made it his duty to prove the charges if he could, never showed his face within the walls when the commission was sitting, and never brought a tittle of evidence to prove his charges. He gave no assistance to the commission in any way whatever. And he excuses himself now in Parliament on the ground that in the city of Victoria, some time after this investigation had begun, a solicitor of that city named Taylor had applied to His Lordship Chief Justice Davidson for permission to appear and cross-examine witnesses on behalf of the Provincial Liberal party of British Columbia, which permission, as I stated in the midst of the speech of the hon. member for St. John yesterday, was denied.

In the first place, every one knows that under the constitution of that commission, under the Inquiries Act, the commissioner is himself representative of the people of this country. It is his business to make an investigation on behalf not of the Conservative party but of all the people of Canada. In that duty he was assisted by Mr. John Thompson, K.C., of the city of Ottawa, a son of a former Prime Minister of this country. The duty of Mr. Thompson, as the duty of the Commissioner, was, not to represent a mere political party, but to investigate anything within the purview of the commission brought before its attention for investigation, and investigate it to the bottom, on behalf of the Canadian people. Mr. Thompson represented the Liberal party as he represented the Conservative party—or rather he represented neither but represented the whole people of Canada apart from all political parties. Therefore, the commissioner took the view that if Mr. Taylor were allowed to represent the Liberal party before the Commission he would infringe upon the duties assigned to Mr. Thompson. Let me draw the attention of the House to the clause of the Act referring to this matter. I should not have to do that, for the wording of the Act is as well known to the hon. member for St. John as it is to me. The hon. member knows well that under that Act it was no part of the duty of the Commission to allow any attorney to take part in its proceedings except the attorney representing the people, as Mr. Thompson did, or the attorney representing any person charged with an offence. The Act is clear and precise in its terms in that regard. Here is the clause:

> The commissioners may allow any person whose conduct is being investigated under this Act, and shall allow any person against whom any charge is made in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

These are the limits of the powers of the Commission, and acting within these limits His Lordship Chief Justice Davidson felt that he was bound to refuse the application of Mr. Taylor.

Now, is Commissioner Sir Charles Davidson to be subjected to attack in this House because he acted within the limits of his powers? Is he, because he gave effect to the law, to be attacked in this House? We remember that the conduct of Sir Charles Davidson in this inquiry has met the approval not only of Conservatives but of Liberals as well. Sir Charles Davidson has not been criticised by any responsible Liberal paper in Canada, but on the contrary they have commended his non-partisan impartiality.

The hon. member for St. John chooses to characterize that investigation as shallow; he chooses to attack not only the commissioner, but Mr. Thompson, K.C., as well. He says of that honoured counsel—who has

given his services free to the people of Canada—that he did not know enough to ask questions that would have appealed to a mere student-at-law. Those are the references of the hon. member for St. John to these two gentlemen. Let me, on the other hand, point the hon. member for St. John to the opinion expressed not by the Conservative journals but by the Liberal journals of this country. I refer particularly to that journal which, at all events outside the city of Ottawa, is the most outstanding Liberal organ in Canada, the Toronto Globe. Here is what the Toronto Globe says of the work of Sir Charles Davidson, who is denounced by the hon. member for Carleton as a whitewasher, and who is blackwashed—in the words of the Free Press—by the hon. member for St. John. I quote from an editorial in the issue of the Globe of Nov. 30 last:

To-morrow morning, at the Toronto City Hall, Sir Charles Davidson, as Commissioner by appointment of the Dominion Government, will continue his investigation of such charges of wrongdoing in the procuring of military supplies as may be brought to his attention. There can be no fault found with the way in which Sir Charles has discharged his by no means pleasant duty for several months past. He has been fair to leniency with every accused vendor or go-between brought before him, but he has also displayed the keen insight of a trained jurist and the moral courage of a stern judge in exposing actual wrong-doing and reprobating deliberately fraudulent conspirators.

If he has done that, wherein has he offended?

That none of those so condemned have yet been sent to jail is not his fault. In his work he has had valuable professional aid from the Government counsel, Mr. Thompson—

The gentleman who, in the opinion of the hon. member for St. John, has not the knowledge of a schoolboy in law.

—Mr. Thompson, whose duties are just as onerous and as important as those of the Commissioner.

And they proceed to urge that certain war contracts should be investigated by that commission. Those who were present at the investigation were quite sure that they were sifted to the bottom, much to the discomfiture of the men who made the charge.

In a later issue, that of December 4 last, after the investigation at Toronto had been concluded, the Globe comes forward with words of approbation for Sir Charles Davidson. They have evidently been reading some journals which, in language as indefinite and vague as in many cases it was meaningless, complained about the country reeking with scandal, and about the blush of shame being on this man and on that, just as did the hon. member for St. John. Here is what the Globe says—and I commend this very good advice to the hon. member for St. John himself. The Globe makes reference not to the Shell Committee, but to other war contracts made out of the money of the Canadian people:

There should be, and we have no doubt there will be, Government investigation of the matter, and there should be retroactive legislation which will enable the Government to confiscate any proven undue profits. Meanwhile, to a number of Liberal newspapers which harp on the subject and claim to have exact knowledge, we may point out that the Davidson Commission exists for the purpose of investigating all war contracts, and that any private individual can place charges before the Commission and have them examined without cost to himself. There will probably be Government investigation; but if any of our newspaper friends are impatient or dubious, and know what they say they do, they don't need to wait for Government action.

In substantiation, or in supposed substantiation, of his attack upon the Davidson Commission, the hon. member for St. John made use of the following language in his speech of the 18th instant and I am compelled to put practically all of it on Hansard. He passes from one subject to another, expressing at first his surprise and then his amazement that there had been no inquiry into this subject and into that subject, naming them one after the other. I am going to name these subjects, and I am going to refer to the evidence and to ask the House to come to a conclusion as to whether the hon. member for St. John is now the only one who should express amazement. The hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) said:

I watched with considerable interest the newspapers in Vancouver when I happened to be there for a day or two, to see whether it would occur to the gentleman who represented this Conservative Government, the Government with which Sir Richard McBride is, or was, so closely allied before a certain event took place; I watched to see whether any question would be asked of Mr. Logan as to how it was that he had carried on the negotiation for the purchase of submarines for a fortnight and yet did not know what the price was to be, and why he simply whistled over the telephone when he found that the enormous price of $1,150,000 was named.

Will it surprise the House first to learn that the evidence clearly shows that Mr. Logan did not carry on any negotiations for a fortnight, or anything of the kind? Will it surprise the House, in the next place to find from the evidence that Mr. Logan had been asked, and asked repeated-

ly, the very question which the hon. member for St. John complains that he had never been asked? I am sorry to have to delay the House with what must be a rather dull proceeding, but I cannot make the reply that should be made to the hon. member without doing so. I quote from the evidence. I am informed that the evidence has been handed to the Opposition—at all events to the leader of the Opposition—and, consequently should be at the disposal of his followers in the same way as it was at mine, which was only yesterday. Mr. Logan tells about sitting in a club in the city of Victoria when there were some gentlemen present, including Mr. Paterson, who had been the engineer or president of the Seattle Construction Company, which had been engaged in the actual work of constructing the submarines. Mr. Logan was asked:

Q. Try to recollect, please, who else was present?—A. I cannot say, I think H. B. Thompson was there, the Lieutenant Governor J. V. Paterson, I. W. Paterson, Mr. Harry Bullen, and myself. Paterson mentioned incidentally that he had a pair of submarines that we could get if we wanted, but there was not much said about it. Then later on—

Q. Did you ask him the price?—A. No, I did not say anything at all about it.

Q. Did anybody ask him the price?—A. No.

Q. Are you quite sure?—A. Yes.

Q. Paterson said somebody asked him the price and he did not know?—A. I did not ask him; somebody may have said something about it, but I did not hear.

Q. Were you not curious to know the price?—A. No.

Q. Not in any way?—A. No.

Q. Although you had been talking about submarines?—A. We were only talking generally on these vessels, they are out of my line. I am in the merchant service.

Q. Yes, but you had a conversation with Paterson, when we were evidently on the break of war, and as I understand it you were discussing submarines?—A. We were discussing the probability of the war, not the submarines.

Q. And Paterson said he had two submarines?—A. He said he had a couple of submarines which Canada could have if they wanted to.

Q. You do not recollect anybody asking what the price was?—A. No, I do not recollect that at all. On the Sunday, just preceding the fourth of August, I think it was the second of August, I was sitting in my house when I got a telephone message from a man named Kay.

Now it is clear that all he had known of the matter up to this point was that some time before, in a club in Victoria, he had heard Mr. Paterson say to a number of friends around the table that there were two submarines there that the country could secure, and that, not being an expert in this line or knowing anything about it, he had made no inquiry about the price.

He was asked repeatedly about it, and in every case the answer was that as he knew nothing about the price he made no inquiry. The next thing he knew about it was on the Sunday before the declaration of war, when he was called upon at his house by a telephone message from Mr. Kay. He states that he did not know Kay, but that Kay had been in the court room, and he was asked to say what took place.

Q. Is he here to-day?—A. I do not know, there will be some one present in the Court who knows him.

Q. Well proceed.—A. That man telephoned to me and asked me if I didn't think we should form a citizens' committee to wait upon Sir Richard McBride and urge on him to buy a battleship in Valparaiso from Chile, and I told him I thought the idea was absurd. When I got down to my office the next morning, I telephoned over to Sir Richard McBride and told him about these two submarines.

That was on the Sunday before the declaration of war. All that had occurred before that was simply a club conversation, at which Paterson suggested that there were these submarines down there which might be obtained. Then he goes on and tells about the proceedings that followed:

Q. With whom did you return?—A. With Mr. Barnard and the Hon. Mr. Burrell. We had a meeting in the Premier's office just about lunch time, and Mr. Bowser was there and I think Mr. Ross.

Q. What Mr. Ross?—A. The Hon. Mr. Ross, one of the provincial ministers. At that meeting I was asked if I knew the price of these submarines, and I told them I did not, and I was urged to give an idea of the cost of these boats and I said: as to cost I would say $375,000 each, but I had absolutely no knowledge of the cost of submarines, and I made that very clear at the time.

But still the hon. gentleman says that no reason at all was given why this man did not know the cost of submarines until he was later told by Mr. Paterson over the telephone:

Q. Why did you talk of $375,000 apiece?—A. Because I knew that was about the cost of a destroyer, but I had no knowledge at all of the cost of a submarine.

What better reason a man could give, I am at a loss to understand. Then he tells about going down to the naval yard at Esquimalt with Mr. Burrell and Lieut. Pilcher:

We discussed the question of submarines being required. It became apparent that they were required and the question of price again cropped up.

Q. How did it crop up?—A. I think Mr. Burrell or Lieut. Pilcher, I am not sure which asked me, but anyway I know it did crop up, and I telephoned from that office to Mr. Paterson to ask him the price of these boats.

and that is when Patterson replied and stated the price at just the price which was paid, which was adhered to from beginning to end, $1,150,000. That does appear to be something of an answer to the allegation of the hon. member for St. John, that no questions were asked as to why this man, who, he said, had been conducting negotiations for two weeks, did not know what the price was until the last.

Then what is the next complaint?

I was struck with amazement to find that when Mr. Paterson, the man who had been in Seattle when the submarines were tested, and when the experts of the Chilian Government refused to accept them—I was struck with amazement to find that he was not asked as to the nature of the test, or as to how the submarines acted under the test.

It will be no surprise to the House to learn, and I will substantiate it from the evidence, that Paterson was asked as to the test and gave his evidence as to the test and how the submarines acted under it. Inquiry was made, most prolonged inquiry. This thing was investigated from place to place, and witness after witness, every witness I should think the wit of man could call to mind, was examined fully on all these points. I quote from the evidence.

Q. Had any asserted inefficiency of these vessels anything to do with the non-possession of them by Chili?

Perhaps, to make this clear, I had better review this phase of the subject. The Chilian Government had defaulted in their contract to purchase the submarines at $818,000, and the commissioner was trying to ascertain the reason of the default. It was shown that they were about $150,000 behind and had made some complaint, through their engineers, that the vessels were deficient in buoyancy which, if I understand rightly from the evidence, is the power of the vessel to speedily come to the surface after being submerged; and the commissioner was endeavouring, and endeavoured through page after page, to ascertain whether or not there was ground of complaint on the part of the Chilian Government as to this buoyancy, and whether or not that was the real cause of their not taking up their contract and, therefore, whether or not they were willingly relieved of the contract and glad to get their money back. Mr. Paterson, in that connection, gave this evidence.

Q. Had any asserted inefficiency of these vessels anything to do with their non-possession by Chili?—A. No.

Sir Charles Davidson: In no sense whatever?—A. I do not know what you mean by "in no sense." What I mean is this. It is the same thing as if you were to take the Princess Charlotte there on a draft of water to carry 1,000 tons and the owners came to a clause in the contract which said they were to carry stores for two months, and they said stores for two months amount to five thousand tons, and you will have to put on five thousand tons. The Chilian Government said that stores for two months amounted to so many tons.

Sir Charles Davidson: Do you mean actually that number of tons?

The Witness: No, that is merely by way of illustration, they put the weight on corresponding to that amount and they said: "Run your trial trips," and they ran their trial trips and they dived and performed it, but they did not come up with the speed that they should have come up and they did not perform their function with the speed that they would have performed it in had they been in a fighting condition.

Sir Charles Davidson: Was it in consequence of that that they refused them?

The Witness: No. They would have taken them anyway, they would gladly have taken them if they could pay them. But that was their official protection against our enforcing the contract which would have made them pay, and by the by, with regard to the price of these boats—

And so on. He goes on talking about the price and how cheap they were. So he was there stating what the real kernel of the difficulty appeared to be, namely that the Chilian Government interpreted the contract as involving enough stores to run the boats for two months, and that with such stores on board, as he explained more fully later on, the boats did not come to the surface with the buoyancy desired; but that no such stores as that would be loaded on for the purposes of battle for which they were intended. There was no difficulty or complaint as to the buoyancy at all.

Mr. PARDEE: As I understand they had paid for the boats to within $130,000 of the purchase price.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Approximately.

Mr. PARDEE: Progress estimates had been paid up to $130,000, so that was all that the Chilian Government defaulted upon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is stated in the evidence $150,000, but it was in that neighbourhood. Just in that connection it is remarkable that the hon. member for Lambton knows just how much the Chilian Government had paid.

Mr. PARDEE: You said so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not yet; why does he know? Because the evidence was given. If the hon. member for Lambton had heard the hon. member for St. John yesterday he

would have known that that hon. member said that nothing was asked as to what the Chilian Government paid.

Then the examination of Paterson goes on:

Mr. Thompson: There is a letter from J. W. Paterson addressed to Sir Richard McBride, and printed at pages 21, 22 and 23 of this blue book. This is what Mr. Paterson says:

It is untrue that the boats are in any way less efficient than their design provided for. It is true the Chilian commission reported the boats as not satisfactory, but that does not mean what Mr. Pugsley tried to show. It really means that the boats, loaded with a quantity of stores and provisions far beyond what they were designed for or could reasonably be expected to carry in war service, did not function so rapidly as in the fighting condition for which they were designed.

It is true that the contract with the contractors gave the Chilians the right to load the vessels in this way, but that is the fault of the terms of the contract and not the defect of the boats as fighting submarines, and it was for fighting that I sold the vessels and you bought them to fight, and not to carry cargoes of provisions.

Mr. PARDEE: In other words, they were no good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend poses as an expert on submarines. I do not suppose he knows that experts were called upon to examine the submarines and that every expert, without a single exception, pronounced them to be efficient in every respect.

Mr. PARDEE: Except that they would not rise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will have a chance to speak, but I say that there was not a witness whose evidence I have read but says—

Mr. PARDEE: That they would not come up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was not a witness who complained of the buoyancy of those submarines. Admiral Kingsmill's evidence will show that. Who is the gentleman to whose evidence my hon. friend refers?

Mr. PARDEE: You have read it. They would not rise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly they would not rise if loaded with too many tons of mere freight and neither would the hon. gentleman if he were so loaded. For the purposes for which they were purchased by this Government the submarines were pronounced by every expert to be efficient in every particular. But the point I am meeting is this—and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) had better keep it in mind—the hon. member for St. John asserted, on his responsibility as a member of Parliament, that no question was asked as to what test the submarines were put to, or as to how they came through the test. The evidence shows that such questions were asked. The hon. member for Lambton says they would not rise. He is in conflict with the hon. member for St. John, but the important thing for Parliament to remember is that a member of this House, on his responsibility as a member, affects to give information to this House when the record shows that that information is entirely incorrect, and on the basis of that information, on the basis of the facts embodied in that information he undertakes to level a charge against an honoured member of the Bench of Canada, Sir Charles Piers Davidson.

An hon. MEMBER: Go on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am willing to go on as far as my hon. friend wants me to go. What was the next complaint of the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley)?

I was amazed to find that no question had been asked of Sir Richard McBride, or of Mr. Paterson as to the grounds on which the latter had represented that the Chilian Government were not able to pay for the submarines.

Well, now, the amazement of my hon. friend the member for St. John must really have been appalling. Here was Mr. Paterson, the president of a construction company, an engineer I think who had to do with the work of constructing submarines, and the hon. member for St. John is dumb with amazement because that gentleman was not asked as to the financial capabilities of the Government of Chili. Does the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee)share his amazement? Would he expect Mr. Paterson to be an expert on the financial capabilities of the Chilian government?

Mr. PARDEE: Does the hon. gentlemen expect us in this House, or the people of Canada, to believe that when there was only $150,000 left to be paid on those submarines, the Chilian Government was so bankrupt that they would default on that amount of money after paying the rest?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It all depends on whether they wanted the submarines or not. They may have been very anxious and very glad to get the money back; the evidence indicates that they were. But how are we concerned with that? The question is, was it advisable for the Government of Canada to buy those submarines, and were they bought in a clean and honest way? As a matter of fact, the president of the

construction company did undertake to give evidence on that point, but he was not asked regarding it, because it would have been foolish for anyone to think that the evidence he would give would be anything but hearsay. At all events he undertook to give evidence as to the desire of the Chilian Government to get away from their contract on some technical difficulty, and to get their money back. But with that we have no concern, except in so far as it flatly contradicts the assertion of the hon. member for St. John. That hon. gentleman was amazed a little more.

> I was amazed to find that the Commissioner had not asked him whether or not the Chilian Government had practically paid the whole amount of the contract price before the inspection and rejection took place.

The hon. member for Lambton now refutes the hon. member for St. John and asserts that there is evidence to show that the Chilian Government had paid $700,000.

Mr. PARDEE: I did not refute it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He asserts that they got $700,000 back and some $14,000 of interest as well.

Mr. PARDEE: I did not refute that charge at all. I simply asked the hon. gentleman a question as to whether or not, after paying the amount on progress estimates, the Chilian Government would default for $150,000. I did not refute the charge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend just a few minutes ago—

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. member admitted it himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member stated that the Chilian Government (who had agreed to pay $818,000) were only about $150,000 behind. Where did he get that information except from the evidence?

Mr. PARDEE: From my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it was before I said a word about it that my hon. friend mentioned that.

Mr. PARDEE: My hon. friend read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. Before I reached the subject, and I appeal to Hansard for confirmation, and my memory is pretty accurate—

Mr. PARDEE: Is it true?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true, and the hon. member knew from the evidence that it was true that they had paid all but $150,000, What they had paid they got back. But the hon. member for St. John is filled with unutterable amazement and asserts that they were never asked the question at all. The hon. member for St. John went on:

> But further, I was surprised to find that none of these gentlemen were asked to explain why three cheques were given, why a draft on a Seattle bank was given, and why the amount was divided into two sums, one of which was a note amounting to $500,000 and the other was for the balance out of which the bank charges and exchange were taken.

Well, this is on a par with the rest. In the first place, his facts are incorrect. There were two drafts signed, and subsequently a cheque for some $29,000 that had been in dispute between Mr. Paterson and the Boat Company. But Mr. Paterson was asked the question, and he gave the reason. Does my hon. friend want me to quote it; I have it here in the evidence. Mr. Paterson explained that it was entirely a private matter with himself; that he did not know at the time how much was owing to the Company in respect of the building of the submarines; that he remitted the first draft for $500,000; that he discussed the matter with the bank manager before remitting; that one cheque was given him for the submarines, and that out of it he paid the first draft, not knowing what was owing by the Electric Boat Company in Seattle; that subsequently there was a dispute as to whether the commission should be $40,000 or $70,000, that he remitted the $29,000 odd which was the sum in dispute as to commission, less the exchange, and that that ended the whole matter. But what is to be thought of an hon. member of this House who, in the face of that evidence of Mr. Paterson, solemnly states to Parliament that no question was asked as to why this money was divided.

Furthermore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) goes on to say:

> Not one single question was asked in regard to that. All that was asked of these witnesses was: did you pay any graft in Canada? did you pay any graft or commission to anybody in Canada? Well, possibly my hon. friend is satisfied.

Now, I undertake that in at least ten places in the evidence I can show that, not only Mr. Paterson, but witness after witness, was asked as to the disposition of every dollar of that money, that every dollar of it was traced to its ultimate destination, and each witness in the most absolute and unreserved terms stated that

not a cent of commission was paid to anybody in Canada or elsewhere, except the $40,000 which Mr. Paterson got; every dollar of which he says he kept to himself, except what he paid for expenses.

The evidence is complete, the evidence of Mr. Frost, vice-president of the Electric Boat Company, the evidence of Mr. Taylor, the auditor of the company, the evidence of Mr. Paterson, the evidence of the president of the Electric Boat Company, and all agree, in response to repeated questions by the commissioner and Mr. Thompson, that not a cent of commission or anything else was paid to any person in this country or anywhere else, or to any association in this country or anyhere else, and that everything in connection with the purchase was regular in every particular. In the face of that, the hon. member states that all they were asked was simply the question: Was any graft paid in Canada?

Mr. PARDEE: What was the contract price that was to be paid by the Chilian Government for these submarines?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I gave that.

Mr. PARDEE: And what was the price we paid for them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I also gave that, but I know the hurry that the hon. gentleman is in to get away from the reckless charges of his associate from the city of St. John. I have already told the House that the Chilian Government's price was $818,000, that the price paid by the Government of Canada was $1,150,000, and I will read the hon. gentleman the evidence if he wants it. The evidence, not only of the Seattle Construction Company, which built these boats, but the evidence of the officials of the Electric Boat Company, who were the owners and who engaged the Seattle company to build them, is that at the price they were selling them for to the Chilian Government there was a loss to them of approximately $100,000 apiece; that is to say, that the cost of construction to the Electric Boat Company was approximately $818,000. They gave an explanation to the Commission, and it was that they had quoted this price below the actual value of the submarines, for the definite and business-like purpose, namely this:—The Chilian Government were only then undertaking the purchase of submarines on a large scale, a Commission had been appointed by the Chilian Government which had only got under way, and they were anxious that their type of submarines should be the type accepted by that Commission, and in the words of a witness, this price was fixed by them as a bait, as it were, in order to induce the Chilian Government to adopt their submarines. Furthermore, it was said, that the Chilian Government, in the course of the construction, adhered so rigidly, and, as they considered, so unreasonably, to the terms of the contract in regard to the tonnage that the submarines were to carry, that the cost had reached a figure that was unnecessary and one that was higher than a more reasonable interpretation of the terms of the contract would have entailed.

9 p.m.

Mr. PARDEE: And this was from a bankrupt government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never said they were bankrupt.

Mr. PARDEE: Does the hon. gentleman claim that they were?

An hon. MEMBER: He said so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I never said so at all.

Mr. PARDEE: You said that they could not pay for them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like the hon. gentleman to read Hansard to-morrow, and then reveal to me the state of his conscience. I know nothing about the financial condition of the Chilian government. I know that they did not fulfil the contract, that a considerable row was raised by them over losing the boats—whether it was sincerely raised or not I do not know—that they took their money back and the general weight of the evidence would appear to be, although I do not pretend to give any verdict on the evidence, that they were not displeased at getting it.

At all events, evidence was further taken to show the value of these submarines and the way they operated after they became the property of this Government. The evidence of Admiral Kingsmill, the evidence of the officers of the Electric Boat Company, the evidence of the experts on both sides of the line, was given and, as far as I have been able to read that evidence, I have found many to agree and I have found none to differ, all accepting the opinion that the boats, under the conditions of war, were bought exceedingly cheaply, and that if delay had occurred they undoubtedly would have been obtained only at a larger price. The evidence of Admiral Kingsmill is most emphatic that in their actual working out they have answered to every test and that with the exception

of minor defects of no major importance whatever, they have been perfect in every respect, and that even assuming some minor and very unimportant defects they have been efficient in every particular and have answered all the purposes for which they were bought.

I have failed to find a single criticism of the price that was paid. While I am not the Commissioner, and while I refuse to make any statement as to what may be his findings, still there does appear, in so far as the Government is concerned, to have been ample cause for congratulation that they were able to procure these vessels at the time they did, at the price they did, and under the conditions they did.

In the face of the attempt made before this House by the hon. member for St. John, to impugn Sir Charles Davidson and his commission, and to impugn this Government, in the face of the assertions he made specifically as to the evidence before the Commissioner, the questions asked and the evidence as actually quoted by me from the documents, I ask, is it any wonder when he railed at me, and asked me if I was satisfied, that I replied to him in the terms I did? Is it any wonder that, being asked if I was satisfied, after he had made these statements as to the evidence, I exceeded the bounds of parliamentary decorum? Yes, there is cause for amazement in this House, cause for even greater amazement than that expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) but the amazement must be on the part of every hon. member of this House and over the conduct of the hon. member for St. John himself.

I have only this to say before I sit down, that the Government does not ask, and does not expect, immunity from criticism. On the whole, so far during this session, I do not think there is cause for complaint as to the character of the criticism offered by the hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had speeches on the Opposition side of the House every one of which has been critical. We have had the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), he, who, perhaps, of all other hon. gentlemen opposite wields the brightest sword behind the leader of the Opposition, a speech critical, line after line, from the commencement to the close, but a speech that was evidently animated by the highest motives and which was intended to assist this country, and which certainly did not have its root in any sordid ambition for the loaves and fishes of office. We had similar speeches from the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and from the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and, in what I have felt it my duty to say in regard to the address of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) I do not wish any words of mine to apply in general to the Liberal party in this House. I isolate him, or rather I do not isolate him, because he, by his own speech, isolated himself, for I do not believe he enjoyed, in the making of that speech, either the sympathy or support of the Liberal party in general, or as represented in this House.

It is to the credit of journalism in Canada that one of the most prominent, if not the most prominent Liberal organ in this country, that is the Liberal organ at the capital itself, at the very time he was making the second part of his address, denounced his utterances as unpatriotic and denounced him as seeking to serve a party and not a patriotic cause, and as acting unworthily as a member of Parliament, at the time at which he spoke. Whatever may be the course of this session, whatever may be done, there is no desire on the part of the Government, and it would be most unreasonable for the Government to ask it, that it be immune from criticism. But it seems to me that it would be only just to accord to the Government, under the circumstances, a freedom from purely partisan criticism which is not too desirable in even ordinary times, but which is little short of treachery now. It is reasonable to ask that we should be freed from those demagogic arts, from those partisan devices, from those appeals to class and race, which, bad as they are in ordinary times, are worse than bad to-day. We ask for fair and honourable criticism. Criticism intended to be a benefit will assist Parliament and the party from which it emanates and it will not do harm to the Government as a Government. At all events if it does harm, it is only the harm which is deserved.

Now I have said all I purpose to say, and the time which I have occupied I believe involves an apology to the House. I believe, however, that words of mine, although they may have been in part severe, are deserved by the hon. member against whom they are addressed, and if perhaps now I have gone in severity further than I intended to go, it could scarcely have been avoided, having regard to the grounds that moved me in so doing.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested, and I am sure every member of this House was interested in hearing the statement made by the right hon. the First Minister when he rose to reply to the leader of the Opposition in this debate. I have reference to the observations made by the Prime Minister as to his visit to the battlefront during the past year. We were all interested in hearing what was being done in Canada for the purpose of furthering the interest of the Allies in this great war, as we were interested in hearing from the lips of the Prime Minister the plans which he has for further advancing the interest of the Allies.

I was very proud to reflect that, coming from the province of Nova Scotia, I could bear testimony to the fact that Nova Scotia has been bearing her full share in contributing men and money towards the great needs set forth by the various organizations in the interest of the entente belligerents. The province of Nova Scotia up to the present time has contributed over 12,000 men to the armies of the Allies. That represents more than two and a quarter per cent of the total population of Nova Scotia, and fully ten per cent of those of military age, and the work of enlistment is still going on. If the right hon. the Prime Minister makes a call to the people of Canada for another quarter of a million men, I have no doubt that the province of Nova Scotia will be found equally ready to contribute its share.

As I speak of the province of Nova Scotia, my thoughts naturally revert to that section of the province from which I come —I refer to the island of Cape Breton. I believe there is no section of Canada—and I do not desire to make any invidious comparisons—that has contributed more men to the allied forces than the island of Cape Breton, and the supply of men who are willing to place themselves under the colours and to assist the other armies of the Allies in the future is not by any means exhausted. Not only have the men of Nova Scotia contributed towards the success of the Allies, but the women are contributing as well. In every city, town, hamlet and village, aye, in every farmhouse and in the abode of every fisherman and mine worker in the province, there is work going on for the purpose of relieving the inconveniences and of adding to the comforts of the soldiers at the front. Red cross work is going on in every section of the province. Early in the war the Hon. Mr. Murray, Premier of Nova Scotia, sent out a call to the people of he province to contribute to the Belgian relief fund. That call was handsomely responded to, and the province of Nova Scotia takes its place in the front rank of those sections of Canada that have listened to and heeded the voice of those who are in need as the result of the war which is now being waged. Nova Scotia is not a rich province, and the contributions made by its inhabitants are in many instances being felt. Sacrifices are being made on every hand by the people of the province, and the watchword of economy sent forth to the people of Canada by the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) is practised in the greatest degree in Nova Scotia. We know that the cost of living is going up by leaps and bounds, while the earnings of a large proportion of our people are decreasing in the same ratio. It is extremely difficult for many of our people who are engaged in day labour to make ends meet, and they are under all these circumstances, considering the members of the families which this class of people have contributed to the war, perhaps making greater sacrifices than those more happily circumstanced. But if economy is to be the watchword, and if it is only by the practice of the most rigid economy that we can hope that the people of this country will be able to bear their reasonable proportion of the expense resultant from this war, the example is not being set for us by the Government of Canada. The Government of which the Minister of Finance is such a distinguished member is not doing its share in the practice of economy and thus relieve as far as possible the burdens of the people. I take the record of the Post Office Department, recently published. The expenditure of the department from 1912 up to 1915 has increased enormously. During the last fiscal year the expenses of the department have gone to $15,961,191, an increase of some $4,000,000 over and above that which was spent a few years ago. In 1912, there was a surplus of $1,310,219. On the 31st of March, 1915, there was a deficit of $2,914,-541. In 1913, there was a surplus of $1,177,-000. In 1914, there was a surplus of $134,-137. In 1911-12, the net revenue of the Post Office Department was $10,482,255. In 1915, the net revenue was $13,046,000, so that the enormous deficit of the Post Office Department during the last fiscal year is not due to any decrease in the revenue of

that department, but to the unwarranted expenditure embarked upon by the late Postmaster General. The revenue increased by 30 per cent while the expenditure increased by 75 per cent. We have some explanation for the extraordinary increase that has taken place in this department in the fact that during the past four years, while there were 1,507 employees dismissed and 3,860 who tendered their resignations—which I am bound to say in this connection is a euphemism, as the resignations were compelled—or a total of those who resigned and who were dismissed of 5,357, there were appointed in their places no less a number than 9,903 officials. Therefore there are now 4,546 employees in the Post Office Department in this year more than there were four years ago. Therefore if economy is so essential to the welfare of the country in the present crisis, the Post Office Department has not set a good example to the people of Canada.

The expenditure in the Department of Public Works for the last five years is as follows:

1910-11	$11,807,035
1911-12	13,928,666
1912-13	18,844,224
1913-14	27,991,436
1914-15	29,283,316

That is to say, in a year after the war had broken out, and while economy is preached by the Finance Minister to the common people in Canada, "economy" was practised by his colleague of the Department of Public Works in such a way that the expenditure was about two millions of dollars more than for the previous year. I understand that a small reduction is made in the fiscal year 1915-16, but that it amounts only to about three million dollars. So I think there is great scope for the exercise of economy on the part of these two important departments of government.

There is another respect in which, I think, this Government might exercise economy and thus lighten the burdens that the tax-payer will be called upon to bear. At this session of Parliament we shall be called upon to provide another enormous sum of money, by either direct or indirect taxation. The subject of the economy to which I refer is the Hudson Bay railway and terminals. These were estimated to cost $17,000,000, and I understand that up to the present time the expenditure on this head has amounted to about $7,000,000. I am bound to say, there is a very wide divergence of opinion as to the advisability of carrying on that undertaking. I do not know upon what data the construction of the Hudson Bay railway took form in the mind of the late ministry. The plan was conceived, I understand, some years ago, and it was urged upon the ground that it was necessary to complete the road, not only in order to open up a large and fertile section of Canada, but also to afford another outlet for the export of Canadian grain. A great many things have happened in Canada since the inception of this work. For one thing, the Government of the United States has offered to give free access to the markets of that country for the farmers of the Canadian West. It is not now necessary to expend vast sums of money in order to secure an outlet for the products of the Canadian farmers. The Government can very readily provide another outlet by simply agreeing to take down the barriers in this respect that exist between the two countries. And, as to the Hudson Bay railway as a colonization road, the same necessity does not exist for it as existed some years ago. We know that up to 1911 a great stream of immigration flowed into Canada from all the countries of Europe, and not only did Europeans come, but some of the very best citizens of the United States found it to their advantage to take up their household goods and move across the boundary into the Canadian West. Unfortunately, for reasons which I shall not discuss at this time, immigration has fallen off to such a degree that it has reached the vanishing point. There is no expectation that in the near future there will be a very large influx of imigrants into this country. Therefore, the necessity for a colonization road is not urgent at this time. I would appeal to hon. gentlemen sitting upon the Treasury benches to spend no more money upon the Hudson Bay railway until the conditions in Canada are more favourable and the people are better able to bear the burden of extra taxation than they are at this time.

But I have another reason to urge why the expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway should cease. I have before me the report made by Mr. Anderson, who, I understand, was in charge of the Hudson bay survey during the past year. From the report I read:

> When the Acadia arrived off Cape Chidley, on the 19th of July, open water was visible from aloft, and the steamer Bonaventure, some miles to the northward, reported similar conditions. The ice, for the most part, appeared to be win-

ter ice, probably from Hudson and Ungava bays. Although occasional bergs and arctic ice were seen, the main pack of arctic ice had passed to the southward. "Winter ice" means ice one year old, but "Arctic" or "polar" ice may be two or many years old, and consequently much heavier and harder.

The constant easterly winds held the field ice packed, making further progress impossible until 31st July, when the wind veered to the westward and finally blew a full gale from the N.N.West, opening up the pack. Conditions were not so severe after this date, but until the latter part of August great fields were continually passing out, part of which returned with the flood tide, partially obstructing the passage.

It was specially noticed that the greater portion of this heavy pack ice drifted towards the south side of the entrance about Cape Chidley and the Button islands, rather than to Resolution island, and, with the strong tidal currents, making it a dangerous locality for any steamer attempting a passage. During the ebb tide the ice pack may become well opened, affording good leads, but on the change of tide it would close up with great pressure in places.

A couple of years ago a powerful Newfoundland steel sealing steamer was caught and received a very bad nip.

During July, 1913, a small auxiliary schooner, being caught in this locality, received such pressure that oil tanks in her hold were burst. The crew abandoned the ship and took refuge on the ice, but on the change of tide, when the pressure slackened, the ice opened up again, and as the ship appeared still seaworthy, owing to her staunch construction, the crew returned on board and managed to clear the ice pack before the next tide.

On the other hand, towards the north side of the entrance, about Resolution island, although the tidal currents were found just as strong, the ice appeared lighter and much honeycombed, probably some that had been carried out on the south side by one tide and returned by the next.

Entering with much ice, about the best passage has generally been found close to Hatton headland and along the north shore. Careful note should be taken of the direction of the wind. A fresh south wind would drive the ice to the northward when a mid-channel course would be the better one to take.

As already mentioned, navigation would have been greatly impeded by ice until the end of August for vessels entering the strait from the east, and from early in October entering from the west, because Fox channel ice began to appear at the west entrance about the latter date, greatly interfering with vessels.

The Acadia, leaving Hudson bay on October 15th, found the passage between Diggs and Nottingham islands about closed, and was forced to pass the night in the ice pack. On the following morning the change of tide opened the pack sufficiently to allow passage, and all ice was cleared about ten miles past Eric cove. Cape Chidley was cleared for the season on the 2nd of November with no ice in sight.

During the past season, after the middle of September, snow storms were the order of the day, and this, taken in conjunction with the ice condition detailed above, rendered the period during which ordinary tramp steamers could have navigated the strait with safety very limited.

Owing to the great masses of ice to be encountered and the difficulty of finding the best lead, hydroplanes operated in connection with the wireless stations might be used with good results, to inform captains concerning the disposition of the ice and where they may find open leads. These would be particularly useful in the autumn at the passage between Diggs and Nottingham islands. It is submitted that they might be more useful than the seagoing tugs hitherto suggested. The information would be obtained much more quickly, with no danger of being caught in the ice. On the other hand, there would be the danger of an accident occurring and the crew of the machine being cast away on an ice flow. In the autumn frequent snow storms and heavy winds might hamper the operation of these machines, and in the spring fogs caused by the sun on ice fields would certainly be a drawback.

Ice conditions in James Bay.

The prevailing northerly winds in Hudson bay during the early summer drive all the field ice to the south end of the bay, very effectually closing up the entrance to James bay until the latter part of August or first of September. This ice consists chiefly of winter ice, although icebergs and Fox channel ice have been found. During the season of 1912 the powerful steel sealing steamer Beothic reported having encountered heavy Fox channel ice and many bergs in this locality about the middle of August, and a period of 8 days was spent in forcing a passage. Strong northerly currents were also reported when abreast Cape Henrietta Maria, making considerable motion in the ice fields that greatly increased the danger. It is quite unusual to find strong currents in this locality, but they were probably caused by a constant northerly wind forcing the water into James bay.

An ordinary tramp steamer would stand a poor chance of escaping injury under similar circumstances, and it would not be well to attempt this region until the latter part of August or early in September. The closing of James bay, for the season, may be taken about the middle of November, as weather conditions are much similar to Hudson bay.

Here we have the report made by an officer of the department sent out specially to investigate the matter, and he reported the fact that Hudson bay is safe for navigation only for a period of about two months in the year. I ask: Is the need for another outlet for our wheat so urgent, or the need for opening up more territory for the settler so pressing, that in the face of the enormous burden we are called upon to bear, we should be expected to continue the operations that have been carried on on the Hudson Bay railway and terminals for the last two years? I spoke to a young man in my own constituency who worked on Hudson bay last year. He told me that in the latter part of August he went on board a steamer to return to his home, and that when they were two days out they were held up for nine days in the ice. I am bound to say that from all the evidence which I have been able to gather, this

country, under the present circumstances, would not be justified in embarking upon any further expenditure in respect of the Hudson Bay railway or terminals. I trust that the Government will heed the criticism that is being made in many parts of the country, and will, for the present at least, eliminate from the estimates to be submitted to Parliament by the Finance Minister, any item of further expenditure in that direction.

We have had a very interesting discussion during the last two or three days on the subject of shells and the manufacture of shells in Canada. This war has given rise to many new industries in Canada, and the manufacture of shells is one of the largest and most important of them. I was very much interested in the address delivered by the Solicitor General (Hon. Arthur Meighen) this afternoon, in which he endeavoured to defend the actions of the Shell Committee in respect of certain contracts which were let for the manufacture of shells during the last year and a half. While the Solicitor General admitted that the price of shells was in some respects somewhat high, he excused the exorbitance of the price by saying that new plants had to be established, and that, for the purpose of defraying the cost of these new plants, it was necessary that the prices in the first contracts awarded should be somewhat high. I have here a statement which I will quote from a New York despatch dated November 15 last:

> A letter written by Sir Henry M. Pellatt, president of the Steel and Radiation Company, Limited, of Canada, has been received in the financial district naming prices being paid for certain classes of shells in Canada. A contract for 100,000 eighteen pound shrapnel shells was mentioned as obtained by that company at a price of $3.80 per shell, and this order was renewed at the same figure. Another contract also renewed called for 100,000 eighteen-pound explosive shells at $4 each.
>
> The first and second contracts will be completed about January 31, 1916, after which renewals of the first contract will be completed every four months and renewals of the second contract about every three months.
>
> On each of the first two contracts and on the renewals, the letter said, the profits were estimated at $200,000. The third contract should turn in profits, the letter stated, of $250,000.
>
> Further renewals of the contract, said the letter, will probably be at gradually shaded prices, but as against this we are gradually reducing costs month by month. Our rejected shells are now less than ⅞ of 1 per cent of our output.

Here we have a statement made through Sir Henry Pellatt, the president of this large and important manufacturing company, that the profits upon these shells amounted to $2 each, not only in respect of the first contract, but in respect of first renewals and all subsequent renewals as well, upon which he avers that the profits amounted to at least $200,000, and in one case to $250,000. I think it would be well for the hon. Solicitor General to get close to his friend, Sir Henry Pellatt, and tell him that the only justification or defence that he could think of for the exorbitance and greed of shell contractors was that it was necessary to pay the first cost of erecting their plant, and say to him that that is no longer a justification for continuing to manufacture shells at that price, inasmuch as the original cost must long since have been paid.

The Solicitor General has endeavoured to get the Government away from the responsibility for the conduct of the Shell Committee upon the ground that it is a creation of the Imperial Government. In a few moments I shall refer to that subject, but for the moment I desire to say that on the 20th day of December, 1915, referring to orders of shells from the United States, Mr. David Lloyd George said:

> David A. Thomas comes back speaking in the highest possible terms of the service rendered this country by J. P. Morgan and Company, not merely in the selection of firms for contracts, as in fact they saved us many millions of pounds by their efforts to reduce the inflated prices prevailing before they took the matter in hand.

It just struck me, on reading that paragraph, that it is most unfortunate that the Shell Committee of Canada came in for no encomiums from Mr. Lloyd George in the language that he addressed to the Morgan Company. I am quite sure that Mr. Lloyd George would have been glad to pay a similar compliment to the Shell Committee in Canada, were they deserving of it. But it is well known all over this country that the Shell Committee, as constituted here in Canada, instead of endeavouring to reduce the price of shells to the Government of Great Britain, were actually a party to enhancing the price of shells so that certain particular friends might reap the benefit. The Solicitor-General stated that the Shell Committee was a creature of the British Government, and that this Government have nothing to do with it, and that, therefore, this Parliament has no right to investigate their actions or inquire into the disposition of any moneys that passed through their hands. I have here Hansard of last session for the month of April, and turning to page 2614 I find a state-

ment made to this House by the right hon. Prime Minister. After referring to certain investigations which took place in the Public Accounts Committee during the last session, he said:

But, nevertheless, I realize, and I think all members of the Government realize, the Minister of Militia himself realizes, that that department was not organized to perform the enormous amount of work that is imposed upon it at present. What has been the course taken by the Mother Country under similar conditions? In respect of such matters, the course taken by the Government of the Mother Country has been to call to the aid of the Government the best business ability of the country. The business men of that country have responded and splendid results have been thus obtained. The Minister of Militia himself, it is only just to say, at least two or three months ago brought this question before Council and urged upon Council the advisability of having his department assisted in this regard by a committee of three business men. In respect of some other matters, the Minister of Militia has taken a course along that line which has brought about most excellent results.

If the House will pardon me—my remarks have been extended beyond what I had at first contemplated—I wish to place before Parliament the record of what has been accomplished by the committee appointed in this country to fill orders which the British Government desired to place here, if they could be placed in Canada, for the supply of munitions. A committee was formed by the Minister of Militia in the early stages of the war, consisting at that time of Col. A. Bertram, Chairman; Thos. Cantley, Esq.; Geo. W. Watts, Esq.; E. Carnegie, Esq., representing the manufacturers; Col. T. Benson, Master General of Ordnance, Col. Greville Harston, Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition; and Lt.-Col. F. D. Lafferty, R.C.A., Superintendent of the Dominion Arsenal, representing the Department of Militia and Defence.

Here we have the history of the formation of the Shell Committee which the Solicitor-General was ungracious enough to repudiate this afternoon. The right hon. Prime Minister at the same time stated that he had asked the Chairman of that committee to prepare a report of their work for the purpose of showing what was being done by a business organization of that character, and he placed upon Hansard the report of the committee. I shall not read it all, but from the opening to the closing sentences of that report there is evidence, which cannot be controverted for a single moment, that this committee was brought into being by the present Government and by the Minister of Militia and Defence. It says:

On the 8th of September, 1914, at a meeting held by the Minister at the Dominion Arsenal, the following committee was appointed to organize the work throughout the Dominion.

This is the committee in respect of which the Solicitor General read a letter written by Mr. Hitchens some time ago.

Another paragraph of this report says:

Perhaps an equally important decision was the appointment of an inspection company to deal with all shell components; this has taken the entire responsibility of inspection from the shell assembling manufacturers, and has also given the shell committee the opportunity of satisfying themselves beyond any doubt that the component parts of shells are correct before the finished shell passes into the hands of the Government inspector.

Many other minor details regarding insurance, shipping, financing, etc., were decided, which have proved to be of great help in carrying on the work of the committee.

4.—Executive Work.

The executive work of the committee has been very wisely entrusted to the chairman, Colonel Bertram, who reports weekly to the Minister of Militia and also to the committee when it meets (which is usually monthly) or more often, at the call of the minister.

The work consists of controlling what might be regarded as a huge combination of factories, in which various contracts are being executed to British War Office specifications, which entails constant attention and queries regarding the selection of suitable factories, the placing of contracts, instructing manufacturers in the art, inspecting the parts made, and the payment and auditing of accounts, etc.

Before contracts are placed, the ability of the firm to carry out the work is fully investigated. If there is any question as to their plant being unsuitable, a competent inspector is sent to report upon the state of the factory.

To safeguard the interests of the committee and to insure the work being carried out in accordance to promise, contracts are placed subject to concellation, if not carried out promptly.

Each manufacturer is supplied with a set of inspection gauges as a guide in making the manufacturing gauges required. They are kept to check the working gauges, and are the property of the committee.

The preparation of drawings of the gauges for the various component parts of the different shells manufactured and the preparation of gauges and their distribution and use, involve a considerable amount of labour.

The inspection of the various component parts, including the analyses of material, various physical tests calling for the employment of over 146 inspectors, besides four chief inspectors, show in some measure the nature and extent of this part of the work. Most of the inspectors employed are experienced machinists and tool makers, who can be trusted to carry out the work thoroughly.

The final inspection of the finished shell is carried out by an army of nearly 200 examiners and district inspectors, under the direction of the chief inspector of arms and ammunition.

On receipt of a certificate that the shells have passed examination and have been packed ready for shipment, payment is made to the manufacturer.

A chartered accountant recommended by the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, checks the accounts of the committee every month. These are then forwarded to Mr. J. W. Borden, chief accountant for the Militia Department. It might be said in passing that

the committee's accountant has expressed himself in gratifying terms of the highly efficient way in which the accounts of the committee are kept.

5.—Shell Contracts.

When it became generally known that shells were being manufactured successfully, the demands for contracts from all classes of manufacturers were very numerous, and it became necessary to inspect the factories to decide which were suitable for undertaking the work. Visits were made to them, and it was found that a large number of additional factories could be usefully employed.

The ordnance advisor reported this matter and indicated how many more shells could be undertaken. The Minister of Militia called a meeting of the committee at Ottawa, and, after discussing the matter, cabled to Lord Kitchner, pointing out that much larger contracts could be undertaken by the manufacturers in Canada. He emphasized the fact that many works were standing idle in the Dominion, while contracts were being placed in the United States for shells by the British War Office. This resulted in additional contracts for 18-pr. fixed ammunition, complete without fuses and empty 18-pr. shrapnel shells.

It was proposed by several of the manufacturers that a deputation from the committee should be sent to the War Office, London, to put their claims before the Secretary of State for War. The Minister of Militia decided, on the recommendation of the committee, to send Mr. David Carnegie, as he was familiar with the whole situation. It was also decided that he should visit Woolwich Arsenal and obtain the latest information on the various details in the manufacture of complete ammunition.

The result of his visit has been fully reported to the Minister of Militia, but it might be briefly stated here that the War Office officials did not fully understand the nature and importance of the committee's work, and had no idea that the factories in Canada were capable of undertaking such contracts, until these facts were placed before them.

Mr. Carnegie presented to the Master General of the Ordnance, General Sir Von-Donop, K.C.B., one of the first shrapnel shells made entirely of Canadian materials, excepting the copper band. He also informed the various officials at the War Office that it was the intention of the Minister of Militia and his committee to make ultimately the copper bands in Canada. As a result of this visit, several additional large contracts have been placed with the committee.

The only material not made in Canada is copper, which, however, is mined and smelted in the Dominion and subsequently sent to the United States for refining.

Miscellaneous.

In addition to the foregoing, the Minister of Militia, through his committee, has made several investigations for the War Office in connection with the supply of propellants and high explosives. An investigation was undertaken regarding the supply of nitro-cellulose powder by a large firm in the United States. Other matters have been investigated, such as the supply of rifles and ammunition for the Russian Government.

I should like to know by what process this committee, over night, had its authority transferred from the Canadian Government to the War Office in England. The only defence the Solicitor General attempted to make, by way of answer to the hon. member for St. John that a committee be appointed to investigate the transactions carried on by this committee, was that the committee was appointed by the British Government, it was a committee over which this Government had no control. And he went further—and here I am at a loss to understand how an agile mind like that of the Solicitor General sometimes lapses—and he made the admission that if it were shown that any member of the Government was responsible for this committee in any way, an inquiry would have to be granted. I trust that the Solicitor General will not require further coaxing or cajoling on the part of hon. member for St. John or any other member of this House, but that he will advise his colleagues in the Cabinet that it is up to them to grant a committee to inquire into the purchases by this commission because I, by reading these remarks made by the Prime Minister in his place in the House a year ago, have brought the appointment and control of this committee directly home to the Minister of Militia. Do we want any further proof that the Shell Committee is an adjunct to the patronage dispensing department of this Government? Is it not well known all over Canada that it has been absolutely impossible to get a contract for shells from the committee unless the applicants had the endorsation of certain Conservatives in the sections of country from which they came? It is well known that—

Mr. ROGERS: That is a very strong statement and I beg to take objection to it because it is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. KYTE: I have so often seen the virtuous indignation depicted on the face of the hon. Minister of Public Works in respect to wrong-doings in the party of which he is such an ornament, that I am not impressed with his interruption to-night. It is well known that in eastern Canada one of the largest steel manufacturing companies of this country was obliged to go around, week after week and month after month, beseeching the privilege of manufacturing shells, and it was not until officials of that company were able to enlist the sympathy of certain prominent Conservatives in Toronto that that concern succeeded in getting a contract.

Then what about the question of the appointment of shell inspectors? I have

just read, from the report of the shell committee which was read to this House during the last session of Parliament by the Prime Minister, that they appointed a special committee for shell inspection. Let us see how these shell inspectors were appointed. The Solicitor General seems to be very much surprised that the appointment of shell inspectors was a part of the party patronage of this Government throughout this country. I have in my hand certain correspondence which passed between the Conservative candidate in my riding at the last election and the Conservative candidate in my riding at the next election, relative to the appointment of an inspector of shells. The first letter is as follows:

Glace Bay, C.B., July 29, 1915.

Joseph A. Gillies, Esq., Barrister, etc.,
Sydney, C.B.

Dear Mr. Gillies,—I have your favour under date of June 28th, with reference to the application of the above-noted for a position as inspection of shell steel. I have to-day written Mr. ———, as you suggest, and am also placing the case before the Borden Club, through whose hands all Sydney recommendations must be made.

Thanking you for your interest in the matter,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) John C. Douglas.

I am sure it comes as a shock to the Minister of Public Works to learn that the appointment of shell inspectors is a matter of party patronage in the province of Nova Scotia. Mr. Douglas is the Conservative candidate in South Cape Breton for the next election, and is at present a member of the local legislature for Cape Breton.

The second letter which I have is as follows:

Glace Bay, C.B.,
June 29, 1915.

Sydney, N.S.

Dear Mr. :—

Mr. J. A. Gillies has written me recommending that you be given an appointment as Inspector of Shell Steel at Sydney. As I have advised Mr. Gillies, I have also to advise you that all recommendations for Sydney positions must be made through the Borden Club.

I have referred your application to that body, and will be pleased to act on their advices at any time such a vacancy occurs.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) John C. Douglas.

Here under this Shell Committee, which was appointed by the Minister of Militia but which has just been repudiated by the Solicitor General and said by him to have been appointed by the War Office in England for the purpose of having shells manufactured in Canada at the lowest price and under the best conditions, we have the spectacle of the inspectors being recommended by the Borden Club, which club has made this Shell Committee an adjunct to the political patronage of the county of Cape Breton. And I have another letter——

Mr. J. D. REID: Give us the name of a man who was appointed on the recommendation of that club.

Mr. KYTE: If I were to give a name I would expect the man would be dismissed from his position inside of forty-eight hours.

Mr. REID: I say that the hon. member cannot give a name.

Mr. KYTE: Inasmuch as the Minister of Customs does not know whether I can or not, his statement is not of very much value. (Reads.)

Sydney, C.B., June 30, 1915.

Mr. ———
Sydney, N.S.

Dear Sir,—I am to-day in receipt of the enclosed letter received from Mr. Douglas in reply to mine of the 28th, written in your behalf, making application for the position of inspector of shell steel. From the enclosed you will see that Mr. Douglas has acted upon suggestion, namely, that he should write yourself so that you might see that he was interesting himself in the matter.

I hope to see you get the position. I will see the president of the Borden Club and will urge upon him to have you strongly recommended for the appointment.

Trusting that you may get this position, and wishing to see you from time to time, I remain,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) J. A. Gillies.

Now, I would like to know what position the president of the Borden Club in Sydney is in to judge of the efficiency or capacity of a man to discharge the duties of shell inspector. I cannot recall at this moment who the president of the Borden Club is, but I do know that that very honourable and respectable position has been held in the past by a lawyer, by a doctor, and by a merchant. I have no doubt that the position is filled at the present time by one or other of the classes I have mentioned. But is it not a most humiliating spectacle, if the statement of the Solicitor-General is true, to find that a committee appointed by the Imperial Government upon the recommendation of the Minister of Militia and Defence to discharge the important and serious duties of purchasing and manufacturing shells in Canada must depend for the inspection of those shells upon recommen-

dations made by the Borden Club? And that is the situation all through. Do we need any other evidence of partisanship in the administration of the Department of Militia and Defence? Why, it was only yesterday that I read in an Ottawa paper that the privilege of shaving the chins of volunteers in Lansdowne Park last summer could not be awarded to a barber in Ottawa unless he had a certificate from the dispenser of political patronage. I also know that in a small town in the province of Nova Scotia, the privilege of washing the soiled linen of the soldiers in a small encampment of volunteers was awarded to the man who now enjoys that important bit of patronage by the Conservate candidate in the riding. The captain in charge did not think it of very much consequence what particular laundryman washed the soiled linen of the company under his command, and he sent the laundry to a laundryman who was a Liberal. Immediately afterwards the captain was sent for by the dispenser of political patronage, the Conservative candidate, and was asked to immediately transfer the laundry to another laundryman. The captain of the company asked why it was necessary to make a change, and the patronage dispenser said, "it is not for you to ask; it is for you to obey."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have other instances to show that so far as the Militia Department is concerned, the whole province of Nova Scotia is reeking with partisanship. Take for instance the recruiting officers. I stated a moment ago that Nova Scotia was nobly doing her duty in the matter of sending recruits to the front. I know that there is only one privilege practically allowed to Liberals in the province of Nova Scotia, and that is to fight in the trenches. But the commissions are very rigidly guarded by the dispensers of Government patronage in the province. I cannot recall at the present moment the name of one Liberal in the province who is a recruiting officer. There may be, I would not say absolutely that there are no Liberal recruiting officers in Nova Scotia, but at the present moment I cannot recall the name of one. I do know, however, a gentleman in the province of Nova Scotia whose only son was among the first to enlist, and who has been fighting in the trenches for the last eighteen months, bearing all the fatigues and all the discomforts and all the dangers that pertain to life in the trenches—that man was sincerely and honestly interested in the Allies' cause and desirous that Nova Scotia should give the best of her men to the great cause. He attended several recruiting meetings in the province of Nova Scotia, and I say that without exception he is the most effective recruiting officer that I have ever heard in my life. After a meeting that I attended was over, I asked him if he was employed or commissioned by the Department of Militia and Defence to act as a recruiting officer. He said: "No, I am not." He added, "I am doing this because my heart is in the work. I was told that the department would appoint me if I got a recommendation from a certain man responsible for the patronage in that part of the country, but I said I would not do so." And he was not appointed.

Take the question of medical officers in Nova Scotia. There may be some Liberal medical men in that province who have received commissions from the Department of Militia and Defence but at the present moment I cannot recall the name of one. I speak of course of those who have joined the service since war broke out. I do know of one who belonged to the militia of Nova Scotia for many years as a medical officer to a particular regiment, and whose position has not been taken from him. He is still a medical officer under the Department of Militia and Defence, but apart from that case, I cannot recall a single Liberal medical officer in the Province of Nova Scotia who is attached to the forces at the present time. I do know, however, several Liberal medical men who are anxious to do their bit in the great war that is now going on, but they were refused commissions in the Canadian forces, and were obliged to apply to the War Office in London and became attached to units of the Imperial aramy. That is absolutely true. I could name half a dozen Liberal medical men who are attached to the Imperial forces under these circumstances. The right hon the Prime Minister realizes as every hon. member of this House realizes the importance of this country being united in this war. Why, Sir, so impressed has this Government become upon the subject of unity among our people that they have swallowed themselves on the question of holding an election. Instead of being in favour of an election now, as certain prominent members of the ministry were in favour of an election in June last, we have this paragraph placed in the speech with which His Royal Highness the Gover-

nor- General opened this session of Parliament:

> The life of the present Parliament expires in the autumn of this year, and, under existing legislation a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisors, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

Keep our people united; have no divisions and no distractions such as would follow in the wake of a general election. That is the cry at the present moment. Mr. Speaker, I question very much the sincerity of certain hon. gentlemen when they speak of the advisability of having a united country. Do they realize that they have divided the Liberals and Conservatives if not all over Canada, certainly in the province of Nova Scotia, on the question of the war. Why is it that none but young Conservatives are recommended for positions in the army? Why is it that none but Conservatives are appointed as recruiting officers? Why is it that none but Conservatives are appointed as medical officers? If the Government desires to keep the people united, I would suggest to the Minister of Militia and Defence that he appoint a few Liberal officers before he gets very much older or carries on the work of the department very much longer.

These are only a few instances that I might recite of the manner in which the administration of the Militia Department is carried on in the province of Nova Scotia. The whole fabric is reeking with shameless and inexcusable partisanship from the one end of the province to the other. It is up to the Minister of Militia to remedy that condition, and I think I am able to say, and say with confidence, that if we have not had more recruits in Nova Scotia it may be because of the unfortunate divisions that have been made amongst the people in that province in respect to the appointments that I have mentioned.

There are several other matters that I intended to refer to, but I have already exceeded the limit of my time. Now, there is one more subject that I am going to deal with and then I am done. Last session we had an investigation in the Public Accounts Committee which resulted in the disclosure of scandals that were absolutely unheard of, taking into account the circumstances under which these scandals were fostered in this country. We do know that two hon. members of this House, when it was suggested that they had been implicated in dealing in supplies for the Militia Department, stood up and indignantly denied the accusation. We know what happened, we know the investigation that took place in the Public Accounts Committee, and we know that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) found it incumbent upon himself to read both of these hon .gentlemen out of the party and out of this House. Here is the language used by the right hon. gentleman on that occasion:

> An delt me say now, for the benefit of Parliament, and particularly for the information of persons throughout this country who may be concerned in selling supplies or materials to the Government account, if any man in Canada, be he Conservative or Liberal, purposes to commit any fraud or imposition upon the Government and people of this country, or to be concerned in any attempt for that purpose, especially in connection with the war vote, he should remember that there are courts of justice in this country and that the doors of the penitentiary are opening for every person who commits such an offense.

I think the Prime Minister stated when he addressed the House the other day that there had been some three prosecutions and one conviction for frauds committed upon the Government. I was not aware that there were three prosecutions. I am aware that there was one prosecution in Regina a few months ago and that a conviction resulted from that prosecution. If others have taken place in the criminal courts, I am not aware of it. Further, the Prime Minister said, speaking of the case of the late member for Kings, Nova Scotia.

> But I am bound to say that his (Mr. Foster's) explanation to me of his undertaking the duty and his explanation—if it could be called an explanation—of his failure to supervise in the most careful manner the expenditure of that money and to bring back to the Government an exact account, with vouchers of every dollar that has been expended must be regarded as far from satisfactory.
>
> Therefore, in respect of the honourable members for Carleton, and in respect to the honourable member for Kings, N.S., I feel that I owe it as a duty to the Government of which I am the head of the party, of which in Federal affairs I am the leader, and to this House, and to this county, to express, as I do here express, my firm disapproval of their conduct in respect of the matters which have been under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee.

That is the declaration which, I believe, resulted in these two hon. gentlemen sending in their resignations to your predecessor, Mr. Speaker. It is well known that the counties of Carleton, Ont., and Kings, N.S., are unrepresented at the present time

in the House of Commons. But the Conservative party in Kings, N.S., met in annual meeting a few weeks ago, and I will read for the information of this House what the Conservative party in Kings County thinks of the repudiation of their member by the Prime Minister:

Kentville, January 6—The annual meeting of the Kings county Liberal-Conservative association was held this afternoon at the court house. After the usual routine business was finished, the president invited DeWitt Foster to address the meeting. At the close of a powerful address on the war and Canada's participation in it, the following resolution was moved by Councillor C. R. Nichols, seconded by Councillor W. A. Reid, and carried amid three cheers and a tiger:

"Resolved that the Liberal-Conservative Association of Kings county, in annual meeting assembled, take this opportunity to express its appreciation of the untiring efforts put forth by A. DeWitt Foster, in the interests of the county and to record its unbounded confidence in his integrity and ability to successfully and creditably represent Kings county in federal affairs."

Now we have the pot fairly bristling over. The Prime Minister, in indignant tones, read the member for Kings out of the party last year and the Conservative press of this country claimed great credit for him for his sturdy manliness, in determining to rid the Conservative party of all grafters and wrong-doers and for having actually read Mr. Foster out of the party. There has been no election held in Kings but I understand that if an election is called the Conservative party in Kings, living up to their resolution, will name Mr. A. DeWitt Foster as their candidate because they consider him good enough to support this Government in Parliament. What ground have I for making that assumption? There is a precedent for it. We know what happened in the province of New Brunswick a few years ago. We know that Mr. J. K. Flemming, the Premier of New Brunswick, was the subject of accusations in regard to certain peculations in which he indulged in respect to the owners of timber limits of that province. He was deposed from the leadership of his party in provincial affairs, he was driven out of the public life of the province, but the Conservative party in federal affairs, a very short time afterwards, named him their candidate in Carleton county for the House of Commons because they thought that, although he was not good enough for provincial politics, he was good enough to associate with the ministers who form this Government. I cite this instance to show the insincerity of certain elements supporting the Conservative party in this Dominion. Recalling the professions made by the First Minister and his promise to prosecute until he had landed in the penitentiary those who had been guilty of wrong-doing, I would not say that the situation of this country was so critical, but in view of what has taken place in the past, in view of what we are sure will take place in the future, the only safety, the only assurance that the people can possibly have that this Government will carry on more economically, more honestly and more in the public interest the affairs with which they have been entrusted is in the appointment of a committee of this House for the purpose of investigating every dollar of public expenditure, not only in respect to shells, but in respect to supplies of every kind and description purchased by the Government during the last eighteen months. Not until this report is presented to Parliament and the Government prove by their actions that they mean what they say, will suspicion be allayed and confidence be restored.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

Friday, January 21, 1916.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 3, respecting the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 4, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 6, to confirm certain agreements made between the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 7, respecting the Farnham and Granby Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 8, respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 9, respecting the Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate "Les Soeurs de l'Assomption de la Sainte-Vierge.—Mr. Lemieux.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

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

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs:

Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blondin,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boys,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Antigonish).
Crothers,
Demers,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Fripp,
German,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lamarche,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lemieux,
Maclean (Halifax),
Marcile (Bagot),
Munson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Patenaude,
Porter,
Rainville,
Robidoux,
Ross,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tremain, and
Wilson (Laval).—36

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Carroll,
Cash,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Delisle,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Green,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.),
Law,
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
Marshall,
Martin (Regina),
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Porter,
Pugsley,
Rhodes,
Rochon,
Schaffner,
Sharpe,
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Stevens,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Wallace,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alta.),
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—119.

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

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs:

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Ball,
Blondin,
Boulay,
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Broder,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke (Wellington),
Davidson,
Devlin,
Ethier,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fripp,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Glass,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lavallée,
Macdonell,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. M.),
Mondou,
Morris,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paul,
Perley (Sir George),
Porter,
Proulx,
Reid,
Robb,
Ross,
Scott,
Sharpe,
Shepherd,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thoburn,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Walker, and
White (Renfrew).—64.

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

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Barrette,
Best,
Boulay,
Burrell,
Chabot,
Cromwell,
Doherty,
Fortier,
Hazen,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
Marcile (Bagot),
Michaud,
Morris,
Paquet,
Paul,
Rhodes,
Roche,
Scott,
Seguin,
Stanfield,
Turgeon,
Verville, and
White (Sir Thomas).—31.

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

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs:

Bickerdike,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Brouillard,
Cardin,
Chabot,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Wellington),
Currie,
Douglas,
Elliott,
Graham,
Gray,
Lavallée,
L'Espérance,
Martin (Montreal, St. M.),
Middlebro,
Murphy,
Nicholson,
Roche,
Rochon,
Stevens,
Verville,
White (Victoria, Alta), and
Wilson (Wentworth).—25.

No. 5.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs:

Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blain,
Boyce,
Boys,
Carvell,
Casgrain,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Invernes),
Clarke (Essex),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Fripp,
German,
Green,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kay,
Kemp,
Kyte,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
Marshall,
Martin (Montreal, Ste. M.),
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid,
Robidoux,
Rogers,
Scott,
Sinclair,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Tobin,
Tremain,
Truax,
White (Sir Thomas), and
Wilcox.—63.

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

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs:

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Baker,
Ball,
Barnard,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Best,
Bickerdike,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Broder,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Currie,
Demers,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Fowler,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Glass,
Graham,
Gray,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Henderson,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Law,
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marshall,
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Perley (Sir George),
Porter,
Power,
Pugsley,
Rainville,
Rhodes,
Robb,
Roche,
Rochon,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe,
Sinclair,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel, and
White (Sir Thomas)—96

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

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.)
Arthurs,
Ball,
Best,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Broder,
Brouillard
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Cash,
Champagne,

Chisholm (Antigonish), Chisholm (Inverness), Clark (Red Deer), Clarke (Wellington), Cromwell, Cruise, Currie, Delisle, Donaldson, Douglas, Edwards, Elliot, Fortier, Gauthier (Gaspé), Gauvreau, Girard, Glass, Gordon, Graham, Guilbault, Hanna, Hartt, Henderson, Hughes (Sir Sam), Kay, Lanctôt, Lewis, Lovell, McCoig, McCrea, McLean (Queens, P.E.I.), MacNutt, McMillan, Marcile (Bagôt), Marshall, Meighen, Merner, Molloy, Morphy, Morris, Morrison, Munson, Neely, Oliver, Pacaud, Paquet, Paul, Proulx, Robb, Roche, Ross, Schaffner, Scott, Seguin, Sexsmith, Sharpe, Sinclair, Smith, Steele, Stewart (Lunenburg), Sutherland, Taylor, Thoburn, Thompson (Yukon), Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Thornton, Tremain, Truax, Turriff, Walker, Wallace, Warnock, Webster, Weichel, White (Renfrew), Wilcox, Wilson (Laval), Wilson (Wentworth), and Wright.—95.

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

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs

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

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

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs

Arthurs, Blondin, Carrick, Carroll, Chisholm (Antigonish), Cochrane, Cockshutt, Devlin, Douglas, Green, Guilbault, Hartt, Hepburn, Lalor, Law, Lemieux, Lewis, Loggie, Lovell, Macdonald, McMillan, Marcil (Bonaventure), Merner, Mondou, Nesbitt, Osler (Sir Edmund), Sexsmith, Shepherd, Smith, Smyth, Thompson (Yukon), Turriff, and Walker.—33.

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

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs

Ames (Sir Herbert, Barette, Béland, Bellemare, Blain, Bourassa, Bowman, Brabazon, Champagne, Charlton, Cochrane, Cromwell, Cruise, Davidson, Donaldson, Ethier, Green, Henderson, Michaud, Munson, Osler (Sir Edmund), Patenaude, Perley (Sir George), Rogers, Stewart (Hamilton), Thoburn, Warnock, Webster, White (Victoria, Alta.), Wilson (Laval), and Wright.—31.

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

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Burnham, Descarries, Devlin, Foster (Sir George), Gray, Hanna, Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.), Lavallée, Lemieux, Marcil (Bonaventure), Perley (Sir George), Rainville, Schaffner, and Taylor.—14.

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

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs

Béland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer, Broder, Casgrain, Clark (Bruce), Copp, Crothers, Doherty, Foster (Sir George), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee, and Pugsley.—16.

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

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records, with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messrs. Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Cardin, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliot, Graham, Gray, Lavallée, L'Espérance, Martin (Montreal, Ste. Marie), Middleboro, Murphy, Nicholson, Roche, Rochon, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson (Wentworth), will act as members on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer, Broder, Casgrain, Clark (Bruce), Copp, Crothers, Doherty, Foster (Sir George), Laurier(Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee and Pugsley, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Messrs. Fripp, Pardee, Ross and Stanfield be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. PUGSLEY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: I desire to speak on a question of privilege. I had not the pleasure of being in the House yesterday when my hon. friend the Solicitor General spoke, but I observe that he regretted my absence, and pointed out that he had been present while I spoke. I can assure my hon. friend that my absence was not caused by any want of desire to hear him. I had understood that my hon. friend was to follow me, but the distinguished and able debater from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) was put up so as to give my hon. friend breathing time. If I had known my hon. friend was going to speak yesterday I should have made my engagements to suit. My hon. friend made an extraordinary statement yesterday with reference to the shell matter, which I think it is my duty to call to the attention of the House. It appears on page 129 of Hansard, as follows:

Here is the way it is put upon Hansard, doubtless for distribution throughout the length and breadth of Canada:

I was quoting from the speech of Mr. Thomas:

"That must be considered, and I may tell you that the cost of shells in Canada has been higher than in competitive countries. It is complained that fat orders have gone to the United States, but I can assure you that a big slice will be reserved for Canada as long as the price is fairly satisfactory. The prices so far have been far higher than in the United States or in Great Britain."

Then, the Solicitor General proceeds to say:

Strange that that should be the way that it appears in Hansard in the speech of the hon. member for St. John, when the words in the quotation from which he read distinctly say "that the prices have been higher than in the United States."

The fair inference from that is that I read an extract to this House which was altered in Hansard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY:—at my instance, I presume, for the purpose of being circulated broadcast throughout Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The fair inference from the words of the Solicitor General is that I read what purported to be an extract from the speech of Mr. Thomas, and that it was altered in Hansard for distribution throughout the length and breadth of Canada, so as to give a faulty impression of what Mr. Thomas had said. The extract as I read it to the House was sent to Hansard word for word, without any alteration. I did not see any member of the

Hansard staff upon the subject; I had no communication directly or indirectly with any member of the staff, and the error which occurred occurred in Hansard and without any fault of mine. As I read the extract, so I sent it out to Hansard with other memoranda for which the Hansard reporter asked. I noticed the mistake when I read over my speech in the Unrevised Hansard, and I immediately corrected it, striking out the word "far," and sent the correction for the Revised Hansard, before my attention was called to the remarks of the Solicitor General.

With regard to the matter of the purchase of submarines, my hon. friend, very unfairly I thought, sought to convey the impression that when I made the statement to the House that to my surprise certain matters had been left uninvestigated, that certain questions had been left unanswered, I at that time had in my possession a copy of the evidence taken by the commission; because my hon. friend is reported to have made this statement, which appears on page 137 of Hansard:

> I quote from the evidence. I am informed that the evidence has been handed to the Opposition—at all events to the leader of the Opposition—and, consequently should be at the disposal of his followers in the same way as it was at mine, which was only yesterday.

Now, Sir, the day when I spoke on the subject of submarines was the day before my hon. friend had himself obtained the evidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was that I had received it yesterday.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I had not seen the evidence; I had not heard of it, and I presumed it would not be available for anybody until the official report was brought down and submitted to the House. That is the time when we have a right to expect the evidence and when I expected that it would be brought down, and I very much suspect that, after I had made my remarks with regard to the submarines, my hon. friend took pains to get the evidence, and in all probability he had a copy of it sent to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, but it was done after I had made my remarks.

Mr. hon. friend did me an injustice in another respect when he sought to convey the impression that I had been guilty of very great unfairness in not quoting correctly the examination by Mr. Thompson before the commissioner with regard to the test.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I rise to a point of order. This is no question of privilege whatever. The hon. gentleman is endeavouring to make a reply to my speech. He is distinctly out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all. The hon. gentleman went on to attack me. He stated that I had been guilty of conduct which in truth he could not describe as the conduct of a gentleman. Before he closed, it is true, he said he had made remarks which he had not intended to make, and which were unparliamentary or might be unparliamentary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am addressing His Honour now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I understand that the hon. member for St. John is speaking in order to correct some remarks which were made by the hon. Solicitor General, and, according to the practice followed in this House, as can be seen in Bourinot, I think that the hon. member for St. John can proceed with his remarks.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend sought to convey the impression that I knew when I made those remarks that the commissioner had inquired very carefully into the test which had been made of the submarines, and he quoted from the evidence, as reported on page 139 of Hansard. My hon. friend sought to convey the impression that Mr. Paterson had stated what the test was. An examination of the evidence as submitted by my hon. friend shows that no such test as the hon. member speaks of was made, and therefore it shows that his attack on me as misrepresenting the test is entirely unfounded. My hon. friend proceeded to say that there was evidence that there were tests, and one would infer from his remarks that the test required the submarines to be weighted down to the extent of 5,000 tons. If we read the evidence, we find that Mr. Paterson only mentions 5,000 tons as an illustration of what the contract might require. When I call the attention of the House to the fact that the total displacement of the submarines is only 313 tons each, hon. members will see how unfair my hon. friend was when he said that there had been a full examination as to the actual tests that had been made, and that I was unfair in my remarks.

I am only going to speak of these few matters, because from one you may judge all. My hon. friend says that I was entirely

wrong and unfair to this House when I stated that Mr. Logan had not been thoroughly interrogated as to his connection with this matter. Just a word as to that. When Mr. Thompson entered upon that examination, he must have had—presumably he would have, he ought to have had—that return.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. member for St. John is trespassing beyond the question of privilege.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If, Sir, you will just allow me to reply. I based my remarks upon the return which was made to Parliament, and I said I had been amazed to find that there had been no inquiry into Mr. Logan's connection with the matter. Do you not remember, Sir, that I mentioned the fact that I watched to see whether any question would be asked of Mr. Logan as to why he whistled over the telephone when the price of $1,150,000 was named?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not a personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am addressing the House on a point of order.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would rise to a point of order also. This is the queerest personal explanation I have ever listened to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member for St. John will keep to the question of privilege.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I said with regard to the perfunctory examination of Captain Logan was said with the knowledge that the Order in Council passed by the British Columbia Government, which you will find at page 9 of the correspondence relating to the purchase of two submarines for the Canadian Government, contained these words:

> Victoria, August 21, 1914.
>
> In pursuance of negotiations conducted for some time previously, Captain W. H. Logan, of Lloyds, made arrangements with Mr. J. V. Paterson, general manager of the Electric Boat Company, Seattle, for the purchase of two submarines.

There is also the fact that Captain Logan had put in a bill to this Government which they paid, I believe, and which hon. gentlemen will find at page 32, as follows:

To personal fees, 15 days at $25	$375
Hotel expenses, 15 days at $10	150
Transportation from Victoria to Seattle and Tacoma, five trips	22
Wires, long-distance telephone, stenographer and other incidental expenses	$50

Having knowledge of these things, I think I had a right to express amazement that Captain Logan was not questioned as to how it happened that, though he was negotiating for a period of fifteen days in relation to this matter, he had never heard of the price. That is the reason I made the statement I did, and that is the reason why I think I am right in saying that the hon. gentleman misrepresented the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite understand the hon. gentleman's explanation that he had not read the evidence—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon gentleman is speaking to a question of privilege.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just wish to accept the explanation—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let him rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) says he wishes to make a personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it according to the rules and practice of the House that an hon. member is entitled to make a personal explanation before the Orders of the Day are called.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman that he had not read the evidence. I assumed, of course, that before he complained of the evidence and based an attack on the integrity of a judge upon it, he would have read it. I now quite accept his explanation, and understand better than ever why he made that attack.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to make a personal explanation in answer to my hon. friend. Let me say that while I had not read the evidence in official form, I did read it in the press as it came out, and the newspapers contained very full reports of what occurred from day to day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Liberal Monthly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, but newspapers published in Victoria, where the examination took place. And let me say that an examination of such of the evidence as the hon .gentleman has read confirms me in

that opinion and justifies the remark I made.

WRECK OF THE PILOT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouta): I desire to read to the House telegrams received this morning concerning the total wreck of the steamer Pilot on Red Island. In reading the first of these telegrams, I wish it to be a correction of the telegram read yesterday by the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) from Mr. Thom. Mr. Thom says in this telegram:

> Forced to hire Mahone as they did nothing and she was dismantled.

I wired down to Dr. Parrot, president of the Trans-St. Laurent Navigation Co., and here is the telegram received from him this morning. In justice to the company, I think I should be allowed to read it:

> Rivière du Loup Station, Que.,
> January 21.
>
> C. A. Gauvreau, M.P.,
> Ottawa.
>
> Mahone ready twenty-four hours after accident. Arrangements made with Thompson for the rescue of passengers now safe on Red Island. An attempt to reach them failed yesterday on account of the strong wind. Will try again to-day with calm seas. Lots of ice. Mahone will live up to her reputation and will save the passengers.

This was received early this morning, and coming into this House at three o'clock to-day I was handed a telegram from Dr. Parrot, which I translate as follows:

> Passengers and crew of pilot have been all saved this morning by the Mahone.

I hope the Postmaster General will be pleased to hear that news. And, if permitted, now that the Pilot is a total wreck, I would ask the Postmaster General if he is going to give back to the Mahone—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order:

Mr. SPEAKER: These last remarks of the hon. gentleman are certainly out of order.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is only a question I wish to put, and I think that at this stage of the proceedings I have the right to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I am denied the right to ask a question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not denied the right to ask a question; that is his right and is conceded.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. GAUVREAU: I beg you to allow me to ask a question of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member has already put his question to the Postmaster General, and the case is closed.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I have no right to ask another question, then?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Then, I will come back to this question another day.

PRIVILEGE—MR. HEPBURN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BERNARD R. HEPBURN (Prince Edward): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On the 18th instant, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made certain observations in this House regarding my connection with shell contracts. On that particular evening I was not present in the Chamber, and I regret very much that the hon. gentleman did not tell me he was going to speak in regard to myself, or I would have made an extra effort to be present. On the following day I was out of the city and had not had an opportunity to bring the matter to the attention of the House until to-day. On page 76 of Hansard the hon. member for St. John is reported as saying:

> People came here from all parts of Canada, politicians, canvassing agents, committee men, influential people from different sections of the country, all clamouring for orders for shells, and among others my good friend the gentleman to whom I have referred, the member for Prince Edward County, obtained for his company a large order. His company is not engaged in the manufacture of steel. He owns a planing mill, I understand, and is engaged in the manufacture of wooden ware. I could understand if he had limited his application to shell boxes that would have been a worthy ambition which could have been fulfilled by the utilizing of his machinery. But he got an order for shells, and the people of Picton naturally supposed it would mean the creation of a local industry which might have justified him in pressing upon the Shell Committee and the Minister of Militia that he was right in using his influence to secure this order so as to enable a steel plant to be erected in my hon. friend's home town.

It is quite true that the firm of Hepburn Brothers, Limited, obtained an order for the forging and machining of shells. My brothers and myself, and my father before me, operated steamboats on the Great Lakes and river St. Lawrence for many years. In connection with that busi-

ness we maintained and operated a machine shop at Picton. We have known General Bertram, formerly chairman of the Shell Committee, for many, many years, and have transacted to our mutual satisfaction no inconsiderable amount of business with his firm. We applied to the Shell Committee for a contract for the forging and machining of shells. We were awarded a contract, not because I was a member of Parliament, but because General Bertram and the committee knew that we had a plant and could complete any contract we undertook. We believed at that time that, with certain modifications and additions, we could utilize our plant at Picton. After having obtained the order—at a price in the fixing of which we had no part, but which was at the uniform rate given to all producers of shells for the same work at that time in Eastern Canada—we discovered, on the report of a competent engineer from Montreal, that our plant at Picton could not economically be utilized in fulfilling the contract. I then obtained further expert advice, as a result of which, having regard to the point at which billets were being manufactured, and having regard also to the fact that Montreal was the labour market of Eastern Canada, we located the plant at Montreal, where we have since forged and machined shells to the satisfaction of the committee and its inspectors. I regret to say that we were unsuccessful in securing a box order, though from time to time we waited upon the Shell Commitee. I sincerely trust that when other orders are to be placed, it will not be forgotten that the firm of Hepburn Brothers have a planing mill in Picton, and that some orders will be turned our way.

The hon. member for St. John continued:

> But he got an order for shells and took it to Montreal, and the shells are being made there now in the east end of Montreal by another concern, the member for Prince Edward County being the go-between or the middleman in connection with the transaction.

These statements are absolutely incorrect. I am a new member in this Parliament. The hon. gentleman who made that statement is an old parliamentarian, and I resent very strongly the imputation that there was anything dishonest or dishonourable in connection with my relation to this contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend pardon me a moment?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to say right here that I made no suggestion—and would be sorry to say I made any suggestion— of fraud on the part of my hon. friend. I should like to disabuse his mind in that respect.

Mr. HEPBURN: I understood that the Shell Committee was letting contracts for the Imperial Government. A firm of which I am a member and a director has obtained an order for the forging and machining of shells. That work is being done by that firm, and I have been and am giving to the business of the company as careful attention as it is possible for me to do. I have made inquiry, and I have been unable to ascertain that there is any rule or custom in this House or in the Senate that prevents a member of either body from being a shareholder or director or officer of a company or corporation holding contracts with the Imperial Government. If I violated any rule or custom, I at least, have the satisfaction of knowing that others are similarly situated. It must be known to the hon. member for St. John, as it is to most members of this House, that no inconsiderable number of the members of both parties, in the Commons as well as in the Senate, are interested in companies of that kind, as shareholders, directors, and officers. I trust that one with the long parliamentary experience of the hon. member for St. John will at least do me the justice of withdrawing the imputation which he has made against me on the floor of this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have too much respect and too much regard for my hon. friend to be willing even to appear to do him an injustice. I was not finding any fault with him—not at all. The Minister of Labour may laugh, but it was with gentlemen occupying positions similar to that occupied by him—members of this Government—that I was finding fault, and with the Shell Committee. I dealt with my hon. friend's firm as a firm that was not engaged in the manufacture of steel, my point being that the Shell Committee had given orders to many people who had no plant, no machinery, and no experience in steel-manufacturing work. I made a statement also which my hon. friend says is true: that the work was not established in Picton, but in the east end of Montreal. As I explained, my hon. friend denies only the statement that I made that he was a go-between or middleman. If my hon. friend says that that is not the position he

occupied, I cheerfully accept his statement, and withdraw the statement which I made to the effect that he was a go-between or middleman. But that does not at all interfere with the argument which I was making: that the Government and the Shell Committee were to be condemned for the practice that they pursued of letting out shell contracts to people who had no plant capable of manufacturing such munitions.

THE COMMANDEERING OF WHEAT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce as to whether there will or will not be any more commandeering of wheat this winter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I should like to fill that remarkable large receptacle for information that my hon. friend carries about with him, but, in respect to the question which he has just put, I am sorry that I cannot yet find a small donation to make to that end.

INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Militia and Defence to the fact that on March 17 last I obtained an order of the House for a copy of the correspondence in connection with an order given by the Militia Department for some 30,000 shovels from the Midvale Steel Company, of Philadelphia. Although that was ten months ago, I have not yet received the papers in connection with that matter. They should not be voluminous, and I presume that if we had them they would supply information that would be useful in connection with the matters that are now before the House. I should like to know if I may expect to receive them shortly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know anything about the matter; I will look into it and bring down a return.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Thursday, January 20.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Last night, at the conclusion of the speech of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. G. W. Kyte), in pursuance of what I was informed was an understanding between the two chief whips, I moved the adjournment of the debate. You, Sir, put the motion and declared it carried. Just as you were in the act of leaving the Chair, the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. F. S. Scott), unaware that you had put the motion to which I refer, rose and moved the adjournment of the debate. Lest there should be any misunderstanding on that point, this morning I communicated with the chief Government whip and stated that I was quite willing that the usual order of debate should be followed, and that, out of regard for the hon. member for South Waterloo, whom I hold in esteem, I was willing to yield my place if he so desired. However, the chief Government whip said that both he and the hon. member for South Waterloo were agreeable that I should proceed. I make this explanation so that it may be understood why I rise first to address the House this afternoon.

If, Sir, you have not been surfeited with the congratulations that have already been extended to you from both sides of the House, perhaps I may be allowed to add my felicitations on the honour that was paid you in being selected as the first commoner of the Dominion. In doing so I desire to express my confidence that your present tenure of office will be marked by the same courtesy, by the same devotion to duty, that you displayed while acting as Deputy Speaker of this House.

To my hon. friends the members for the Yukon (Mr. Alfred Thompson) and L'Islet (Mr. E. Paquet) I desire also to extend my congratulations upon the very eloquent and acceptable way in which they discharged the duty assigned them by the Government of moving and seconding the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne.

It is eminently fitting that at the opening of another war session we should reaffirm our determination to consecrate with renewed energy all the moral and material resources of this country to the task of securing victory for the cause in defence of which so many thousands of our brave fellow countrymen have already laid down their lives. That determination on the part of the Canadian people has been asserted so often in this debate that it seems to me it would serve no purpose if I were to repeat it. I may, Sir, however, reassert that the members of the Opposi-

tion are as one with my hon. friends on the Government side of the House in their willingness to pass all necessary war legislation and to subordinate the interests of party to the needs of the nation. That unity does not by any means imply the stifling or the absence of criticism on either side of the House; for it is only by helpful criticism that measures may be perfected, past errors corrected, and future mistakes avoided. That being so, I proceed to deal with some matters that, in my judgment, are fair subjects of criticism in the public interest.

Dealing first with the larger aspect of some of the questions raised in this debate, let me say that, like the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) I too was disappointed that, in his speech, the right hon. the Prime Minister did not give the House and the country some information with regard to the invitation that was extended to him to attend a meeting of the British Coalition Government while he was in England last summer. As the right hon. gentleman has not vouchsafed any information on that subject, we may be pardoned if we discuss the incident itself and the results, if any, that are likely to flow from it, in the light only of such knowledge as we have been able to gather from the newspapers. And first let me inform you and the House as to how that incident was represented by the Toronto Daily News, in an article published in the month of September last and reproduced in part by the Ottawa Citizen on the 29th of September, 1915. The Toronto News is represented to have spoken about the incident in this fashion:

> Sir Robert Borden has lifted the Dominion out of an inferior position to equality with the Mother Country.

I am quite prepared to admit that that unqualified statement, if true, would have marked perhaps the most important step taken by this country since Confederation. The News was very definite upon the matter, and it proceeded in these terms:

> Upon journeying to the Imperial Capital to consult with the British Government, the War Office, and the Admiralty, Sir Robert was welcomed directly into the Imperial councils. For the first time in the life of the Empire a Dominion minister was received into the inner circles of the government and took a seat in the Imperial cabinet. The triumph of the policy which he has so long advocated marks a long forward step in the consolidation and re-organization of all the King's Dominions for effective defence purposes. The recognition for Canada thus obtained by the Prime Minister will be regarded by future historians of these times as a highly significant and overwhelmingly important development.

You notice that there was no qualification on the part of the News; it asserted that this forward step had been taken and that the hope held out for closer Imperial connection had been realized. That is not by any means the way in which the incident appeared to other journalists of high standing in the Mother Country. For instance, in the Statist of July 24, 1915, Sir George Paish, whom all the members of this House will recognize as a very able man, a most eminent financier, one so eminent that even the Minister of Finance would not,—I think, disdain to sit down and talk exchange and currency generally with him. Sir George Paish has this to say about the right hon. the Prime Minister's attendance at that meeting of the British Cabinet:

> The invitation given by Mr. Asquith to Sir R. Borden to join in the proceedings of the Cabinet on Wednesday of last week has given rise to much speculation amongst our contemporaries. We venture to think that a great deal of the speculation is entirely beside the mark, and that the incident, though well worth noting, has not the significance generally attached to it. It is quite true, of course, that this was the first time that a minister of any of the Dominions beyond the sea was invited to attend a meeting of the Cabinet. But it is to be recollected that the action was not merely exceptional but was so exceptional as to demand a departure from accepted rules in very many particulars. Sir R. Borden, in the first place, is the Premier of the greatest of the Dominions beyond sea. In the second place, Canada has contributed in a remarkable manner to the defence of the Empire against unprovoked aggression, and, in the third place, Sir Robert is the first notable minister of any of the Dominions to visit London while the war has been in actual operation. An honour paid to him, then, is as exceptional as are the circumstances in which it is paid. But there is a much more powerful reason for thinking that entirely too much significance is attached to the presence of the Canadian Prime Minister at a meeting of the purely United Kingdom Cabinet.

Then, Sir, Sir George Paish goes on to analyse and discuss what will be the condition of the various nations of the world after the war. The analysis is most interesting, but it is of such length that it would not be proper for me to put the whole of it upon Hansard. However, I shall read you the concluding paragraph:

> If our readers agree with these observations, they will see that when the war comes to an end there will be in reality only three really great powers in the world—the British Empire, the United States and Russia. It will be clear, then, that a new war will be one of the most unlikely of things, and everybody will be disposed to look forward to at least half a century of peace.

And here I may interrupt the reading of this article to say that, within the last few days, that view has been strongly supported by Lord Derby. The article proceeds:

If that be so, what motive will the self-governing dominions have to draw closer their relations with the Mother Country? While they had to count with a war with so aggressive and so powerful a country as Germany it was natural that they should desire not only to give assistance to the Mother Country, but also to secure the protection of the British fleet for their overseas communications. But what need will they have for the protection of the British fleet if they can reasonably count upon peace for half a century? Similarly, we ourselves will come out of the war loaded with debt. Our main thought will be to reduce that debt as rapidly as possible, to find means of keeping up our revenue, and especially of pushing our trade in every direction, so that we may pay off at least 100 millions of debt per annum. If that is to be our main preoccupation, is it likely that either the public or ministers will trouble much about drawing closer the relations with the daughter countries? We shall retain for them the same affection as now. But we shall comfort ourselves that if the day of distress comes they will prove to us as they are proving now, "that blood is thicker than water," and we shall put off to a time of greater leisure the reorganization of the Empire.

On second thought, and perhaps after reading that article of Sir George Paish, the Toronto News in a further discussion of the subject was not so cocksure of the position which it had taken in the first instance, and in a quotation from an editorial of the News, reproduced in the Ottawa Citizen of October 14, 1915, I read this:

On crossing the Atlantic he—

That is the right hon. the Prime Minister——

—was invited to take his seat in the Imperial Cabinet—an honour never before enjoyed by a Dominion statesman. The incident was full of meaning for the future. Sir Robert Borden's demand on the part of the Dominion for a voice in Imperial affairs is in the way of being realized.

The first article in the News said it had been realized.

Now, the right hon. the Prime Minister, so far as I know, has not given the public of this country any information on the subject. The only incidental reference that has fallen from his lips on the subject since his return from England, that has come under my notice in any event, is contained in a speech which he delivered some time last month before the Canadian Club in New York. In the course of that speech, The Farmers Sun of Toronto represents the right hon. gentleman in its issue of December 29 last, as having said this:

4 p.m.

[Mr. Murphy.]

It is realized that the great policies and questions which concern and govern the issues of peace and war cannot in future be assumed by the people of the British Islands alone.

And commenting on that somewhat delphic utterance, The Farmers Sun said:

The proposal implies of course either distrust of British diplomacy in the past or a crusader's impulse to bear arms against the world. While it is doubtful whether the colonies can by any arrangement whatever or by any menace of arms become influential in European politics, it is not doubtful that to make the attempt, however feebly, they must permanently commit themselves to share the burdens of European militarism. They will never be able to speak again of voluntary participation in Europe's wars.

About the same time as the right hon. the Prime Minister spoke before the Canadian Club in New York, the matter was practically given its quietus in the British House of Commons. On December 22, 1915, the Ottawa Citizen published this cable despatch:

London, December 21.—The Premier in the House of Commons to-night was asked whether, in view of the share taken by the dominions in various theatres of war, he would include representatives of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, in the British Cabinet without increasing its size.

Mr. ASQUITH: I don't think the proposal is practicable. The Colonial Secretary has already intimated to the dominions that they will be consulted in connection with terms of peace, and that the Government will warmly welcome any Prime Minister who finds it convenient to come here to discuss fully and frankly questions of Imperial policy.

This would show, according to Mr. Asquith, that a warm welcome awaits any Prime Minister of the overseas dominions, but no seat in the Cabinet. That, Mr. Speaker, makes it quite evident that so far as our Imperial relations are concerned, they were not changed by the attendance of the right hon. the Prime Minister at the British Cabinet meeting last summer. It further makes plain that the original dictum of Mr. Asquith still stands, namely, that the British Government cannot share its responsibilities for the issues of peace and war with any of the overseas dominions.

In his speech yesterday, my hon. friend who sits beside me to the right (Hon. Frank Oliver) urged upon the Government the necessity of new and larger action in the care of wounded and disabled soldiers. My hon. friend was listened to with profound attention, and in my judgment he never was more convincing than he was in that speech of yesterday. He fully deserved the compliment that was paid him by my

hon. friend the Solicitor General. In speaking as he did, the hon. member for Edmonton spoke not at all from a sense of the parental sacrifices that he has had the privilege and the pride of making, but rather from that sturdy sense of public duty which has always distinguished him as one of the people's representatives. Naturally, in my case his words fell upon receptive ears and if any word of mine can add force to what the hon. gentleman said yesterday I would appeal to the Government to lose not one minute in applying themselves to the task of revising the schedule upon which allotments are to be made in the future to wounded and disabled soldiers. I say, further, that while we have voted hundreds of millions, this House and this country are quite willing to vote hundreds of millions more in order that a proud, willing and generous people may discharge its full duty towards the men who have faced the Grim Reaper and have given the best that was in them in defence of their native land and the British Empire. The Government cannot act too quickly in this matter, and in acting they may be assured of the unanimous and hearty support of the gentlemen on this side of the House. As my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has said, all these expenses, no matter of what character, should be borne by the Government, and if the Government, in performing the task which my hon. friend has suggested, and which I also urge upon them, could do something to stop the mad rage that has seized upon a certain portion of the community for soliciting subscriptions for this, that and the other thing, they would confer a very real and lasting benefit upon a worried and harassed portion of the business and professional community. Parliament, I repeat, should provide all these funds, and I am sure that both sides of the House will combine to support the Government in whatever new measures they may propose.

In his criticism of war expenditures my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) urged upon the Government the necessity of holding a speedy enquiry into all these expenditures. A similar request has been made by every hon. gentleman who has spoken from this side of the House, and all these gentlemen were merely voicing a demand that has become general on the part of the public. Let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker, how general that demand is, and perhaps I can best do that by citing certain facts connected with the correspondence that took place in the fall of 1914 between the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the right hon. the Prime Minister. It will be recalled that my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) made an inquiry in this House on the 29th of March last regarding the receipt of that correspondence by the Prime Minister or by any member of the Government. On that occasion the Prime Minister was not in his seat, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was leading the House, said that he had no knowledge of the correspondence, but would bring the enquiry to the attention of the Prime Minister, when a decision would be reached as to whether it could be brought down to the House. That was on the 29th of March. On the 8th of April last the matter again came up in the House, upon a motion by my hon. friend from South Renfrew, which was adopted by the House. The motion read as follows:

> For a copy of all correspondence that has taken place since August 4 last between any official of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and the Prime Minister, the Acting Prime Minister or any member of the Government or any department thereof.

On that date, April 8, a short discussion ensued. The Prime Minister stated that he had received a communication from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, but that he understood the Canadian Manufacturers' Association regarded it as of a confidential character. Later on he added that after communicating with the association he would bring the correspondence down if they had no objection. Another inquiry was made in regard to this correspondence on April 13, 1915, by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) on behalf of the hon. member for South Renfrew, who was absent at the time, and in reply to that inquiry the Prime Minister said that he had communicated with the gentleman who had written him the letter but had not yet received a reply.

Now, Sir, there is something extraordinary about all this. As I have stated, the first inquiry about this matter was made in the House on March 29. On the following day, March 30, 1915, an interview with Mr. G. M. Murray, Secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, was published in the Toronto Star; and, speaking with reference to this correspondence, Mr. Murray said that it was not confidential and that the Prime Minister could bring it down if he pleased. About a week later the Toronto Globe appended to its report of

a further discussion in this House about the matter a foot-note in these terms:

> Mr. G. M. Murray, secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, in an interview on March 30, while not admitting that any letters of protest had been written to the Government in regard to the above, was quoted as saying, "Any letters that were written were to the Premier, and he can make them public if he chooses."

As you will observe, Mr. Speaker, there is a very sharp conflict between the statement of the Prime Minister and that of Mr. Murray. I make no comment on that. I do not want to introduce anything harsh or controversial into the discussion. It is not necessary for me to make any comment at all; the facts speak for themselves. The matter was further dealt with in an editorial in the Toronto Globe on April 17 last, two days after this House prorogued. I will quote some paragraphs from that editorial:

> Why did the Prime Minister arrange for the prorogation of Parliament without first bringing down the war-graft correspondence between himself and the executive of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association? That correspondence was called for again and again, and yet again, within the past four weeks. Parliament had a right to it. It is of intense public interest. Its interest is measured not only by its intrinsic merits, but also by the studied and persistent efforts of the Government to keep it secret. Why is it kept secret by the Prime Minister?
>
> That correspondence, as known to other members of the Cabinet, deals very plainly and in interesting detail with important lines of war-graft not investigated and not even mentioned in the committees or before the House. A series of typical graft cases in several provinces, and covering various types of exploitation by different orders of favoured "middlemen," are described. Names and places and dates are given. Circumstances are recited. Evidence both illuminating and condemnatory is outlined. It is all in the hands of the Prime Minister. Why was it not submitted to Parliament?
>
> That correspondence dates back to the early days of the war-contract scandals. It presents facts. It appeals for investigation. It warns against delay. Why was it unheeded?

Later on in the same article, referring to the Prime Minister's attitude in the House, the editorial goes on:

> He talked about the correspondence being "confidential." He professed willingness to lay it before Parliament if granted "Permission." He needed no man's permission. Why did he not do it?
>
> The correspondence was public, not private. It was between a public body and the Prime Minister. It dealt solely with matters of high and serious public moment. Weeks ago the Executive of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association declared publicly that "the Premier may publish it if he chooses." Why did Sir Robert Borden not choose to lay that very important correspondence before Parliament?
>
> Is it true that the publication of that correspondence might clash very harshly with the Prime Minister's grave-toned condemnation of Garland and Foster, and might contradict very emphatically, and utterly discount, all his own protestations about war-grafters and middlemen? Why was not his zeal for Governmental honesty, his condemnation of barefaced robbery, his respect for the doors of the penitentiary, and his enthusiasm for political purity as professed solemnly on Thursday—why did all these fine qualities slumber through September and October? Had he heeded the warnings of his friends in the Manufacturers' Association then would two of his supporters in Parliament be accursed as war-graft scapegoats now? Why did he mock at those warnings? That is the people's question to the Premier. Why?

This matter was regarded so seriously by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association that special reference was made to it in the report presented at the annual meeting of the executive committee of that association held in the city of Toronto on the 9th of June last. So seriously did the association regard this matter that it took the trouble to hand out official reports of the proceedings of the annual meeting to the several newspapers. In these reports so handed out by the executive, special attention was drawn to one important paragraph in the executive committee's report. That paragraph, as reproduced in the Citizen of June last, reads as follows:

> Less than a month later, on October 23—

That is, in the year 1914——

> Less than a month later, on October 23, a letter was addressed to the Premier, pointing out that the method of handling war orders was giving rise to a good deal of dissatisfaction. He was informed that, making all due allowance for the fact that some manufacturers might not have had the necessary equipment, and that others might not have been able to guarantee satisfactory deliveries, it was apparently true that some had more than their share of business, while others had gone without. In some quarters the impression seemed to prevail that war material could not be sold to the Government on its merits, but only through influence, and it was accordingly suggested to the Premier that the business should be thrown wider open, and placed as far as possible with manufacturers or producers direct, instead of through middlemen, thus insuring competitive prices, and at the same time giving the Government the satisfaction of dealing with responsible parties.

Then, Sir, in order to emphasize the warning that they had sent out to the Prime Minister, the executive committee go on in their report to explain why they did that, and they furnish by their explanation a key to practically the whole

of the correspondence. I quote again from the Citizen report of the 10th of June last:

> The words of the executive committee's report, showing the motive behind the explanation of the association's position in the matter of war contracts were: "Your committee consider it important, however, in view of certain facts that have been elicited by public inquiry in Ottawa, to offer this statement, so that no stigma can attach to the association for any alleged inaction or indifference."
>
> The report enumerates a number of constructive suggestions which were submitted to the Premier as a practical means of throwing the business "wide open." They were as follows:
>
> 1. That all the requirements of the various departments of the Government, whether for ordinary or special war purposes, should be advertised, and interested manufacturers invited to tender on their supply.
> 2. That a permanent Government sample room should be opened at Ottawa, with possibly branch sample-rooms in other points, such as Montreal, Toronto, etc., where, as far as practicable, samples of all goods required would be available for the inspection of contractors.
> 3. That in charge of each sample-room there should be an officer to supply inquirers with full particulars as to any kind of Government requirements.
> 4. That in the awarding of contracts it should be a standing rule that preference be given in every case, other things being equal, to Canadian products.
> 5. That generally speaking, the policy pursued should be frank and open so as to induce Canadian contractors to quote on any lines they might be capable of producing.
>
> The letter concluded with an offer to give free insertion in Industrial Canada to all advertisements calling for tenders from manufacturers, and even to bring out special issues supplementing the regular monthly issue, should such a course be deemed necessary or advisable from the Government's standpoint.

I do not propose to make any comment on that report. I need only say, the facts speak for themselves. Although this correspondence with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has not been brought down, although more than nine months have elapsed since its production was ordered by this House, what has been revealed with regard to it proves conclusively that several duties have been cast upon the Government. In the first place, it is their immediate duty to bring that correspondence down to this House. In the next place, it is their duty to grant a committee of inquiry before which the legitimate manufacturers belonging to that association may appear and justify the warning that they sent to the Prime Minister in October, 1914. Another duty is incumbent upon them viz—to grant that committee so that these manufacturers may repel the insinuation, as they desire to repel it, that they have in any way been mixed up in the game of war profiteering. Further, it is the duty of the Government to appoint that committee so that these legitimate manufacturers may make plain who are bona fide manufacturers and who are the mushroom manufacturers that have grown up under the aegis of the Shell Committee and of the Government.

I started on this branch of my subject by stating that there was a general demand for the appointment of a committee of inquiry. The Solicitor General yesterday took exception to the quotations from Liberal newspapers on this subject. Well, I will meet him on that point—in fact, he has already been met on that point. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) read from the Ottawa Evening Journal a demand for that investigation. Now, the significance of that demand lies not so much in the fact that that newspaper is an out-and-out supporter of this Government as in the fact that its editor is a warm personal friend of the Prime Minister. It is not likely that that gentleman would make a demand for an inquiry unless he was very strongly impressed by the absolute necessity for investigation. My hon. friend from St. John also read the demand for an investigation from the Montreal Daily Mail in its criticism and ridicule of the valedictory of General Bertram. Again the significance of that demand from the Daily Mail lies not so much in the fact that it also is an out-and-out supporter of this Government as in the fact that the editor of that paper is a half-brother of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). So that, with regard to the Daily Mail, we may say that the demand for an investigation comes from within the bosom of the family itself.

The demand has also been made by such staunch Tory papers as the trade journals published by the MacLean Publishing Co., of Toronto, including the Contract Record, the Electrical News, and, I think the Lumberman's Record. In order to satisfy my hon. friend the Solicitor General that I am not quoting from a source friendly to the Liberal party, I will read, first, a declaration of the political faith of the editor of the Electrical News, whose opinion on the subject of investigation I intend to quote. In his issue of the 1st of January, 1916, the editor refers to his criticism of the Government, and says:

> Right here at the start let me say that this criticising of the Government is no pleasant task. I am well aware that the publishers of this paper will get little credit for honesty of

purpose. So accustomed is the public to the harpings of the party and corporation press that it has become case-hardened. It has learned to look through the printed articles for the self, party or corporation interest that prompted it. Let it be known then, once for all, that I prefer the Borden Administration, with all its sins, to a government controlled by a party that sought to tie us up to the United States with a reciprocity treaty. But this paper represents a constituency of business men. It realizes that they are tired of seeing politics practised where business methods should be applied. They know that honest criticism is the best medicine for any government—even if you have to hold its nose while you administer the dose.

We do not propose anything so drastic as that. The editor goes on:

As I have said before, the publishers are not in a position to handle a war contract and do not care to farm one out.

A little further on in this same article is the following :

We simply want to show that petty politics are no satisfactory substitute for patriotism, and that party machines cannot do the work of factory lathes.

Surely the Solicitor General could not be supplied with better authority than that. I have gone to a good deal of trouble to get it for him, and I hope he will be satisfied with it. In this same issue of the 1st of January the Electrical News has this further to say on the subject of an investigation:

The public demand an investigation. They look not to the Conservative political machine but to Sir Robert Borden for that investigation. They feel that the Premier who is a gentleman rather than a politician, has been sinned against. They know that when next Sir Robert Borden visits England he will not want to be pointed out as the sponsor for a committee that scattered its contracts like so much political graft, while our soldiers cried from the trenches for the munitions they so sorely needed. Sir Robert Borden may be deluded by the men he has trusted but he is not the man likely to stand idly by while the good name of the Dominion is dragged through the dirt and grime of a war scandal. Sir Robert Borden will act. Sir Robert Borden must act to save the reputation of the country he represents and his own political honour.

Further on the same issue the Electrical News discusses this subject of an investigation in this fashion:

The Government has everything to gain and nothing to lose by being open and above-board in the matter. So many stories have been whispered, so many charges have been flung broadcast that to remain silent must simply be taken as an admission of guilt—an admission that the worst has not been told. Never since Confederation have so many stories of trickery, trafficking and grafting been afloat. They come to this office by the score. All cannot be given because all cannot be investigated. It would take a big staff working overtime to get into them all. But they pass from mouth to mouth, growing with each telling. Probably most of them have not yet reached Sir Robert Borden. His "machine men" probably see that such as do reach him are fumigated, sugar-coated and otherwise specially prepared for his consumption. But even his own party organs are hinting that makers of munitions "have striven to get large profits out of their contracts." The Toronto News (Conservative) charges it all to "stock market booming," but closes its article with the rather ominous sentences: "As in previous crazes a reckoning is coming. It may be close at hand and some very prominent men may be involved in the inevitable disclosures."

That last sentence is quoted by the Electrical News from an editorial in the Toronto Daily News, which, as every one knows, is one of the strongest supporters of this Administration. In view of the opinions of these newspapers which support the Conservative Government of the day, surely it will not be pretended that the demand for investigation is not as strong from the members of the Conservative party as it is from the members of the Liberal party.

The story of how the contracts for the shell boxes were let is also told by the Electrical News in its issue of December 1, 1915. That paper said this:

The purchase of shell boxes was another of the duties of this now famous Shell Committee. Naturally you would expect them to follow the same policy in regard to the boxes. And you won't be disappointed. There was the same secrecy, the same spreading out of contracts to cover commercial or political depression, and the same awarding of contracts to the little fellows regardless of their equipment or financial capacity. That one of the largest box factories in Canada received a contract for 25,000 boxes and manufactured on a sub-contract 50,000 boxes more is eloquent evidence of the business acumen exercised in carrying on this branch of the business. That a Montreal firm not in the box making trade was awarded a contract which it sublet to a box manufacturer in the same city is further evidence that if the committee was honest it was incompetent. That a company of low financial standing was able to secure a large contract, even though it had to construct a new plant for the work, would indicate that the government—for this shell committee stood for the government—had poor relations whose exigencies gave it greater concern than the exigencies of the Empire.

And then, Sir, returning to the subject on January 1, 1916, the Electrical News said:

Just one more instance of how the Shell Committee handled contracts. This story has been investigated and can be vouched for, as can the others that have from time to time found place in this column. The owner of a planing mill in an Ontario town went out after a shell-box contract. His application brought the usual answer that all contracts had been let. Imagine his surprise when a shipping clerk in a dry goods

house in his own town secured a contract, put up a building, completed his contract and got a renewal. The shipping clerk had no plant, no experience and no business rating. But he knew a man who knew something about how contracts were got. Pretty wise man, wasn't he? Thrifty, too. For he still retains his job as shipping clerk, though he occasionally finds a few moments to run over to the shell-box plant and figure his profits.

Here is a friend saying to the Government: All the stories that we have published in these columns have been investigated and can be vouched for; grant a committee, and they will be proved before that committee. That, in effect, is what is said by these gentlemen, who prefer the Borden Government, with all their sins, to the Liberal Administration. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how can a Government refuse a friend such a demand as that? Surely the challenge of the Tory editor of the Electrical News will, in any event, not be ignored.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Where is the Electrical News published?

Mr. MURPHY: It is one of the publications of the MacLean Publishing Company, of Toronto.

In the course of his speech the hon. member for St. John cited the experience that Mr. F. P. Jones had had with the Shell Committee as a further reason why an investigation should be granted. It seems to me that that incident was so important that the full details of it should be put upon Hansard; it is because I am impressed with a sense of its great importance that I shall venture to do that. The Contract Record, in its issue of November 9, 1915, thus refers to Mr. Jones' experience:

Mr. Jones, like many another, went to Ottawa with a tender for shells. When the contracts were let they went as usual to the favoured few and Mr. Jones was not of them. Those contracts were let at prices lower than previous contracts but higher than Mr. Jones' tender. Unlike many another Mr. Jones did not throw up his hands and go home. Instead he went straight to Sir Robert Borden. The Premier was not inclined to listen to a disappointed tenderer, but when Mr. Jones turned to the door with a decisive "Very well, I'll give my statement to the press," he was invited to call again in a couple of days.

Here I interrupt the reading to say that a little later I shall read a letter written by Mr. Jones, giving effect to the explanation which the Prime Minister interjected the other day when the hon. member for St. John was referring to the same subject. The article continues:

"On the second visit he found Mr. Thomas with the Premier. Mr. Jones sat down at the typewriter and made three copies of his statement, one for the Premier, one for Mr. Thomas, and the third he kept. That statement showed that the contracts let by the committee were just $21,000,000 higher than if awarded at the rate of Mr. Jones' tender. A cable to England stopped the contracts before they had been approved by Lloyd George. And in future all contracts for munitions will be open to competitive bids.

"Of course explanations were in order and they were made. It was pointed out that certain concerns had taken risks when shell making was an experiment that might prove costly to the makers and these concerns were entitled to consideration. And probably they were. The earlier price charged the Empire was $5.15 for machining a dollar's worth of shell. This was later reduced to $2.90 for doing the same dollar's worth of work. At these figures one would naturally conclude that it was the Empire and not the experimenter, or rather contractor which was entitled to any consideration that was going. Again it was pointed out that policy demanded that the contracts be spread around so as to help relieve commercial depression brought on by the war. And it is only fair to add that this policy has been more or less successful.

There has been no noticeable commercial depression at or near the concern of which Mr. Thomas Cantley is the head and which is said to be making more profits in a month than it ever did before in a year. Neither is the company of which Mr. G. W. Watts is representative making any complaint of hard times. Of course, it is merely a coincidence that Mr. Cantley and Mr. Watts are both members of the Canadian Shell Committee.

It is clearly understood that the manufacturing members of this committee are there in a purely advisory capacity and it is probably to clear them of unjust suspicions that their names are not expected to appear when the new Munitions Committee is appointed.

That article from the Contract Record was widely copied in the Canadian papers. At the request of the right hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Jones wrote a letter explaining what occurred in connection with his interview with the right hon. gentleman. That letter, as reproduced in the Toronto Globe of November 13, 1915, reads as follows:

I called at your house by appointment in regard to the manufacture of shells. After hearing what I had to say you informed me that I should place my representations before Mr. D. A. Thomas, who was acting for the British Government, and who was then in Canada. To this I agreed, and accordingly you then consulted by telephone with Mr. Thomas, who was then in Montreal, and arranged that I should interview him for that purpose in the immediate future. The interview as arranged took place within forty-eight hours. I never saw you and Mr. Thomas together, and I never said or in any way intimated that I would give any statement to the press, nor had I any intention of doing so. The statement which has appeared in the press with regard to my interview with you is utterly unfounded. You received me most courteously, and listened attentively to everything I had to say, after which the interview was arranged as above stated with Mr. Thomas.

That letter, Mr. Speaker, is all very well so far as it goes; but, as you will not have failed to notice, it leaves the serious charges quite untouched. For instance, it says nothing about the prices previously allowed to manufacturers by the Shell Committee being very considerably higher than the prices at which Mr. Jones was prepared to make the same class of shells. It also leaves untouched the published statement of the Contract Record that Mr. Jones had shown the Premier that a saving of $21,000,000 could have been effected on the previous shell orders had the Shell Committee awarded them at the rate of Mr. Jones' tender.

It further leaves untouched the other statement that the contracts already let at the higher figure and sent to Mr. Lloyd George for approval had been stopped by cable. These rather important details being overlooked in Mr. Jones' letter, you will not be surprised that the letter did not satisfy the Contract Record. An editorial from that paper on the subject of Mr. Jones' letter was reproduced in the Ottawa Citizen of November 26, 1915, and is in these terms:

At the request of Sir Robert Borden, Mr. F. P. Jones, of the Canada Cement Corporation, has come forward with a sort of blanket denial of the story of his interview with the Premier re the shell game. According to Mr. Jones' statement, Mr. Thomas was not present at that interview, nor did he threaten to make a statement to the press if his tenders were not given proper consideration. He admits, however, that Sir Robert sent him to Mr. Thomas, and to ensure him due consideration in that quarter, called up Lloyd George's representative and arranged the interview. Mr. Jones further states that at the interview arranged by the Premier, Mr. Thomas warned him that tenders would be called for.

It would appear from the above that Mr. Jones is not taking the public entirely into his confidence. He neglects to mention why it was necessary to call on the Premier and later attend a premier-arranged interview with Mr. Thomas in order to acquire the valuable information that tenders for shells would be called for.

He also neglects to mention whether he had first been to the shell committee with his proposition. Of course, if he had, it might be necessary to go to either Sir Robert Borden or Mr. Thomas in search of such valuable information as he received. Were not the shell committee representing Canada in regard to the purchase of shells? Were they not giving out information in regard to the asking for tenders? Were they not using their every endeavour and undoubted business ability to secure for the Empire the munitions she needed and in the cheapest market? Apparently not, for Mr. Jones, according to his own statement, had to go first to the Premier and then to Mr. Thomas before he could discover that tenders were to be asked for. But please note the grateful sequel: "Our company again tendered and I am pleased to say got business at the prices tendered by us." These little words "again tendered" are an indication that previous to his interviews with Sir Robert Borden and Mr. Thomas, his company had been in the field for shell contracts. Why doesn't Mr. Jones go further and tell the public why his other tenders had been turned down, and why he found it necessary to go over the heads of the shell committee before his tenders received the consideration they merited and his factories the orders subsequent events show they were entitled to?

Blanket denials are not explanations, and it is explanations that are in order at the present time. Mr. Thomas has stated that profits of the manufacturers have been higher than they were entitled to; the shell committee has been allowed to drift into oblivion, and evidently requested to do its drifting with the least possible noise; it has been replaced by a Munitions Committee, which is in the hands, and evidently under the complete control of Mr. Lionel Hichens, who has come out from England as the personal representative of Mr. Lloyd George. What does this all mean? Why, if the story told here is not true, was the shell committee abolished?

This column admitted on the start that it was impossible to get sworn statements. It is so still. Consequently, it is impossible to be exact as to details. But the essentials of the story of the breaking up of the shell game have yet to be denied. The interviews between Mr. Jones, Sir Robert Borden, and Mr. Thomas took place. They were followed by the disappearance of the shell committee. A report was sent out from Ottawa that all munition contracts had been cancelled. A competitive system of tendering replaced the old haphazard system. And big firms got contracts who had not been able to get even information concerning them before.

Just why it is impossible to get exact details is perhaps shown by several letters addressed to this column. They come from contract holders in Toronto, and, in each case the writer complains that his firm cannot get any more contracts because it is accused of giving things away.

As you are aware, this Government appointed what is colloquially referred to as the War Purchasing Committee. That committee, I understand, is under the chairmanship of the member of the Government without portfolio, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp). Public attention was directed to that committee by a charge published in a Toronto paper called Men's Wear, to the effect that a clothing contract had been awarded to a Toronto real estate agent, one Carl F. Hopkins. In course of time that charge was taken up by the Davidson Commission, and, not to trouble the House with too many details, it was found by that Commission that the particular contract referred to in Men's Wear was a contract for clothing for the British Government, and therefore did not come within the scope of the Commission. But, in the

course of the inquiry it was revealed that this Toronto real estate dealer, Mr. Carl F. Hopkins, had, as the Empire Clothing Company, got another contract, and this other contract he obtained from the Militia Department of this Government. Some of the facts brought out with reference to that Militia Department contract before the Davidson Commission are illuminating. In the Toronto Globe of December 30, 1915, I find this report of the proceedings of the day previous at the sitting of the Davidson Commission in Ottawa:

Ottawa, December 29.—The "Men's Wear" charges as to the granting of Canadian military clothing contracts were again before the Davidson War Contracts Commission this morning.

Mr. J. V. Reid, secretary of the Contracts Branch of the Militia Department, was the first witness. He produced a letter written on March 29 last by C. F. Hopkins of Toronto, to the Director of Contracts, stating that it was immaterial whether a contract was given to C. F. Hopkins and Company or the Empire Clothing Company—whose name was on the patronage list—so long as one was secured. A contract was actually given in August to the Empire Clothing Company for 12,000 pairs of trousers, being secured by tender. Hopkins himself had received no contract.

The letter referred to, which was produced from the files of the Militia Department, was headed:

"C. F. Hopkins & Co., clothing manufacturers, factories 150-160 John street, office 30 Adelaide street, Toronto; cable address; Hoco." The letter was addressed to P. W. Brown, director of contracts, Militia Department, Ottawa, and was as follows:

"Dear Sir,—Following my phone conversation with you this afternoon, I sent you views showing some of the interior of our plant and also a letter from one of my partners which will explain itself.

"It does not matter whether we receive the orders for clothing in the name of the Empire Clothing Co or of C F Hopkins and Co., clothing manufacturers, so long as we receive them.

"According to your letter of December 18, 1914, our name has been on the patronage list for the supply of clothing since that date. We have received no word or contract, although several of the members have spoken on our behalf.

"Since I spoke to you last, I understand that the clothing for the third contingent has practically all been ordered, and I trust we may secure a portion of the next clothing order."

It is peculiar that, in this investigation before the Davidson Commission, this Toronto real estate clothing dealer, Mr. Hopkins, was not called as a witness.

Mr. Acton, the man responsible for the publication of the article in Men's Wear, was called as a witness, and if one can judge by newspaper reports of the proceedings, he was dealt with rather severely by the commissioner. In point of fact, he was handled in such a fashion that you would think that he, and not Hopkins, was the guilty party. Eventually he was induced to hand in a sort of half apology for having dared to make the statements that he had made in Men's Wear. Now, these somewhat peculiar happenings before the Davidson Commission led the editor of the Electrical News—you remember him, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who said that with all its sins he preferred the Borden Government to the Liberal administration—in the issue of January 15, 1916, to say this:

We are informed from Ottawa that the work of the Davidson investigation commission is almost finished. To criticise that work would probably be considered contempt of court and I would hate to be the only one to receive punishment at its hands. But I fain would ask a question or two. Surely one may venture that far. And my first query would naturally be: "In the Hopkins investigation was it Mr. Hopkins or Mr. Acton who was being investigated?" And following this would it be unwise or unkindly to ask why Mr. Hopkins was not called to the stand? Mr. Hopkins' home is in Toronto, but he is taking most of his meals at the Biltmore Hotel in New York city. I believe he prefers the New York climate and if he does spend an occasional Sunday in Toronto it is because his family still resides in the Queen city. Of course he might have gone to Ottawa as a witness but those attorneys have a way of talking to mere witnesses that does not make their position in the box an attractive one.

Further light on the work of this Davidson Commission is thrown by an editorial of the Toronto Globe of December 15, 1915, in which the editor of that paper discusses the distribution of an order for 188,000 pairs of trousers. I will read a few paragraphs from the editorial in question:

The only cure for the suspicion that army contracts are being awarded by favour at excessive prices is publicity. When the names of successful tenderers, the prices quoted by them, and the quantity of goods ordered from them are published in the Press unsuccessful bidders can at once learn why they did not obtain the order or a share of it. In the case of the trousers contract, which is the subject of judicial inquiry, the commission did not award the contract to the lowest tenderer, 5 p.m. but split it up among a considerable number of bidders, all of whom were paid the price at which they tendered. This, Mr. Kemp explains, was done because there was urgent need for the clothing and because there would inevitably have been delay had the lowest tenderer been given the entire contract. An order for 188,000 pairs of trousers was distributed among ten eastern Canadian firms and several in the west, the units averaging about 12,500 pairs. The eastern companies participating and the prices per pair at which they tendered and at which each company did the work were as follows:

	Price per pair.
T. Eaton Co., Toronto	$3 20
A. Kilbert & Co., Montreal..	3 28
Crown Pants Co., Montreal..	3 43
Copley, Noyes & Randall, Hamilton.	3 43

	Price per pair.
Cohen & Sons, Montreal..	$3 50
Punchard, Burril & Co., Toronto ..	3 58
Canada Clothing Co., Montreal.. ..	3 64
Empire Clothing Co., Toronto.. ..	3 69
W. E. Sanford Mfg. Co., Hamilton.	3 72
Capital Brand Trousers, Toronto ..	3 73

Had the contract gone to the lowest tenderer —the T. Eaton Co.—the total cost to the country would have been exactly $40,000 less than it was under the system of "divvying up" and giving each firm the price it asked for. Was the need for haste served by this extra price? It is stated by Mr. Kemp that the Eaton Co. had half a million dollars' worth of government work on hand when the trousers contract was awarded. Was that work of such a nature as to stand in the way of the speedy carrying out of the trousers contract? Had the "Capital Brand" company, for example—which is unknown to the most important houses in the clothing trade in this city, and which got $6,625 more for making 12,500 pairs of trousers than the Eaton Co. would have charged for the same work—greater facilities for turning out this clothing in a hurry than the Eaton Co.?

Hon. J. D. REID: Would you have liked them to go without trousers?

Mr. MURPHY: I must ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs to solve his own conundrums. My hon. friend the Solicitor General quoted from an article which had appeared in the Toronto Globe in approval of the Davidson commission. May I be permitted to say that that article was written prior to the hearing of this case by the Davidson Commission, and that after that case was heard the Globe was not exactly of the same opinion. Here is what the Globe said after the Men's Wear charges had been gone into:

Is Mr. Kemp playing politics with army orders instead of awarding them to the lowest tenderer irrespective of politics as Sir Robert Borden promised? It looks very much like it. That apology of Brother Acton was distinctly premature. The Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons should spend an hour or two in the company of Mr. Carl F. Hopkins real estate dealer in the main and clothing manufacturer on the side and learn who the members were who spoke "on our behalf" before the Kemp Purchasing Commission was appointed and whose influence was so potent that after the commission took charge the Empire Clothing Co. was given 49 cents per pair more for making army trousers than the lowest tenderer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing said against the commissioner in that Globe article.

Mr MURPHY: No, there is nothing said against him, but may I point out to the Solicitor General that there is nothing said in his favour? Of the methods pursued by this War Purchasing Committee the Electrical News offers pointed criticism.

[Mr. Murphy.]

In its issue of December 1 last, after referring to the fact that this War Purchasing Committee was staggering along under a sharp fusilade of criticism, it stated:

But here again that scattering of contracts to cover that same commercial depression creeps in and brings forth the usual criticism. The segregation of tenders thus rendered necessary often practically wipes out competition and the net result is that the big concerns are often neglected while may a sweat shop with a machine hastily stuck in a cellar is working night and day to turn out materials that do not keep the equipment up to the requirements of enlistment. Some of the big concerns are prepared to take this work at actual cost in order to keep their factories running and their staffs together. But the system in vogue does not give them a chance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of these disclosures, taken from responsible public journals in this country, I submit that the public will not be satisfied unless the work of this War Purchasing Committee is included in the scope of whatever investigating committee may be appointed by Parliament to go into the subject of war contracts generally.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, that throughout a large part of last session a special committee of this House sat to investigate the contracts that were awarded by the Militia Department for boots and shoes. You will further recall that, in connection with that investigation, it was disclosed that in one case a middleman had received over $15,000 for securing contracts for an old and well-known boot and shoe manufacturing concern in the city of Quebec. You would naturally have expected, Mr. Speaker, that, in view of the disclosures before that special committee of this House, war graft in boots, in any event, would have stopped. Well, Sir, I am sorry to inform you that it has not. I have under my hand a copy of the court record of a suit entered in the Superior Court in the City of Quebec. The plaintiff is a gentleman of the name of Frank W. Belmer. The defendant is the John Ritchie Company, a long-established and highly respected firm in the city of Quebec. The plaintiff, Belmer, produced a contract in writing whereby he was appointed to act as middleman between the John Ritchie Company and the Government for the purpose of securing contracts for boots and contracts for canvas shoes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who were the parties to the contract?

Mr. MURPHY: The contract is contained in two letters, dated respectively

October 13 and October 28, 1914, signed by Mr. Warrington, secretary of the John Ritchie Company, and addressed to Frank W. Belmer, Quebec. Belmer alleges that under this written contract he secured orders for boots and shoes for the John Ritchie Company from the Militia Department. The contract stipulates that Belmer is to be paid a commission of fifty cents a pair on every contract for boots he secures for the John Ritchie Company from the Militia Department, and a commission of thirty cents a pair on every pair of canvas shoes. It is not alleged in court that Belmer makes any claim for any commission in connection with the boot contract, but apart from the record I am informed that he was paid a very considerable sum of money for the boot contracts he obtained. Belmer claims, and in fact this constitutes his whole claim, that through his agency the John Ritchie Company obtained from the Department of Militia and Defence between October, 1914, and November, 1915, contracts for 150,000 pairs of canvas shoes, and he accordingly claims the sum of $45,000 commission, which is at the rate of thirty cents a pair on the 150,000 pairs. It is only fair to say that the defendant company does not admit that the plaintiff is entitled to any commission with respect to the canvas shoes. But the written contract—and this is tne most immoral part of the whole proceeding—this written contract by which Belmer is appointed as middleman or go-between for the John Ritchie Company the defendants do not dispute. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a case that ought to be investigated, this case of Belmer is the one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: What was the result of the action?

Mr. MURPHY: It has not been tried yet. The defendant disputes the plaintiff's claim, and the action is still in court.

Hon. J. D. REID: It could be investigated by the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. MURPHY: Parliament is the High Court of the nation, and any investigation that is held should be held under the direction of Parliament.

Mr. REID: I said it could be investigated by the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. MURPHY: Certainly. I was proceeding to say that instances could be multiplied of middlemen acting in other capacities, with a loss to the Government in each case; but I have already taken up a great deal of the time of the House, and I feel it would be loading up Hansard unnecessarily if I were to enumerate these cases. I submit that I have made it clear that a demand for an investigation is general on the part of the public, and the necessity for it is such that without it the honour of this Government, the honour of this Parliament, and the honour of this country, can never be vindicated.

Let me now refer somewhat briefly to the speech made by my hon. friend the Solicitor General yesterday. Considered in the large, that speech may be divided into two parts; that part in which he laboured to prove that his colleague the Minister of Finance, did not say what he meant, or did not mean what he said, when he answered the inquiry of the hon. member for St. John as to whether this Government was paying the whole cost of the Canadian overseas expeditionary forces, and that part in which he laboured an attack against the hon. member for St. John, and sought to minimize the effect of that hon. gentleman's speech by showing that here and there he had been mistaken as to a name, or a date, or a place, as, for instance, when he said that the Solicitor General had delivered a speech at Fort William when it should have been Portage la Prairie. The hon. member for St. John exposed this afternoon some of these mental acrobatics on the part of the Solicitor General, and it is therefore unnecessary for me to refer to these particular things. I have just this to say, that, listening as I did yesterday, and as I always do, with great interest to what the Solicitor General had to say, I was more than ever impressed with the strikingly strong resemblance between the hon. gentleman and the famous knight, Sir Hudibras, immortalized by Butler. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, Sir Hudibras as Butler depicted him? Perhaps you have forgotten, so for your benefit and the benefit of the House I will just quote his description:

> He was in logic a great critic
> Profoundly skilled in analytic;
> He could distinguish and divide
> A hair 'twixt south and southwest side;
> On either which he would dispute,
> Confute, change hands, and still confute.

That is a perfect picture of the Solicitor General, and the resemblance between him and the worthy knight was never so striking as it was yesterday. He laboured long and valiantly to extricate his col-

league the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) from the difficulty into which it was evident he feared the Minister of Finance had got by the answers he made to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) on Tuesday last. It was somewhat amusing to us on this side of the House to see the agitation that broke out on the benches opposite immediately after the Minister of Finance had made those answers to the hon. member for St. John. The Minister of Finance himself was obviously disturbed. He moved uneasily in his seat; he moved out of his seat; he went around the opposite side of the House talking to his friends; he was obviously ill at ease. Now, why should he be ill at ease, and why should the Solicitor General labour to prove that his words did not mean exactly what he said and what he intended them to mean? The Minister of Finance was asked an ordinary and a proper question. Like an honest man he gave that question an honest answer. Yesterday my hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) emphasized the honesty and the point of that answer. The matter has evidently become one of such agitation in Government circles that I propose to put upon Hansard again question and answer as they fell from the lips of the two hon. gentlemen on Monday last. On page 42 of Hansard I find the following, referring to the previous answer given by the Minister of Finance:

> Mr. Pugsley: That means, of course, all the ammunition, all the guns, all the boots and shoes, and all the clothing used by the Canadian soldiers at the front?
>
> Sir Thomas White: Our understanding is that the Canadian Government will pay all, but that an adjustment is necessary and will have to take place later.
>
> Mr. F. W. Maclean: Does that include transportation?
>
> Sir Thomas White: I speak subject to correction by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, but I believe that the Canadian Government has agreed to pay all the cost of transportation also; in other words, we desire to pay the entire cost of the Canadian Expeditionary Force abroad.

It cannot have been many minutes after the Minister of Finance had made that perfectly honest and frank statement that somebody whispered in his ear: "Why, you have given the whole case away; when you admit that we are paying for these things, then we cannot dispute the right of Parliament to investigate them." That explains the disturbance on the opposite side of the House. Now, I submit that my hon. friend the Solicitor General did not make the matter any better by his handling of it yesterday. He spent a good deal of his time in an attack upon the hon. member for St. John; but as part of that attack was repelled by that hon. member this afternoon, it is unnecessary for me to refer to it at any length.

I want, however, to refer to one matter in regard to which the Solicitor General waxed warm and indignant. He accused the hon. member for St. John of misrepresenting what he, the Solicitor General, had said in a speech at Portage la Prairie about taxing war profits. Quoting from Hansard of yesterday, page 134, I find that my hon. friend the Solicitor General spoke thus:

> I said that I believed there had been some cases of large profits

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want you to pay particular attention to this, because in a moment I am going to appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, and I want these words remembered.

> I said that I believed there had been some cases of large profits.

Why was he so specific? He was repelling the charge of the hon. member for St. John, that he had knowledge that there were large profits. Well, it so happens that I have in my hand the report published in the Ottawa Citizen of December 20, 1915, of the speech delivered by my hon. friend at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Don't you think I ought to know what I said better than the Ottawa Citizen?

Mr. MURPHY: I am willing to concede that my hon. friend ought to know better than the Ottawa Citizen, but my hon. friend will consider this, that the people can judge of what my hon. friend said only by the reports of his speech that appear in the newspapers. I am going to read the report, and it will be open to my hon. friend to say that it is wrong. It must have been some such report as this read by the hon. member for St. John that led him to make the statement which he did yesterday. The Citizen report of the speech of my hon. friend the Solicitor General at Portage la Prairie was, in part, as follows:

> Touching on the question of the war tax, Mr. Meighen referred to the necessity of raising funds for relief purposes, and expressed the opinion that it was the function of the Government to raise such moneys by way of taxation, and in this manner all would be forced to assist. The Federal Government said Mr. Meighen, cannot get past the British North America Act in connection with taxation, but can assist by increasing the tariff.

"We have no power to tax lands," continued Mr. Meighen, "and have not got the one hundred and one methods that the provincial government has for this purpose. A great deal has been said about taxing the munition makers, and I for one am in accord with the scheme."

Upon that pronouncement I heartily congratulate my hon. friend. The report goes on:

There is no doubt that there have been great war profits—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite different from what the hon. member for St. John said.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, but how could a man without knowledge have made such a specific and pointed statement as that?

There is no doubt that there have been great war profits, and if they can be gotten at fairly to get a share of the money for the public treasury, then they should be gotten at, but it is up to the Minister of Finance to look after that, and if it can be done he will no doubt do it.

And this very patriotic announcement on the part of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, based on what everybody concluded was his knowledge of large war profits, so appealed to the Ottawa Citizen that with the report it published a portrait of my hon. friend so that people might recognize their benefactor when they met him on the street. If that report is not true, my hon. friend can contradict it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The report contains just the ordinary inaccuracies that appear in reports that travel over thousands of miles. In regard to the point in question as to what I said in regard to there being large war profits, it is exactly as I said, and as I said yesterday in the House that large profits were paid out at first. But I pointed out the reason: it was that the price of machinery was included in the price first paid to the contractors. But at this time that is not being done.

Mr. MURPHY: I have listened to the Solicitor-General very often, and I would remind him of the old proverb about the net being spread in the sight of the bird. The hon. gentleman does not deny the accuracy of this report in the Ottawa Citizen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I do.

Mr. MURPHY: Then, the hon. gentleman does deny it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not as to the point of there being large profits. But in other respects there are inaccuracies.

Mr. MURPHY: Then, we are in agreement on that. Very well. Now, this is what he said yesterday:

I believe there have been some cases of large profits.

We will leave it at that. But let me point out that there was a great omission in his speech of yesterday, an omission that must have sadly disappointed hon. members from the West. He forgot all about the commandeering of the wheat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is coming.

Mr. MURPHY: Oh, that is coming. But a part of it did come. That part was in the shape of an official statement handed out by my hon. friend, with his name attached, to the press.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. MURPHY: The press said so. Here it is: "Government statement handed out by the Solicitor General, Hon. Arthur Meighen." And in that appeared the statement that the wheat had been commandeered at the request of the British Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read that statement.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman will find it in last Monday's Hansard, quoted in the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can tell the hon. gentleman he will find nothing of the kind in the statement.

Mr. MURPHY: Just for the sake of accuracy, let me quote it. I will not be Sir Hudibrased. Here is the speecn of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, reported in Hansard of the 17th January:

Official Government Statement.

Ottawa, November 28.—The following official statement was issued by the Government tonight:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Go ahead.

Mr. MURPHY: Then, my right hon. leader said:

The official press bureau made the following statement yesterday—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the hon. gentleman read the statement which he says was made by me that the wheat had been commandeered at the request of the British Government.

Mr. MURPHY: The statement handed out by the Solicitor General, as quoted by the leader of the Opposition, contained that statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the hon. gentleman read it. We will decide this point.

Mr. MURPHY: The Solicitor General wants the statement read rather than the quotation of it. I have here the Toronto World of the 29th November, 1915—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is quite sufficient to quote Hansard.

Mr. MURPHY: I have this official statement of the Government:

> The phenomenal crop of wheat in the Canadian west has brought upon the government the duty of assisting to the farthest extent possible in its marketing. The supply of wheat the world over is known to have been abundant, and the importance of taking advantage of every opportunity to provide for the disposing of our grain is on that account the greater. For many months the government has been in touch with the British authorities with a view to procuring orders from the United Kingdom and the allied governments in order that the utmost share of the consuming demand in those countries may be turned towards our Canadian surplus. As a consequence of this, the British Government has requested the Canadian Government to provide within a short time a very large supply of No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 Canadian northern wheat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that say that the British Government said to commandeer the wheat?

Mr. MURPHY: It says: "The British Government has requested the Canadian Government;" and that is the reason hon. gentlemen opposite advanced to the people of this country for commandeering the wheat. What is the use of hair-splitting? What is the use of taking up time unnecessarily?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The British Government asked us to provide the wheat. Does that mean that they told us how to provide it? That was our affair. If the hon. gentleman calls this hair-splitting, I am afraid there is something wrong with his mind.

Mr. MURPHY: No, what is wrong is with my hon. friend and his colleagues. This statement was contradicted by the British Government the next morning. And what followed? Immediately after the contradiction, another statement was put out, that the request for the commandeering of the wheat came from—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I must take the hon. gentleman to task again. There is no statement in the official statement contradicted by the British Government nor by any press report from the British Government.

Mr. MURPHY: What the British Government said, as quoted by my right hon. leader, was:

> With reference to the announcement from Ottawa on November 28, that the Canadian Government had commandeered 16,000,000 bushels of wheat at the request of the British Government, the Board of Agriculture state that the British Government have made no such request, and that at present they have no information on the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly what I have been telling him.

Mr. MURPHY: That is the whole point. Surely it is idle to discuss these trivialities raised by the Solicitor General. What was this statement handed out for? To explain why the Government had commandeered the wheat; there could be no meaning in it but that.

Now, another position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) yesterday was that he would not attack or defend the Shell Committee. Then he went on to put up what looked to us on this side like something intended to be a strong defence of that commitee. I must say he damned them with faint praise; and I can well imagine each of the dismissed members of that committee, after reading the hon. gentleman's speech this morning, expressing his own feelings in a paraphrase of a famous couplet:

> 'Twas all very well to dissemole your love,
> But why did you kick me down stairs?

As a last word to my hon. friend the Solicitor General, who yesterday so strongly objected to our quoting from Liberal newspapers and animadverted very severely upon the speech of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) let me show him how that speech impressed one of the strongest and most consistent Conservative newspapers in this Dominion. In its issue of yesterday, the Montreal Star has an editorial in these terms:

> The Shell Committee Charges.
>
> Charges of the gravity of those which Dr. Pugsley has made against the late Shell Committee should not be allowed to remain as the mere casual remarks of a debater on the speech from the Throne. So old a Parliamentarian as Dr. Pugsley knows that there is a proper way to bring statements of this sort before the House. And doubtless he will make good his accusations by some such formal step before the session is very much older.
>
> In any case, the Government cannot permit these shocking and humiliating charges to remain uninvestigated. We are confident that no Canadian Government will hide behind the technicality that the money, said to be worse than wasted, was British money, entrusted to us to be carefully spent amidst the strain of a great

war, and not our own money. That would be to confess and proclaim that we would be less honest in dealing with sacred trust funds than in handling our personal property.

If a pound of British money, entrusted to a Canadian committee to buy the greatest possible amount of war material, was allowed to be diverted to Canadian private purses in inordinate profits, then the men guilty of this sordid and despicable treason were guilty of weakening by just so much the fighting forces of the Empire in the face of an appalling peril. They might as well have gone to the trenches and taken the rifles out of the hands of our boys, fronting a German attack, and then sold these rifles for their personal profit to the first second-hand dealer whom they met. If this has been done, the country wants to know it, regardless of legal technicalities or partisan politics.

A thorough investigation into this whole shell game should be set on foot at once.

In contrast with the sordid greed of the war profiteers, and to show the brighter side of human nature, I want to pay a tribute, before I conclude, to an American gentleman resident in Philadelphia, who has set an example that we may well follow. The name of this gentleman is Albert C. Middleton. He was virtually the proprietor of the Victor Talking Machine Company, in conducting the business of which he made several millions of dollars; now, though under fifty years of age, he is practically retired from business. His American company had an English connection, the Gramaphone Company, of England. This English company has a large contract for supplying war munitions. One of the managers of the English company requested this Philadelphia gentleman to purchase munitions in the United States. Mr. Middleton agreed. Up to May last he had sent to England about $30,000,000 worth of munitions, and he had placed orders in the United States for as many millions more. The bills for all these munitions were sent to this American gentleman of high repute, and were paid on his personal voucher. For doing all this, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Middleton not only made no charge, but he actually paid the expenses of the office staff necessary to look after these war munition orders. And, Sir, when he was asked why he gave gratuitously the services of himself and his staff, the only reply that he made was: "I am deeply interested in the Allies' cause." I think that I would be correctly interpreting the feeling of this House and of the people of Canada if I should thank that man in the name of the people of this Dominion for the unselfish service that he has rendered gratuitously to the cause in which we are all so deeply interested. I am satisfied that there are many men in Canada who would do as Mr. Middleton has done if they were but given the chance, and I appeal to my hon. friends in the Government to give every man who is willing to bear a man's part in this great struggle the chance to play his part.

One word more in conclusion, and by way of pointing the moral that I want to bring home to the members of this Government. There has been laid before you, Sir, a portion only of the black record of the war profiteers. But even that portion is so bad that, not unnaturally, you ask yourself: by what process of reasoning could these men justify what they have done? Let me, Sir, suggest an answer to that question. If the war profiteers reasoned at all, it occurs to me that they must have followed a course of reasoning similar to that which, it is said, a former generation of medical men used to employ in dealing with certain desperate cases. You are aware, Sir, that in the crisis of a serious malady the bleeding of a patient was often said to turn the scale towards healthy life. Possibly with that in mind, and, in any event, looking at Canada in the crisis of this war, the profiteers must have reasoned thus: as with individuals, so with nations, so even with empires; therefore, at this critical stage in Canada's life, financial phlebotomy on a national scale has become necessary as a desperate remedy. And to work they went, with knife and tomahawk, all the time loudly proclaiming:

> True patriots we; for, be it understood,
> We bleed our country for our country's good.

Mr. Speaker, the first and paramount duty of this Parliament is to provide a ligature that will stop the country's bleeding. That ligature can take only the form of an investigating committee, and, as one of the representatives of the people of this country, I now ask this Government to appoint such a committee without one moment's further delay.

Mr. F. STEWART SCOTT (South Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, permit me to add my congratulations to the many which you have received upon the honour which has been conferred upon you in the position to which you have just been appointed.

The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Hon. Chas. Murphy) will pardon me, I am sure, if I do not attempt to follow him in some of the questions which he has raised. Speaking for myself, I must

say that I have nothing but admiration for the tone and spirit of the many magnificent speeches which we have heard during the course of this debate, and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has especially in his opening remarks, kept up the high standard of the speeches which we have heard during the last few days.

The hon. gentleman raised the question as to what was the true meaning of the visit of the Prime Minister of Canada to the councils of the Empire. I confess that I am unable at this time to give an answer to that question; I do not know what the answer will in the course of time be. Twenty years ago the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, speaking on the subject of imperial federation, said that he was almost afraid to speak on that subject for fear he might lose his reputation as a practical statesman. He said, too, that imperial federation was described by many as a dream, but that somehow or other, it was one of those dreams that seemed to fasten themselves upon the public imagination, and dreams that impress the public in that way somehow or other had a way of coming true. Our Empire has travelled far since Mr. Joseph Chamberlain gave expression to that opinion. At the time of the South African war, owing to the part played by the people of Canada, the relations which existed between the Motherland and the colonies were vastly changed. I do not know what may be the true significance of the visit of the Canadian Premier to the councils of the Empire, but I do know that when it was cabled to Canada and to the different parts of the Empire throughout the world it kindled fires of Imperial patriotism that, when we associate with it the great sacrifices of treasure and blood that have been made by the colonies in this great struggle, will, it seems to me, have a tremendous influence on the future development of the Empire. We may not know at the present time what may be the future position of the colonies and their relation to the Motherland but we do know that never again will the people of this Empire be satisfied with the relations that have existed in the past.

The last speaker said that in the investigation which took place under sanction of this Parliament in the last session it was shown that a certain middleman named Charles Slater had received a commission of $15,000 on a contract which he had secured from the Dominion Government for the supply of army boots. What were the true circumstances in connection with that incident? This man was associated with a company located in Quebec called the Gauthier Company, which was at that time conducted by the widow of the man Gauthier, who founded it. She had assumed that business, and was carrying it on as a limited liability company. There was associated with her as a commercial traveller a man named Charles Slater. He had been in the past, owing to his experience in the shoe business, as was brought out in the investigation, the shoe expert of the late Government. That shows the estimation in which they held his ability. This man represented to this lady, who was conducting this business, that, through the influence which he possessed with the Government at Ottawa, if she would pay him a commission of 5 per cent. on any orders which she might receive from the Government, he would use his influence in getting those orders. What are the facts? The Gauthier Company, in common with many other shoe manufacturing concerns throughout the Dominion of Canada, were awarded contracts for shoes. They filled those contracts. They received their contract at exactly the same price as was paid to other manufacturers. This man represented to this woman that it was through his own influence that he had secured this order. I submit that an arrangement of that kind, entered into in that way, in so far as this Government or any other Government might be concerned, involved nothing discreditable or disreputable. I may say further that this same firm, owing to just such careless, such unbusinesslike methods, have since gone into insolvency, very largely as the result of their operations in these war contracts, and have been able to pay their creditors only a small percentage of their liabilities.

I have no knowledge of the other contract to which the hon. gentleman referred. If I heard the names correctly, he referred to one Belmer and the John Ritchie Company; and I believe the case, as he makes it out, narrows down to this, that Belmer, having a contract with the Ritchie Company is now suing them for a commission on orders which the John Ritchie Company received. The right hon. leader of the Opposition asked the hon. gentleman a question which it seemed to me was pertinent. The first impression which I gained was that the contract to which he referred was a contract between the Government, or some

representative of the Government, and this firm; but we find that the contract was an ordinary contract between a commercial man and the firm; and I have only this to say, that if the John Ritchie Company, after the knowledge that has gone throughout the length and breadth of this country after the investigations we have had, knowledge which has been heralded broadcast throughout the press, that no middleman can secure orders for boots or for other commodities from the Militia Department, that if any business firm enters into a contract of that kind with a middleman, they have only themselves to blame. And I submit further that it will be found that if the John Ritchie Company did secure that order they received it at the same price that was paid to other manufacturers at the same time. I submit further that if they are foolish enough, under those circumstances, to enter into a contract of that kind, certainly this Government is not to be blamed or to be held responsible.

As I said before, I have enjoyed very much indeed the speeches which we have had during the past few days. I listened, as I always listen, with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). He is always so clear cut and so emphatic in his statements that I am sure the whole House joins with me in saying that we all listen to him with a great deal of pleasure. I want, for a moment, ask the consideration of the House to a point that was brought up by the hon. member for Red Deer in his speech of the other day. He was speaking about the amendment which was submitted to this House upon which the House divided in the session of last year. He said:

> Now, for my part I have no regret about the criticism or about the amendment, especially that portion of it which referred to the raising of additional obstacles against trade from Great Britain at this particular crisis of the Empire's history. I would appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, to whom I have never appealed without receiving careful attention, whether our criticism of that particular part of the Budget of last year has not been justified in the event.
>
> It cannot be pleasant to him—I am sure it is not—that at this moment the imports from Great Britain to this country should be disappearing almost to the vanishing point. This decrease in British imports into Canada comes at a moment when we know that Great Britain needs for the particular purposes of exchange to be sending more goods into Canada.

He was supporting an amendment that was submitted to the House. I will read the amendment once again:

> This House is ready to provide for the exigencies of the present situation and to vote all necessary ways and means to that end, but it regrets that in the measure under consideration duties are imposed which must be oppressive upon the people whilst yielding little or no revenue, and that the said measure is particularly objectionable in the fact that instead of favouring it, it is placing extra barriers against Great Britain's trade with Canada, at a moment when the Mother Country is under a war strain unparalleled in history.

There were two points raised in that amendment, the first being that the budget of one year ago would yield little or no revenue. The hon. member for Red Deer the other day said that he had no regrets for the stand he had taken upon that occasion. I have here the figures furnished by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech a year ago. He stated that to meet the requirements of this country there would be needed $150,000,000 or $30,000,000 over and above his estimate of what would have been raised under the old method and system of taxation. Now, we have had some months' experience of the working of that budget, and what is the result? I am informed that the estimate of $150,000,000, which the Minister of Finance had reason to expect would flow into the coffers of this country, was altogether too small, and that the receipts will be very considerably in excess of that figure.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCOTT: When the House rose at six o'clock I was referring to the argument of the hon. member for Red Deer as to the effect of the budget increase of five per cent last year upon goods imported from Great Britain. The argument of my hon. friend was that it must be a matter for regret to the Finance Minister to-day to find that as a result of that action upon the part of the Government imports from Great Britain to Canada had fallen to such a low point. For the consideration of the House I should like to submit some figures from the trade returns which it seems to me hardly bear out the argument of the hon. member for Red Deer. In August, 1914, the month in which the war broke out, there was a decrease in our imports from Great Britain of 26.3 per cent as compared with August, 1913; in September the decrease amounted to 40.3 per cent; in October to 31.8 per cent; in November to 42.3 per cent; in December to 35.2 per cent;

in January, 1915, to 26.8 per cent. Taking the average percentage of decrease during those months we find that from July, 1914, to January, 1915, there was an average decrease of 33⅓ per cent. In February, 1915, the tariff proposals of the budget of 1915 came into effect, and in that month we find a decrease in the imports from Great Britain of 21.7 per cent; in March a decrease of 38.1 per cent; in April of 28.1 per cent; in May of 40.2 per cent; in June of 38.4 per cent; and in August a decrease of 33.6 per cent. We find, then, that the average rate of decrease for the months during which the new budget proposals were in operation was 29 per cent. So that the situation resolves itself into this. The decrease in imports from Great Britain during the months of the war previous to the imposition of the extra five per cent imposed by the Budget of 1915 was greater than the decrease during the months the Budget has been in operation. It does not seem to me a matter for wonder, however, that there has been a continued decrease in imports from Great Britain to Canada. I think that decrease can be attributed to other reasons than the tariff. For instance, the importation of steel from Great Britain to Canada has decreased. Steel is a very important industry in Great Britain, but at the present time Great Britain is so absorbed in carrying on the war, and her industries are so much engaged in turning out munitions, that she has no steel to spare for Canada and the other countries of the world. The same thing applies to woollens. The woollen mills of Canada are busier at the present time, perhaps, than they have ever been before. The reason for the decrease in our imports from Great Britain is not because the people of Canada are not prepared to buy owing to the imposition of the additional five per cent war tax, but simply because Great Britain has not goods to sell; and at the present time we see Canada not only supplying her own market but exporting large quantities of goods to Great Britain.

If we examine the imports of the United States from Great Britain, dividing them into the two periods I have described, we shall find that the situation there is largely the same. In December, 1914, the imports from Great Britain to the United States decreased 47·8 per cent; in January, 1915, 38·4 per cent; in February, 27·7 per cent; in March, 20·5 per cent. In the United States we have no additional tax placed upon imports from Great Britain. Their imports from that country decreased just the same as our imports did. If we take the world-wide trade of Great Britain we shall find just the same thing. I have the figures here, and I find that in the month of August, 1914, the decrease as compared with the same month in 1913 was 45·1 per cent; in September, 37·1 per cent; and so on. The export trade of Great Britain has steadily declined.

During the course of this debate we have heard the Government criticised for the manner in which it has carried on the business of this country—that they did not use economy enough, that they were not careful enough in the expenditure of public funds, and that as a result the best interests of the country were suffering. I have before me a statement prepared by the Finance Department of the receipts up to January 10, 1916, and I find that the receipts up to that date are $25,205,634.51 in excess of last year. On ordinary account the expenditure is $10,743,393.76 less than last year. Capital expenditure during the same period is $6,257,400.82 less than last year.

So that if we take the total additional revenue that this country has received up to the present time as a result of the Budget of 1915, and if we add to that the economies that have been effected in the administration of the affairs of this country as compared with the previous year, we shall find that the financial position of Canada at the present time is better by $42,206,429 than it was one year ago. Therefore I do not think that the charge can be successfully substantiated that the ministers of the Crown of this Administration have not been alive to the necessities of the occasion, and have not practised economical methods wherever possible. When the war broke out the Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech at the war session of Parliament, said that until the conclusion of the war no new work on capital account would be begun, and I believe that that has been the policy, and that it can be said that no new work has been undertaken by the present Administration since the outbreak of war.

I have followed the various gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, and it seems to me that the situation in this Parliament at the present time hinges, to a very large extent, upon the charges that have been made against the Shell Committee. As I thought of this feature of the situation, history seemed to be once again repeating itself. Just as last year we had a great deal of discussion about other

charges that had been spread broadcast throughout the land, so at this time we have charges of a somewhat similar nature lodged against a very large and important industry. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) this afternoon referred to the so-called shell scandal, and demanded an investigation. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year the right hon. leader of the Opposition brought to the attention of the House and of the Government the fact that there had been very widely discussed throughout the country certain charges against a few manufacturers of having supplied a poor quality of boots. The Liberal press throughout Canada had many references to that matter, just as we find many references at the present time to the so-called shell scandal. Newspaper references to the boot question could have been quoted quite extensively last year just as there have been quoted in this debate references to the so-called shell scandal the Toronto Globe said:

> The punk boot men are still at large. The boot scandal will stand as a discouraging warning until it is cleared away by the adequate punishment of the guilty.

Again it said:

> Shavings of wood and pieces of cork do not appear to be good material out of which to make the soles of soldiers' boots.

The Government at that time decided, rightly or wrongly, that that question should be investigated, and for weeks throughout the entire session a special parliamentary committee investigated every possible detail, every tittle of evidence that could be submitted for its consideration, to prove that there had been scandal in connection with the purchase of boots. As a result of that investigation, a majority report and a minority report were submitted to the House. I will not weary the House by going over the ground further than to say this, that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who was a member of the committee of investigation, said from his place in the House, after the matter had been given the fullest and most careful investigation, that the manufacturers had supplied to the Militia Department boots which were well up to the sample, and that there was absolutely no evidence of any fraud upon their part. The reports came down for the consideration of this House. The matter was fully discussed by the members of the committee; yet it was so clear that there was nothing to justify the charges that had been made that, when the matter came to a division, there were only five members among hon. gentlemen opposite who thought that it was of sufficient consequence to record their vote. Therefore, from that time to the present, alarmed and excited although I will admit the public mind was, just as it is alarmed at the present time, we have not had a single complaint about the way in which those boot manufacturers have fulfilled their contracts. I said there was a similarity between the conditions that existed at that time and the conditions that exist at present. I have listened to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite; I have heard their references to the way in which this business has been conducted by the Shell Committee; but up to the present I have not seen brought to the attention of the House any charge that would justify an investigation. As an example, let us take what the hon. member for St. John the other night said:

> Then, again, I am told that another gentleman, a gentleman of my own profession, a lawyer in the city of Montreal, who contested the constituency of Richelieu at the last election, Mr. Morgan,—
>
> Mr. Lemieux. Not Pierpont?
>
> Mr. Pugsley: No, Mr. E. D. Morgan.
>
> Mr. Rogers: Pierpont's brother.
>
> Mr. Pugsley: Pierpont's brother? If he keeps on manufacturing shells he will be Pierpont's partner and it will not be long before he can laugh at Pierpont Morgan.

And so the fact of this Mr. Morgan having received a contract was held up to contempt and ridicule. I have in my hand a letter from this Mr. Morgan, setting out the situation in so far as his shell contract is concerned, and I would like to submit his statement of the situation to the consideration of this House, with this exception: there are certain references of a personal nature made to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), which I would very much prefer not to be the medium of bringing to public attention. If the House will permit me, I will read this letter of Mr. E. A. D. Morgan, with the extracts to which I have referred left out:

> Montreal, January 20, 1916.
>
> Hon. Mr. William Pugsley,
> House of Commons,
> Ottawa, Ont.
>
> Sir,—My attention has been called to a statement made by you, on the floor of the House, that a contract had been given to E. A. D. Morgan, barrister, of Montreal, former candidate for Richelieu, at a higher price than given to others. I, however, wish to state, to show you how uncalled-for were your remarks—

I leave out a paragraph.

—the only facts in this connection with which you were unacquainted.

There is in Sorel a very large machine shop, the property of a bank, who had to take it over when the former owners found themselves in difficulties, it is splendidly equipped and very well disposed for the manufacture of shells, and it was only running at about one-third capacity.

Another factory, the property of another bank, was idle

Ever since the question of manufacturing shells was broached, in order to obtain employment for the great number of men in Sorel, who found work hard to get owing to war conditions, and more particularly the cutting down of the number of men in the Government shipyard at Sorel, and the absence of large steamers coming to the port of Montreal having done away with lightering, I worried the former Shell Committee to get a shell contract, and at any price.

I had induced my two sons to invest $10,000 each and had obtained the promise of several thousand dollars from friends as well as about $25,000 in $100 subscriptions from the workingmen in Sorel.

Once again I omit a reference of a per sonal nature.

To return to shells. Getting no results from the Shell Committee, I even went to Mr. Thomas, and when he suggested our making shells at cost price, I told him we were prepared to do so, but, like my Irish forbears at Fontenoy, I wanted "the English to begin first," and the Welsh mine owners to show the same disinterestedness, by agreeing to give the miners the same wages for three years after the war, as they were giving them at present, so as to prevent strikes at a time when France was in such dire need of coal.

I also agitated very strongly with the members of the Federal Cabinet the importance of having a French-Canadian on the Shell Committee, as a measure of justice to them.

Possibly, for those reasons, I got no shell contract, but when tenders were called for, my sons and I tendered for two contracts, one for 60,0 0 4·5 and another for 40,000 60-pounders These tenders were put in at the price suggested in the circular, which I had been lucky enough to get hold of.

We obtained a contract for only 25,000 shells and not at a higher price than given to others.

This contract was too small to allow of the purchase of the large plant at Sorel, as the bank refused to sell. I then asked for an increase in the number of shells, at least up to 40,000.

Upon the statement of the new board that they could not increase the number of shells, but that they expected to get further orders, and we would have an opportunity to tender, I offered to renounce our contract and to take a 100,000 shell order at the lowest price that any one would ask for tenders. This was also refused.

I then asked the bank to start work at their factory on the order given to my sons and myself, transferring them the contract without any consideration whatsoever except that the work be carried on at Sorel. This was declined.

I thereupon endeavoured to organize a company and succeeded, as a matter of fact the building is now under construction and the machinery under purchase, for delivery in time to carry out the contract. As the three brothers who became interested in the matter had already bound themselves to purchase the machinery, and insisted that they should have the entire say in the matter, my sons (one of whom, seeing the delay in obtaining a shell contract, had decided to "do his bit" otherwise, and enlisted for overseas service, which, by the way, is more than any of yours have done), instead of putting money in the new company, took one-fifth of the stock for their interest in the contract and I agreed to transfer 2½ per cent of the stock which I was to get to the manufacturers of the machinery, the sole consideration being the quick delivery of the machinery.

Once again I omit a part.

As I know you will not rectify your statement and that I cannot, until after the next election, refute it on the floor of the House, I am sending this letter to your colleagues, who heard your accusations against me.

Yours truly,

E. A. D. Morgan.

This is one of the cases cited as showing that there has been wrongdoing in the letting of shell contracts. It seems to me that if something of a more substantial nature than this cannot be charged against the Shell Committee, there surely is not at the present time any ground for an investigation.

There have been other rumours. Last night there was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) something that went further than mere rumour, a quotation from the columns of a New York financial paper. It referred to a letter written by Sir Henry M. Pellatt, president of the Steel and Radiation Company of Canada, naming prices being paid for certain classes of shells in Canada. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by going over this entire article. In effect, the situation is this: Sir Henry Pellatt writes to New York financial interests that the company of which he is the president had received contracts for the manufacture of shells, and that on this first contract his profit is going to be $250,000, and that he has another contract that will show a profit of $200,000. Now, I submit to the judgment of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that if they were legitimate manufacturers engaged in the production of shells and had their own business to carry on, would it be reasonable to suppose that they would write a letter of that kind giving to the public the profit they were going to make. Who is Sir Henry Pellatt? Is he a great captain of industry? I have never heard him so described. He is a member of the firm of Pellatt & Pellatt, stockbrokers, of the city of Toronto. Sir Henry Pellatt, when he

wrote that letter, wrote it as one form of advertising. He is not concerned about the profits that are going to be made out of the shell industry in Canada. He is playing for bigger game. He wants the impression to go abroad in Wall street, in the stock exchanges of Toronto and Montreal, that he is getting big, fat, round contracts for war munitions, and he has got a war stock that he is going to sell to the unsuspecting public.

I come from a place where shells are being manufactured as successfully as in any part of this Dominion of Canada—and the work is carried on not for stock-jobbing purposes, but as a legitimate manufacturing enterprise. In connection with the shell orders that have been given in my constituency—and many have been given up to the present time—I may say that 75 per cent of the profits are represented to-day in the capital cost of new machinery and equipment. I know nothing of the operations of the stock market, but I will guarantee that Steel and Radiation stock, simultaneously with the announcement to which I have referred, was placed upon the market in the stock exchanges of Canada and the United States. I will guarantee also that that stock had a phenomenal rise, and that when this war is over, Sir Henry Pellatt will not hold that stock and will not be in a position to receive those war dividends—the unsuspecting public will once again have been taken in. I believe that the case of the Steel and Radiation Company may be taken as a fair sample of where this agitation has come from with regard to the abnormal profits that are being made in the production of shells.

I do not wish to enter into any discussion as to what might have happened if hon. gentlemen opposite had held the reins of power in August, 1914. I myself am persuaded that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been Prime Minister of this country at the time war broke out, he would have given to the service of his country all the earnestness and zeal that patriotic enthusiasm could command. But I desire to say that the people of Canada have followed the record of the Borden Administration since the war began. They have observed the way in which the Prime Minister of this country has assumed and discharged the duties of that difficult position; the way in which the Minister of Militia has fulfilled his arduous task; the way in which the Minister of Finance has guided our financial course during a most difficult and trying period; the way in which the other members of the Cabinet have measured up to the situation. And I may add—when all this passion that is being aroused has passed away, hon. gentlemen will agree with me—that I would include the Shell Committee amongst those who have given magnificent service to their country. When I think of what the Government has done during these trying times; when I think of the way in which they have represented the genius and the aspirations of the Canadian people, as a humble member of the party which I represent, I am indeed proud.

I feel that I must not too long transgress upon the time of this House. As I said before, I have taken a great deal of pleasure in listening to the speeches that have been delivered in this debate, and I think that the tone of them has been splendid, and creditable indeed to this House of Commons. I am not one of those who think that the Opposition should sit still and say nothing. I think that if there is anything, even in the present situation, that demands criticism, hon. gentlemen opposite would be derelict in their duty if they hesitated to criticise it. But it seems to me that when we think of what has been accomplished in this country, when we think of what the country has passed through, and of the opportunities that there have been for irregularities, when we consider that nothing more substantial has been brought against the record of this Administration, our affairs have indeed been conducted in an honourable and creditable manner.

Reference has been made to certain agitators in the province of Quebec, of whom we as Canadian people do not feel proud. In this respect I am prepared to accept the view of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who said the other day that we must look not to the Bourassas and the Lavergnes for an expression of the feelings and sentiments of the French-Canadian people, but that we may find those sentiments properly expressed in the speeches that have been delivered by the Lauriers and the Casgrains. I believe implicitly that that is a proper summing-up of the situation. In regard to the statements that have been made recently in the Quebec legislature, I believe such is the benign influence of British institutions, that these men will live to regret the day that they ever gave expression to such sentiments, and that their children, whatever their fathers may

have advocated, will be loyal and patriotic Canadians.

As I endeavoured to catch the spririt underlying the opinions of hon. gentlemen of this House, and as I tried to think of what I might appropriately say on this occasion, it seemed to me that in concluding the remarks that I was to make to-night, I could not do better than quote to the House an extract from a spech delivered more than fifty years ago by a distinguished member of Parliament. He was speaking for unity; for the removal of race and class prejudices. The late Thomas D'Arcy McGee, in the course of an address in which he was speaking of the future of Canada—and with these words I shall conclude—said:

> All we have to do is, each for himself, to keep down dissensions which can only weaken, impoverish, and keep back the country; each for himself, to do all he can to increase its wealth, its strength, and its reputation; each for himself—you and you, gentlemen, and all of us—to welcome every talent, to hail every invention, to cherish every gem of art, to foster every gleam of authorship, to honour every acquirement and every natural gift; to lift ourselves to the level of our destinies, to rise above all low limitations and narrow conscriptions; to cultivate that true catholicity of spirit which embraces all creeds, all classes and all races in order to make of our boundless Canada, so rich in known and unknown resources, a great new northern nation.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, before I enter upon the subject of my remarks on this occasion, I deem it my duty to offer you my congratulations on your elevation to the seat which you now occupy, knowing that in that position you will display the dignity which you have shown in an inferior seat, and that impartiality will at all times characterize your actions, as we have seen even during the few days you have presided over this House.

I have listened with great attention to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. It has been my pleasure in other sessions to listen with gratification and admiration to the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Alfred Thompson). On this occasion he has again been equal to the task imposed on him, and his speech will remain among the cherished records of Canada for many years to come. The seconder of the address has recalled to this House many of the deeds of the French Canadian people from the province of Quebec in the present war. I need not mention the speeches of the right hon. Prime Minister and the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who have both been equal to the task of the day. It was my pleasure again to listen to the eloquent address of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain), who also reminded this Parliament and the country of the deeds which have been acomplished in the field of battle by French Canadians from the province of Quebec. He gave us some information as to the number of soldiers who have gone to the front from that province, many of whom have already come back with glory, while others have given their lives and died the death of heroes in defence of the sacred cause of liberty, justice and right. I join with these gentlemen in paying honour to the members of the French-Canadian race from the province of Quebec and from Western Canada for the part they have taken in this great war.

But I rise to say that far to the east of Quebec, along the coast of the Atlantic and the gulf of St. Lawrence, there is also an element of the French race, in the land of Evangeline, the forest primeval so poetically described by Longfellow, now converted into prosperous towns and villages, and happy homes, blessed with large families, educated to the forgiveness of the harshness of conquest in the present enjoyment of the glorious faculties of British citizenship, the Acadians of the Maritime provinces, who, in this present crisis, have given testimony of their love of country and their appreciation of the benefits of British citizenship equal to that given by any other section of the Canadian people. As senior member for the Acadian people in this House, representing the largest number of Acadians in the Maritime Provinces, who opened to me the gate of this sanctuary some sixteen years ago and have kept it open for me on every occasion since that time, I deem it my duty to make you acquainted with what has been going on among the Acadian people in the Maritime Provinces. Let me tell you that the efforts of the French race in the province of Quebec have been equalled —I say it with pride—by those of the Maritime Provinces. Not only the common citizens among the Acadians have given their attention to the position in which Canada has been placed through this turmoil of European war, but every man of intelligence of every position, every Acadian priest in the Maritime Provinces, has devoted his time, his efforts, his eloquence, to calling upon the young men of his place to enlist with others and go and

defend their country by defending the rule of Britannia. It has been my pleasure on many occasions during the last year to address recruiting meetings in my county. There is not one district which I have not visited, and in many of them, especially in the larger places such as Bathurst, where the population is mixed, we have always had the ministers of the non-Catholic denominations side by side with the Catholic priest; and in every other district, the French districts more particularly, every meeting was presided over by the parish priest; and as my hon. friend Mr. Lemieux said of the Province of Quebec, in any place where no hall or schoolhouse afforded sufficient accommodation for the multitude, the vestry of the church of the locality was open to the recruiting meetings, presided over, as I say, by the parish priest.

The hon. the Postmaster General, as well as the seconder of the Address, in order to show to the country at large, as well as to this House, the unanimity of action of the whole people, more particularly among the ecclesiastical authorities, has read to this House the noble words that have fallen from the lips of the Archbishop of Quebec and the Archbishop of Montreal.

I am sure that every one in this House will be edified by his words, and that they will be read by future generations. Will you permit me, Mr. Speaker, to read a few more passages to the House. I am sure you will agree that no more patriotic, no more eloquent and fervid appeal has been made during the war than that made by the only Acadian Bishop in the Maritime Provinces, Bishop Leblanc, of St. John, at a public meeting held in the city of St. John on the 1st November, 1914. This is what he said:

> As Canadians our cause is bound up with the cause of Britain her interests are ours; if England falls we are going to fall with her, and we are going to lose all the glorious privileges we enjoy as citizens of the British Empire. Canada now so free and so happy, so blessed by God with such great resources, Canada that has such a brilliant future before her, will be reduced to a condition of vassalage and crushed under the iron heel of a foreign 'and unsympathetic ruler.
>
> Failure for England in this war will mean England's destruction and even success will have to be dearly paid for; but, let us thank God, the age of chivalry is not passed; there is still enough patriotism and heroism in the young men of this province to make a supreme effort now for England's cause. Our hope is in our young men, to them we look to uphold the honour and the glory of the British Empire, of that empire which, rather than break its plighted word to gallant little Belgium, has been willing to sacrifice the best and noblest of her sons

Coming from such a high dignitary, these words could not fail to have a beneficent effect, and I may say that since then, on more than one occasion, Bishop Leblanc has given expression to similar sentiments at French gatherings, more particularly at Moncton and Shediac. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that a great number of Acadians have enlisted in the military forces. They have enlisted in every county of the Maritime Provinces. I know whereof I speak, so far as the counties of New Brunswick are concerned, and I think the hon. members from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, who represent consituencies containing French elements, can testify to the fact that in their constituencies also the Acadian people have risen to the occasion. Hundreds and thousands of them have already gone to the front, and only recently, just before the Christmas holidays, it was decided to form an Acadian battalion.

9 p.m.

I desire to extend to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia my congratulations upon his prompt response to the request of the Acadian people. At present they are engaged throughout the counties of New Brunswick and other parts of the Maritime Provinces in forming a battalion of their own, with their own officers, and, let me add, with their own chaplain. Only a few days ago, just as I was about to leave my home to come here to attend to my duties in Parliament, we received a report in Bathurst that two brave young men from the county of Gloucester had been killed in action. One, Cyril Vigot, though born on the island of Jersey, had been a resident at Caraquet, in the county of Gloucester for many years. He had left one of the best positions open to young men in the county of Gloucester, having been manager of one of the branches of the Loggie Company in Caraquet. The other young man, Henry Bertin, before leaving to join the colours, appealed to his mother not to refuse him permission to go, saying, "I feel I have to go for my country." The action of these brave fellows showed what the young men of Acadia are prepared to do to play their part in the struggle for liberty, right and justice.

The people of Canada have always shown themselves willing and ready to respond to the call of duty. Many outside observers have remarked that the plane of Canadian

patriotism was the loftiest ever offered to human contemplation by reason of the many virtues of the different races embraced in the Dominion, races inspired by the highest ideals of Christianity. In the present crisis they have exhibited to the world their readiness to bear the greatest sacrifices for the preservation of those ideals. The fact has been dwelt upon that Canada engaged voluntarily in this war. She went with all the speed possible to the assistance of the Motherland, and of the small nations which were threatened by Prussian militarism. But Canada has not been alone in showing such a fine example. We have seen the same response on the part of our sister dominions. We have seen Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, and other portions of the Empire moving with the harmony which has been the admiration of the world and the consternation of the Kaiser of Germany. How is it that Great Britain has been able to evoke the patriotism of all her possessions at the moment of trial? How has she been able to link together her distant possessions, and to present such solidarity in the face of the enemy? All this was accomplished, not by any threat or menace such as the Kaiser of Germany would use, not by the blood-and-iron policy of Bismarck, not by conscription, but through love beaming across the seas and drawing from every British shore the affection of Britain's millions of subjects blended into one common soul under the benevolent smile of Providence. From Ireland, which has suffered persecution for centuries, we have seen thousands of soldiers instantly respond to the call and take their place in the trenches alongside the Belgian soldiers. The Irish soldier in the battlefield, mindful of the noble words of Gladstone his protector, does not merely look on while the fight for freedom progresses but rushes into the fray and willingly sacrifices his life. His valour and fearlessness is excelled only by the heroism of the Belgian soldier. Such, Mr. Speaker, is the position in which we are to-day, and which is likely to continue for some time to come. The people of Canada will continue to make any sacrifices that may be needed, sacrifices in men and sacrifices in money.

As I said a moment ago, Britain accomplished all these marvels without conscription, and I wish to say how much I appreciated the declaration of the right hon. the Prime Minister the other day, and the declaration of the leader of the Opposition, that there shall be no conscription in Canada. Why, Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in this war for the very purpose of effacing, if we can, conscription from the face of the earth. The conscription of the Prussian people has been the cause of all the bloodshed during the last eighty years. It is against this Prussian militarism, which has made a whole nation of seventy million people merely the tools of military officers, that we are sending our young men to-day. The Prussian soldier is fighting to-day not because he is exercising his own intelligence, nor from any motives of freedom, but to give vent to his passions,—and patriotism takes second place in his heart.

Canada is to raise five hundred thousand troops. In speaking to the young men of my county I have always said that we wanted them to go voluntarily, that we wanted them to go because we did not want conscription applied to Canada if Germany should unfortunately win this war, and the more deeply our young men have been impressed with this idea the more eagerly have they come forward. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who knows conditions in New Brunswick, is aware that in the early months of the war recruits in that part of the country came forward rather slowly, for the reason that like nearly every one in Canada and in Great Britain too they made the mistake of thinking the war would be a short one. Many young men have said to me, What is the use of going? Why, after we have had six months training at Valcartier the war will be over. But now, when the necessity for sacrifice has been made clear to them, they are coming forward in thousands where a year ago they came forward in hundreds. I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that if conscription is absolutely necessary in Canada we shall have to resort to it, but I maintain that if we adopt the proper measures it will not be necessary to have conscription in order to raise the 250,000 men who are required. The people of Canada will willingly give them. I wish to place myself emphatically on record against conscription. I do not wish to say anything offensive in regard to what has happened in England lately. One of the glories of Britain is that she has never had to resort to conscription. It is of course only a mild sort of conscription they are proposing there now and merely a temporary measure, because the leading men of Great Britain no doubt feel that they

owe it to the Allies to do all they possibly can to help secure victory. It is to be regretted that a year ago the labour element in Great Britain was not really educated to the necessities of the occasion. We have seen that Welsh statesman, Mr. Lloyd George, appealing to the labour element, and the labour element once it was educated to the necessities of the occasion responded with a patriotism that could not be excelled by any other class of British subjects.

I agree also with the opinion of my hon. friend from Edmonton, that our wounded soldiers who return to Canada must receive a larger pension. If you satisfy our young men that if they become incapacitated through the war they will be treated by the nation according to their sacrifice, if you convince them that they are fighting for a nation which is worthy of the sacrifice, and that when they come back incapacitated they will not be at the mercy of any municipality or even a province, but that the Government of the nation itself will give them an adequate pension—and they have a right to it having sacrificed their future and exposed their life—then I say, we shall get all the recruits we need.

The duty of providing for our wounded soldiers ought not to be left to the provinces nor to the Patriotic Fund. Our soldiers must feel their security before they go. The provinces should not have such a burden imposed upon them, because some of our provinces have certainly no great wealth at their disposal. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) will agree with me, I am sure, when I say that the revenues of the province of New Brunswick are small compared with all its necessities, and if we were to impose to-day upon the Government of that province the responsibility, or a part of the responsibility, for the maintenance of our returned soldiers, some of them might not get the comforts which they have a right to expect. The Dominion Government and the nation at large should undertake this duty. The same thing has been done in the United States. The Government of the United States after the war of the Revolution did not distribute the cost of the pensions to her returned soldiers amongst the different states nor leave it to the devotion of her people, but established a pension board and gave the soldier what was needed for his comfort and that of his family when he got back from the front.

Another question which I wish to bring to the attention of the House is a paragraph in the speech from the Throne which reads as follows:

> The life of the present Parliament expires in the autumn of this year, and, under existing legislation, a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met my avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.
>
> That purpose can only be effected through the medium of legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. A resolution authorizing and requesting the enactment of such legislation as will extend the life of this Parliament for the period of one year will be presented to you.

No one appreciates more deeply than I do the position in which Canada is at present on account of this war. It has been said by the Liberal party at least that the Government of the day should carry on the prosecution of the war. Now, the war has lasted eighteen months, and is not yet ended, and while the end may come within a short time, the war may, unfortunately, last a very long time. The proposal in the speech from the Throne means an amendment to the British North America Act under which we live to-day, and I view it with all sincerity and seriousness. My views upon the constitution of Canada have been well known to this House. I believe, since I have been a member of it, and also to the people of my constituency, either through my addresses to the public or through the press, for many years before I became a member of this House. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that I always view with apprehension any suggestion of a change in the constitution of Canada. While the minority in New Brunswick have suffered on account of the constitution, we have been educated to suffer for the sake of the constitution, in order that changes in it and in the methods of applying its principles may not endanger privileges conferred upon some classes of the people by it. Our constitution is not exactly the same as that of Great Britain: it is the depository of the privileges of the minorities throughout the whole Dominion. Majorities of to-day may be minorities of to-morrow, and the constitution is for the happiness of all the people of Canada and of the minorities, whichever they may be. I do not yet say definitely what position I may have to take on this question; but you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues from the Maritime Provinces, as well as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, know

that I have strong views on this question; that I have always opposed as strongly as I could any change in the constitution unless effected by the very means indicated, if not by the letter, by the spirit of the constitution. It is my respect and love and admiration for the constitution which has led me during my life time to stand by it and to ask my people to stand by it. It is to me the ideal legislation which has as yet been given to the people of the western hemisphere, and which is far superior to the constitution of the United States. I have always given the fathers of Confederation the highest praise for their wisdom at the time when they met together to frame that constitution, which was to insure the happiness of the people of Canada not only for the past fifty years, but for centuries to come. Only very recently Sir Chas. Tupper, the last survivor of the fathers of Confederation, passed away. His death was the occasion for expressions of admiration for this old statesman of Canada. The whole press of Canada was filled with praises of his name for his deeds. A great many of our leading statesmen from the capital of Canada, and from other cities and towns throughout the Dominion, flocked to his funeral in order to give an expression of their admiration of his career. Owing to circumstances, I was not able to participate in that demonstration; but I have given strong expressions of my admiration of Sir Charles Tupper, as well as of every other one of the fathers of Confederation, for their framing of our constitution.

I do not know yet with what safeguards the Bill may be surrounded when it is presented to this House for consideration. I have always claimed that if any change in the constitution is to be made, there is only one way to proceed, and that is by the submission of the proposed change to consideration on the part of the representatives of the provinces. Confederation is a union of the provinces of Canada, and these provinces have come together for certain purposes and on certain terms, which are set forth in the constitution. Only last session I attempted to prevent a change in the constitution with regard to representation in this House. It was not for the sake of popularity that I took that stand. All my colleagues in the province of New Brunswick were not only willing but anxious to have the change made, because it would secure larger representation for New Brunswick and for the Maritime Provinces generally. The change was made upon an address of the two Houses of this Parliament to the Parliament of Great Britain. If the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) were here he would bear me out in stating that at the last moment, before that Bill was passed, I again appealed to him to have the proposal submitted to a conference of the Premiers of the provinces. If it were approved by such a conference, then the Parliament of Great Britain could sanction it and all would submit to it. But, unfortunately, my last appeal fell upon deaf ears, and so we have that change made in the constitution of Canada. Now we are asked to-day to do what, perhaps, a large proportion of the people of Canada might regard with some apprehension, as I do. Our electors have sent us here for a period of five years, which period will expire on the 7th or 8th of October, when, if not before, in regular course, this Parliament will cease to exist. But we are asked now to sanction the lengthening of that term. This will save us the trouble of returning to our electors. This question has a legal as well as a moral aspect. There is the legal objection to giving ourselves an extension of life as representatives when the people whose representatives we are have not sanctioned that extension. There is also the moral aspect when we undertake to vote for ourselves indemnity for one or more sessions beyond the time for which the people sent us here. These are considerations, which, I believe, the people of this country have seriously in mind.

I quite realize that in this time of war many and great sacrifices are called for. No one dreads more than I do the sadness of this war, which has invaded my own home as it has thousands of others. It is not for the sake of a political fight that I would express my disapproval of this proposal. We must consider conditions in all these matters, and must regard so grave a question as this with the seriousness which the people expect of us. It is true that a change has just been made lengthening the life of the present Parliament of Great Britain. But, as I have stated, the British Parliament is not in the same position as ours. Under our constitution this Parliament is the depository of the liberties of many classes, minorities and majorities, in the Dominion of Canada. We must remember, also, that Great Britain has assumed the financing of the war not only for herself but for her allies as well, a tremendous task to be undertaken by the British Par-

liament. We must remember also that the statesmen of Great Britain have only demanded an extension of the life of their present Parliament for eight months, which term will expire before the natural expiry of the term of our own Parliament next October. But we are asked to extend the life of this Parliament for a year beyond its regular term. Consider also how different are the conditions in Great Britain and here. There, as soon as the war was declared, the Prime Minister of Great Britain called to his assistance and to the councils of the nation, not only the titular leader of the Opposition, but a number of the most eminent members of that party, forming what has since been called the coalition Government, in which almost every party in the House of Commons is represented, making a representation, we may fairly say, of the whole nation. But in Canada the same thing was not done. Had the Prime Minister at the beginning of the war called to the councils of the nation the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and had he acted with that right hon. gentleman in the same spirit as the leading statesmen of both sides in Britain have acted together, the people of Canada would be in a different mood, and many of them would not be actuated by the spirit which actuates them to-day. If then this Parliament had expired and the war was not yet ended, Canada might have enjoyed the spectacle of a general election carried on practically without opposition, resulting in the return by acclamation of practically every member on both sides of the House to continue his work here.

These are views, I believe, which will strike my electors of the county of Gloucester, and so I wish to make them clear to this Parliament, as well as to the people of Canada. A Bill to amend the constitution is to be presented. What safeguards it will contain I cannot say, but I deem it my duty again to express my opinion in regard to any proposed change in the constitution. Not only last year, but three years ago as well, I said that I would always oppose any modification or change in the principle of the constitution without consultation with and the sanction of the provinces of the Dominion. If my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were here to-night I would remind him of the correspondence which I had with him at one time concerning the terms of subsidies to the provinces. On that occasion I wrote him that I could not possibly support any change in the constitution unless that change were sanctioned by an interprovincial conference. My hon. friend and leader at that time—I believe it was in 1906—made immediate reply to my communication, expressing his appreciation of my remarks, and advising me that he had made up his mind to submit the proposal for the change in subsidies to an interprovincial conference. This was done; the change was subsequently sanctioned by the British Government, and since that time no fault has been found with the further subsidies which have been given.

It is now forty years since I first called upon the people of my constituency to adhere to the terms of the constitution. Forty years ago I was perhaps younger than I am to-day, but I gave all my efforts to my people, and I am willing to give them to-day. Again, a few years ago, when Saskatchewan and Alberta became provinces of the Dominion, I stood by the terms of the constitution. I thought it would be useless to give to these provinces more than was given to them when then entering Confederation, because if we were to grant them more, the proposed terms would be submitted to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council would strike off anything that was not contained in the statute which admitted these provinces into Confederation. At that time I appealed to my electors to stand by the terms of the constitution; to-day I feel it my duty to say, without saying that I am bound to oppose the Bill, that until I know the safeguards by which it will be protected, I shall maintain my ground. Only when the terms of the bill are explained shall I be able to say whether it is my opinion that we should avoid the turmoil of an election in Canada at this time by adopting such a measure. Nobody is more fond of peace than I am—I am known in my country as the peacemaker—but if I apprehend greater friction in the future as a result of the adoption of this proposed measure than would be caused by an election, I would choose the lesser evil; I would say let us have an election rather than submit the people of Canada to future controversies by changing the constitution in an improper way.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to you for your attentitve hearing, as well as to the other members of the House.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Hazen, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, the House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

Monday, January 24, 1916.

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Regulations under the Destructive Insect and Pest Act.—Mr. Burrell.

Report on the Agricultural Instruction Act, 1914-1915.—Mr. Burrell.

THE GOVERNOR GENERALS'S SPEECH.
ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Friday, January 21.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I desire to be associated with the previous speakers in this debate who have referred in terms of congratulation to your elevation to the high and important position of Speaker of this House. I think it is a fact that you are the youngest man who has ever been called upon to be the first commoner of Canada; but in spite of that fact, those who have been associated with you in the work of this House for the past four or five years are satisfied that you will discharge the duties of this important position in a way that will be worthy of the traditions of the office; that you will have due regard to the preservation of the dignity and decorum of debate, and that as between the parties in this House you will hold the scales of justice with an even hand.

I desire also, as others have already done, to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Alfred Thompson) and to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) on the manner in which they discharged the task of moving and seconding the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. It was my pleasure a few years ago to visit that far distant constituency of the Yukon; and although I think in no constituency in Canada is there keener party feeling, yet I found on all hands an expression of opinion that the present member represents that constituency in a way that gives satisfaction to the people irrespective of politics, and with due regard to the ambitions and potentialities of that great and extensive district.

I also, Sir, would like to say that I concur in the words that have been uttered with regard to the Governor General of Canada. It has been a good thing for this country that during this time of stress and strain the representative of His Majesty in Canada is a gentleman who has had such an extensive, varied and long experience as a military man, and whose knowledge of military matters has been of very great value in making more effective than it otherwise would have been the aid which Canada has given to the Empire in the present crisis.

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), to whose speeches, I, in common with other hon. members, always listen with pleasure, who always holds the attention of his auditors, whose moderation in criticism and in debate, and whose admirable parliamentary manner are worthy of emulation, has made certain representations in regard to delays that may have occurred between the time when the Canadian troops are enlisted and the time when they actually get into the firing line. I would like to say a few words on that. At page 37 of Hansard, the hon. member for Red Deer used these words:

> But the point that is exercising the mind of our people is this: I think they would be glad of the assurance that there is no undue delay in getting the recruits, once they are raised, into the trenches. I hope the Government appreciates my point, and I hope that some one will give the country and Parliament the necessary assurance upon that point.

I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Government fully appreciates this point. It has been the subject of more or less discussion in this country, and there is no doubt that there is, among those who enlist, a feeling that possibly at times unnecessary delay has occurred before they are able to get into the trenches, and come face to face with the foe. That opinion reaches us from those who are overseas. My youngest son, who is serving with the Artillery overseas, who went to England in August last, and who, I think, about a week ago crossed over to France, has frequently written to me complaining about the length of time that he is obliged to remain under training in Great Britain, and expressing his impatience at the delay in getting into the firing line. That is the feeling which characterizes all of our young Canadians who go overseas. They are impatient at any delay that may occur, as their desire is to get into the firing line as soon as possible, and they are apt to fret and chafe at the months they have to spend in training and drill before the British mili-

tary authorities think it is desirable that they should actually go into the trenches. Hon. gentlemen know that the First Canadian Contingent which crossed the seas was only a comparatively few weeks in camp at Valcartier before it was transported to the other side; but after it arrived in England it was kept under most unfortunate conditions in camp at Salisbury Plain during the whole of the winter before the British authorities thought our troops sufficiently trained and disciplined to take their place in the firing line; but, when they did meet the foe face to face, they proved themselves the equal of the best soldiers that were fighting side by side with them, and they brought undying honour and glory to their country. Everybody knows that, except in comparatively few cases our Canadian soldiers have had little training of a military character, and so it is necessary that they should undergo a certain amount of preparation before they cross the sea. The Canadian Government and the Department of Militia are sending those men forward week by week as they get the necessary training, and as the war office wants them, and as transports can be obtained. When they arrive on the other side of the water, then their disposition is a matter for the British War Office. They are not members of the Militia of Canada, but are enlisted specially for overseas service, and when they get to the other side they become part and parcel of the British army. It is then for the British War Office to decide when they shall be sent to France and when they shall take their place in the firing line. I say to my hon. friend from Red Deer, and to the people of this country, that, so far as the Government of Canada and the Minister of Militia of Canada are concerned, they are fully alive to the desirability of sending the men forward as quickly as they can be sent forward, having regard to their training and fitness for the work, and they will continue to do so in the future as in the past.

My hon. friend and colleague from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made a lengthy speech to this House the other night, a speech very different in tone and in style of criticism from that delivered by the leader of the Opposition and that of the hon. member for Red Deer. In the course of that speech the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) referred to the question of transportation, the difficulty of getting tonnage, and the increased freight rates upon the ocean, and he referred to it with the intention of holding the Government of Canada responsible for the conditions that exists. The hon. gentleman, with an absolute lack of generosity—to use no stronger term—suggested that the reason for the existing conditions was that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) last year had to spend several weeks away from Canada, overlooking entirely the fact that the Minister of Agriculture was forced to leave Canada on his doctor's advice and in consequence of the condition of his health, and that while he was away under his doctor's orders he was able to render good service to Canada by representing the Dominion, and also His Majesty the King, at the Exposition in California. The hon. gentleman suggested also that the Government were not attending to such matters because they had gone out to address recruiting meetings. It is very hard to satisfy my hon. friend and some of his friends. I have been reading in Liberal newspapers criticisms of the members of the Administration because they had not made more recruiting speeches than they have been able to make, in view of the tremendous amount of work thrown upon them during the last two years. A leading newspaper in Ontario, some months ago, found fault with the Prime Minister because he was not addressing more recruiting meetings, and it asked, who had heard a word in favour of recruiting from the lazy lips of Sir Robert Borden. And now the hon. member for the city of St. John holds the Government responsible for the high freight rates because, as he suggests, the members of the Administration had been spending too much time in addressing recruiting meetings.

With the war, a state of affairs arose regarding tonnage and transportation that has certainly been very difficult to deal with. The breaking out of the war put out of business a great many ships that had been engaged in the carrying trade. Go down to the ports of Boston and New York, and you will see there steamers of the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg-American swinging at anchor, absolutely idle, unable to continue the business which they had carried on before the war, because were they to venture out from their safe havens in Boston, New York, or other American ports, they would be captured by the vigilant British cruisers which, operating from Halifax, are protecting the trade routes across the seas for the people of Canada and the Empire.

In addition, ships flying our own flag have been held up and interned. I know of two vessels belonging to St. John or other Maritime Province ports interned in the port of Hamburg where they happened to be when war was declared. Such vessels are prevented from taking part in the general carrying trade. Besides the dislocation of trade in this way, hundreds of ships have had to be taken over by the British Admiralty, as is absolutely essential if the war is to be carried to a successful termination. All this has led to disturbance, trouble, and difficulty in the transportation of goods, and naturally it has caused an enormous increase in the freight rates which have to be paid. My hon. friend might have known that this is a condition which applies not only to us but to all the shipping of the world generally. It would be quite as fair to hold the Government responsible for the fact that freights have advanced equally in the United States, and even more in the Argentine Republic and other South American countries, but in view of the statements he has made, I desire to give a fair, frank statement of what the Government has done to meet the transportation question and to give to the product of Canadian mills, forests, and farms, means of reaching the market during the progress of the war.

The efforts made by the Government to secure adequate tonnage for the Canadian export trade relate to two classes of exports. One class includes the whole of the general commercial overseas exports of the Dominion; the other comprises the large quantities of supplies and munitions of war which are being purchased in Canada by the British Government. As will be seen a little later on, a very efficient and comprehensive organization has been built up for dealing with the last-mentioned class. But, while making certain that there would be no obstruction in the flow of war supplies to the other side, the Government at the same time realized the necessity of doing everything possible to meet the need of ocean transportation for general commercial purposes. As early as March the question was taken up formally with His Majesty's Government. At the instance of the Prime Minister strong representations were made by means of official communications to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, pointing out that the Canadian export and import trade was facing a serious condition on account of the shortage of ocean transport due to the requisitioning by the Admiralty of so many of the best carrying vessels of the principal steamship lines. The necessity for taking all possible measures to relieve this situation was urged. The Prime Minister had already put the matter forward through Sir George Perley, the Acting High Commissioner in London, requesting him to take it up directly with the appropriate departments of the British Government. This was done and Sir George attended many conferences with officials in London. The question was kept continually before the Admiralty and other departments all through the spring. Representations were made on behalf of various Canadian shipping companies whose tonnage in greater or lesser degree had been requisitioned. In June a large boat for the St. Lawrence coal carrying trade and three vessels belonging to the lumber trade were released after much negotiation.

In June also conferences were held in Ottawa between an Inter-Departmental Committee and representatives of Canadian steamship companies operating between Montreal and the United Kingdom. Measures for meeting the growing scarcity of tonnage were considered.

At the end of June the Prime Minister went to London to confer in person with His Majesty's Government, and particular attention was devoted to this problem of providing adequate transportation for general commercial purposes. The whole question was fully discussed during July and August at a number of interviews which the Prime Minister had not only with the permanent officials of the Admiralty, but with several of the members of the Cabinet, all of whom realized its importance. It was recognized that the matter was equally important to Great Britain and to Canada; to Great Britain because of the food supplies which she must receive from this country and in order that her manufacturers might have access to the Canadian markets; to Canada in order that trade with the Mother Country might be maintained, and that the large crops which were to be harvested might find a portion of their market in Great Britain and other European countries. It was pointed out that in view of the part Canada was taking in the war it was especially desirable that every facility should be given to continue our export trade. The fact that a very large wheat crop was anticipated was particular-

ly and insistently put forward. It was urged that from sixty to sixty-five per cent of our normal tonnage, peculiarly constructed for the North Atlantic trade, had been requisitioned, and that a serious situation would develop unless adequate steps were taken to meet it. As a result arrangements were then made that the Admiralty should release, so far as the paramount exigencies of war would permit, every available vessel that could be used for this service. The matter was also taken up with the steamship lines whose ships had been requisitioned by the Admiralty, and urgent representations were made to them as to the chartering by them of steamships wherever they could be obtained that might take the place of those requisitioned. One immediate result of these steps was the assigning of two steamers fitted with refrigerator plants to be used in transporting frozen meat from Canada. Assurances were also given that if more tonnage was needed for this purpose it would be provided.

After the Prime Minister returned in September the subject was still kept before the British Government. Strong representations were made to the Colonial Secretary; at the same time the matter was urged through Sir George Perley, who made it the subject of many conferences both with the British permanent officials and with the members of the Cabinet. As a result, since the 1st of January, 1915, twenty ships requisitioned by the Admiralty have already been released for the Canadian service, and, in addition, the High Commissioners' Office has secured the release of three ships as to which notice of requisition had been given. His Majesty's Government have also assigned three prize ships, the Kawak, the Barenfels, and the Nerime, to be used in the North Atlantic trade. Furthermore, the Colonial Office secured three large sailing vessels which have been chartered to the Canadian Government and will be made available on this route. His Majesty's Government have also transmitted information as to other sailing vessels which are open for charter, and this information has been given to shipping agents. It is also to be borne in mind that the fact of the inauguration of the regular transport service since last February at the instance of the Government for the transportation of war supplies has released, to a considerable extent, the space in the regular liners, and this space so released has been and is now available for ordinary commercial tonnage.

In considering this question it must always be borne in mind that after all and above all we are at war. More than 1,500 steamers have been requisitioned by the British Government alone for war purposes, and the governments of other nations have been obliged to pursue the same course with respect to their mercantile marine. As Premier Asquith pointed out in the Imperial House of Commons several weeks ago, the demands made upon the British Government in this respect have involved the transporting of 2,500,000 officers and men, in addition to 320,000 sick and wounded, 2,500,000 tons of supplies and munitions, and 800,000 horses and mules; and these figures are exclusive of millions of tons of stores which have been carried by the navy for Allied Governments. Military and naval requirements must be paramount, rough and ready though their demands often are; and they must be served fully at the cost of all other considerations. The life of the Empire depends on this, and all interests should bear in mind that considerations of commercial advantage should never be allowed to place any restriction or impediment upon the difficult and momentous military and naval operations in which we are engaged. In view of these facts and considerations, Canadian producers and shippers may consider themselves fortunate to have fared as well as they have. The steps taken by the Government have resulted in giving to the exporter enough ocean tonnage to make the transportation of our great crop a certainty, and have enabled our prices to be placed on an export basis immediately. More ships than in other seasons have been employed in the North American grain trade. The export shipments during October were the greatest in the history of North America. It also appears that while there has been a marked advance in freight rates on the North Atlantic route, yet the freight rates from Australia and the Argentine, our chief competitors, have advanced to a much greater degree.

I now wish to say a few words regarding the regular transportation service inaugurated for carrying supplies and munitions of war for the British Government.

Mr. KNOWLES: If the honourable gentleman will pardon me, I should like to ask him two questions. The first is: have the twenty-three vessels that were released

for the ordinary commercial transport work been earmarked for the carrying of Canadian export trade, or are the owners at liberty to ply the ships in any waters that they like? The second question is: what is the total tonnage or carrying power of these twenty-three vessels?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot give my honourable friend an answer to his last question, but, in reference to the first, I may say that the release of these vessels had special reference to the Canadian carrying trade.

Mr. KNOWLES: They cannot engage in anything else?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot say that; it had special reference to the Canadian carrying trade. We have found that the paramount considerations of the war make it necessary that a vessel shall at times be transferred to a port other than its original destination. I will tell my honourable friend what I mean. Suppose a transport sailed from St. John, loaded with a cargo for a port in France and before reaching its destination those in charge of the vessel would receive instructions to proceed to Greece or to a port in some other country; the paramount necessities of the war would make it necessary that they should take their cargo there. That has, to some extent, affected regularity in sailing; but, as I have said, the release of these vessels had special reference to the Canadian carrying trade.

Mr. KNOWLES. Could they be carrying from the United States?

Mr. HAZEN: Of course, they continue under the direction of the Admiralty, who can change them from time to time as they see fit.

The difficulty of obtaining tonnage and the consequent rise in freight rates having become noticeable in the early stages of the war, it was at once appreciated that the most pressing need at the moment was to provide ships for the large quantities of supplies and munitions of war which were being purchased in Canada. It was recognized that if the productive capacity and industrial resources of Canada were to be effectively employed in the prosecution of the war, this was a need that would become even more pressing as time went on, and that any steps taken must be such as would make it certain that in any event there should always be available for this purpose adequate facilities. The Government took steps forthwith to meet the situation. In the fall of 1914 the Government appointed an acting director of overseas transport who had had long experience with one of the large transportation companies in matters relating to overseas shipping. Under the direction of the Government, this officer entered into negotiations for the charter of suitable vessels, and by anticipating charter conditions and securing ships in many instances considerably in advance of requirements, the Government was enabled to move war material, munitions and supplies at rates approximating those prevailing in normal times for ocean freights.

Early in the present year the growing scarcity of marine tonnage and the increasing charter rates having become acute, the Government sent this officer to London for the purpose of laying before the War Office and Admiralty proposals involving closer co-operation between these departments and the Government of Canada, and looking to the requisitioning of a sufficient number of vessels to constitute a tri-weekly service for the carriage of war office supplies and munitions between Canada, United States ports and France. In conjunction with Sir George Perley, who has at all times rendered the most valuable service in this matter, a number of preliminary interviews were held with the officials of the War Office and Admiralty. Finally, as the result of a joint conference held on February 9 last, an agreement was reached under which the Admiralty engaged to supply 18 transports at once for this service, and more when required. This number, owing to the enormous growth of War Office purchases in Canada, has since been increased to 40, and still further additions are anticipated. In short, the regular transportation services contemplated was inaugurated and the organization established for this purpose has since grown to very large proportions.

The very great benefits accruing to the Canadian export trade from the establishment of this service have not, perhaps, been widely understood. A brief consideration of some of the figures available will give some idea of the situation that would have confronted Canadian producers if they had been obliged to depend solely on ocean space available in ordinary commercial liners, whereas, by reason of the work of the Overseas Department, there has been an uninterrupted service for the transportation of supplies of all kinds, including hay and oats, shells, and all the great variety of articles which are being purchased in Canada by the British Government for war purposes.

During the period between August 25, 1914, and April 30, 1915, 244,913 gross tons were handled by this service on account of the Imperial and Canadian Governments. Between, however, May 1, 1915, and November 15,1915, there was an enormous expansion—over 375,000 gross tons being forwarded during that period (6½ months), or about 60 per cent more than was moved during the preceding eight months. But a still greater expansion is taking place. The Overseas Department is now being called upon to provide for about 125,000 gross tons of munitions, war materials and supplies per month, or approximately one and one half million tons per annum; and the tonnage is still growing.

Arrangements for this winter contemplated the operation of 20 transports on a regular service between West St. John, United Kingdom and French ports, and adequate accommodation has been reserved at West St. John for the exclusive use of the Overseas Department. Between 50 and 60 sailings are anticipated from that port during the winter, and these vessels will lift between 250,000 and 300,000 tons. It is also arranged to allot to the Halifax route 20 additional transports, which constitute a service to the United Kingdom and French ports. As in the case of West St. John, dock and shed accommodation has been reserved for the exclusive use of the Overseas Department. From Halifax also 50 or 60 sailings are expected and these vessels, too, will clear between 250,000 and 300,000 tons.

Negotiations were completed for the prompt bunkering of transports at both Halifax and West St. John while the loading is being carried on. The addition of this enormous tonnage to the regular winter business of Halifax and St. John has necessitated the provision by the railways of increased railway yard accommodation, and it is hoped that the remedial measures taken in that regard will prevent serious congestion. The work of the Overseas Department in handling this large tonnage with the ships available has been made possible by the efficient and systematic organization built up, by which intelligent segregation at the sea-board and prompt loading have been secured. The average time on this side—excluding the period of vessels in dry dock or undergoing repairs—has averaged less than five days. It is difficult to reach an adequate conception of the vast amount of detail involved.

The prompt action of the Government in taking the steps which were taken toward the establishment of this service has secured to Canadian producers, both of manufactured goods and of farm products, an uninterrupted outlet for the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of War Office orders, the acceptance of which would not have been possible but for the inauguration of an economical overseas transportation service. Further, the fact that these transports, owing to their regularity in sailings, have been in a position to handle promptly War Office supplies which otherwise would have occupied space on regular liners, has been of distinct advantage to the general export trade of Canada and has released to that extent ocean space for commercial tonnage. Since the inauguration of the service not a pound of Government transport has been forwarded on regular liners.

I thought it was only fair and right that I should give a full statement of what the Government has done in connection with the matter of transportation since the war broke out, in order that the facts might be known throughout the country, that any false ideas which might prevail in consequence of the speech made by my right hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) might be removed, and that everybody would have an opportunity of looking into the facts for himself.

Now, let me explain how these arrangements have worked out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman a question? I have been informed by some pulp firms that ships which have been requisitioned by the home authorities had to be released. Thanks to the efforts of my hon. friend the Postmaster General I have been able to obtain the release of at least two or three of those ships. I see in this morning's newspapers that an embargo is to be imposed by Sweden on pulp for England. That means that there should be a great business in pulpwood between Canada and Great Britain, but unless the ships are released, and they are of small tonnage generally, the pulp business and the country will suffer. May I ask my hon. friend to look into this matter, and see whether there is no possibility of getting other ships from the naval authorities in Great Britain so that these small vessels can be released.

Mr. HAZEN: The embargo to which my hon. friend refers—I judge from newspaper reports I have seen, for I have nothing else— is in a sense a retaliatory measure. I can assure my hon. friend

that the Department of Naval Service, and the other departments of the Government will continue to press upon the British Admiralty and the British Government the importance and necessity of having ships available to carry the products and manufactured goods of Canada to the markets of Great Britain. We will continue to press that. I have had requests made to me to use my influence to get the British Admiralty and the British Government to release ships that had been requisitioned for other ports. In a number of cases they have requisitioned that the ships after reaching the other ports of the United States proceed to the ports in Canada. Under the circumstances I felt I could not make that request to the Admiralty because we were urging the British Admiralty and the British Government to supply us with all the ships necessary for the purpose of carrying the products of this country across to Great Britain. Under the circumstances I felt it would be a most illogical thing for me to make that requisition. The men whose ships are requisitioned are paid according to a scale prepared by a committee of ship-owners and a committee of the Admiralty. It may be that they can get more while engaging in private work than they might be paid by the Admiralty, but during this time of war we must all be prepared to make sacrifices, and ship-owners cannot be any exception to the general rule.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did the commandeered wheat go over in Admiralty vessels or in ordinary transport vessels?

Mr. HAZEN: I speak entirely subject to correction, but I presume it goes over in the ordinary transports. I think that is the case. I wanted to point out to the House—and I am sorry my hon. friend from St. John is not here, because one would gather from his remarks that shipping on the ocean between Canada and the Motherland was not so great as formerly—I should like to have pointed out to him, taking the port of St. John for example, what the effect of the action of the Government in regard to that trade has been. I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. A. H. Harris, the acting Director of Overseas Transportation, dated Montreal, January 6. In it he says:

> Dear Mr. Hazen,—In the memorandum to which you referred at our interview yesterday afternoon I stated that the Overseas Department would put an average of about 50,000 tons per month of Imperial supplies through West St. John this season and that this added to Canadian Pacific estimates would probably mean the handling on an average of about 350 carloads per day at that port.
>
> During the month of December the following Imperial transports cleared from West St. John,—
>
> Peshawur, Egori,
> Dunedin, Pascal,
> Thespis, Royal Transport,
> Hunstrick, Elswick House,
> Trelawny, Lord Strathcona.
> Wayfarer,
>
> with 67,484 tons of cargo as compared with five transports containing 14,296 tons of cargo for the corresponding period 1914—an increase of 400 per cent.
>
> During December 1915 eight steamers of the Canadian Pacific and allied lines cleared from West St. John with 67,892 tons of cargo plus 1,166 horses as against four vessels containing 29,351 tons of cargo plus 605 horses for the same period in 1914—an increase of 130 per cent.
>
> Other lines in December 1915 had 19 steamers from West St. John with 45,994 tons of cargo, as against 11 steamers with 16,699 tons of cargo and 657 horses in December 1914,—an increase of 200 per cent.
>
> The whole making a grand total of 181,370 tons and 1,166 horses in December 1915 as against 60,346 tons and 1,262 horses in December 1914, a general increase of 200 per cent.

I am told that the result will be even more satisfactory during the present month and during the month of February. Further, I am told that while I have given the figures for the port of St. John, a similarly gratifying state of affairs exists with regard to shipments from the port of Halifax. I may tell the House further for their information that from statements I received this morning, I find that to-day there are seven transports loading at the port of St. John, six transports loading at the port of Halifax, in addition to vessels of the C.P.R. and other commercial lines.

My hon. friend from St. John made special reference to the lumber trade of New Brunswick. He said:

> The same is the case with the lumberman. Go down to the province of New Brunswick, which is a great spruce producing country, the market for which is on the other side of the water. Although there is a great demand in Europe, resultant from the war, yet the lumberman cannot get his lumber to the European market except upon the payment of freight of as much as two hundred shillings per standard, whereas before the war the normal rate was about thirty shillings per standard. That is an increase of about eight hundred per cent in the tariff upon lumber, which is a great burden not only upon the producers, but upon those on the other side of the water who might be able to use the lumber to advantage.

Let us see what the facts are with regard to the lumber trade and the transportation of lumber to the other side of the water.

The lumber trade received the consideration of the Government in the same manner as the other business of this country, and since July 14, 1915, the Naval Service Department, in conjunction with the Acting Director of overseas transport, has shipped, under orders from the Admiralty, by vessels entirely distinct from those transports which I have referred to as having been commandeered by the Admiralty for other purposes, the following quantities of lumber from the ports named:

Quebec.—Four cargoes (spruce, elm, pine), toal approximately, 7,600,000 feet B.M. from six shippers.

Gaspé.—One part cargo, 724,000 feet B.M. from one shipper.

Chatham, N.B.—Two cargoes from three shippers, total 5,700,000 feet B.M.

St. John, N.B.—Four cargoes, approximately, 12,000,000 feet B.M. shipped to date.

Four further cargoes of approximately the same dimensions now loading or due to load from five shippers.

Halifax, N.S.—Two cargoes, 6,500,000 feet B.M.. Two further cargoes of approximately the same total now due to load from five shippers.

Box shooks.—In addition to above quantities, 400,000 boards for ammunition boxes are being shipped, part from St. John and the remainder from Halifax.

Estimated total from eastern ports, 50,000,000 feet B.M.

Pacific coast ports.—Ten cargoes, 30,000,000 feet B.M. from various shippers.

Estimated total shipments from Eastern and Pacific ports, 30,000,000 feet B.M.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: What about the rates?

Mr. HAZEN: This is lumber which is bought and paid for in this country, and the man on the other side is paying for freight. I shall have something to say about that later.

I give a further statement, more in detail, of lumber shipped from Canadian ports under the direction of the Imperial Transport Service and the Department of Naval Affairs. The ships which carried lumber from Canada are given in the following table:

List of cargoes of lumber shipped from Canadian ports under direction of the Imperial Transport Service and the Department of the Naval Service.

From Quebec.

Ship.	Sailed.	Cargo.	Shippers.
Statesman	July 14	365 standards	Gooday & Coxlong, part cargo.
Germanic	July 20	3,000,000 ft. B.M. (estimate)	Burstall & Dobell Becket Co.
Usher	Nov. 10	500 standards	Gooday & Co., part cargo
Dunclutha	Nov. 20	1,482 "	Price Brothers.
	Total, 7,600,000 feet B.M.		

From Gaspé.

Eagle Point	July 30	362 standards	Coxlong & Co., part cargo.
	Total, 5,700,000 feet B.M.		

From St. John.

Grantley Hall	Aug. 31	1,768 standards	McKean & Co.
Kilkerran	Sept. 11	1,597 "	"
E'swick House	Dec. 25	1,239 "	"
Quantock	Jan. 14	1,481 "	Partington Pulp and Paper Company.
Alton	Jan. 17		John E. Moore.
Oceania	Now loading		"
Rio Tiete	Now loading		
(Name not known)	Shortly due		
	Shipped to date, 12,000,000 feet B.M.		

List of cargoes of lumber shipped from Canadian ports under direction of the Imperial Transport Service and the Department of the Naval Service —*Concluded.*

From Halifax.

Ship.	Sailed.	Cargo.	Shippers.
King David	Aug. 15	1,621 standards	Musgrave & Co.
Spilsby	Oct. 30	1,634 "	John E. Moore.
D meterton	Due shortly		
(Name not known)	Due shortly		

Shipped to date, 6,500,000 feet B.M. Box shooks from Halifax and St. John in various ships, 400,000 boards estimated 1,000,000 feet B.M. Estimated total form eastern ports, 50,000,000 feet B.M.

From Pacific Coast.

K. Jason	Aug. 19. (From Bellingham, Wash, U.S.A.)	4,293,000 ft. B.M.	A. F. Thane & Co., San Francisco.
Llandudno	Aug. 30	3,025,000 "	Various B.C. mills.
Lena	Sept. 14	2,614,000 "	" "
Orange River	Sept. 30	3,101,000 "	" "
Llangorse	Oct. 18	2,902,000 "	" "
Holtye	Oct. 20	3,840,000 "	" "
O to Trechman	Nov. 14	3,067,000 "	" "
Gilella	Jan. 9	1,837,000 "	" "
Ha wood	Nov. 15	2,830 000 "	" "
Karma	Jan. 3	2,574,000 "	Half cargo Seattle, half Vancouver, various B.C. mills.

Shipped to date 30,000 feet B.M.
Grand total from Eastern and Pacific ports, 80,000,000 feet B.M.

If my hon. friend from St. John was correct in his argument, there would be very large stocks of lumber remaining in the province of New Brunswick this year. In order to get exact facts with regard to that, I communicated with a gentleman in the city of St. John, a friend of mine and of my hon. friend opposite, and asked him to give the facts with regard to the shipment of lumber from St. John, the stocks that were being wintered over, and other information concerning lumber shipments from the province, and how the trade was being handicapped by lack of transport. In reply I received this letter, under date January 20:

St. John, N.B.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister, Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Minister,—I have your letter of the 19th instant.

I will be very glad to give you the desired information, as nearly as I can.

The Admiralty have, so far, loaded at St. John, seven transports, carrying in round figures 20,000,000 superficial feet and there are two cargoes sold which will be shipped in the near future, about 6,000,000 more, making a total of 26,000,000 superficial feet.

[Mr. Hazen.]

The regular liners will not lift as much stock this year as in former years, owing to the very large amount of other traffic which is offering, but as near as I can figure out, these liners will about clean up the balance of the wintering stock here at St. John and these shipments will be complete the latter part of April.

The shipments from St. John in,—

1915	was approximately	130,000,000
1914	"	85,000,000
1913	"	86,000,000

So hon. members will see that the lumber shipments from the port of St. John in 1915 were 44,000,000 superficial feet in excess of the lumber shipments in 1913; and 45,000,000 feet in excess of those in 1914. My correspondent, one of the best informed lumbermen in New Brunswick, goes on to say—and I shall give the whole letter to the House, not only part of it:

The wintering stock here at St. John this season is much less than in average years. The wintering stock on the Mirimichi in round figures, in 50,000,000 and on the Restigouche 40,000,000. Nova Scotia, has to-day, of last year's stock, unshipped, in round figures 35,000,000.

Regarding the log cut for this year, in my opinion it will be considerably less than the average of former years. The North Shore people say they will cut about two-thirds of their

average cut and on the St. John river the cut will not exceed two-thirds of last year.

Then the Nova Scotia production for this winter will be almost 50 per cent less than last winter.

The combined stock in Liverpool and Manchester, England, for the past five years, were as follows:—

These figures are made up to the first of January.

	Standards.
1911	18,440
1912	11,370
1913	25,570
1914	11,950
1915	31,320

The figures on the first of this month, would seem to be very large, but I think a large portion of this stock is really sold and is lying on the docks at Liverpool and Manchester, waiting removal to the interior of the country.

The winter shipments will be comparatively small this season and the stock figures for Liverpool and Manchester should be away down low on the first of May next.

Approximately this is the best information I can give you and if you desire to do so, you may use my name.

I am sorry not to have seen you before you went back to Ottawa.

With kindest regards.

Yours very truly.

(Sgd.) John E. Moore.

On Saturday I had a conversation with one of the largest lumber operators in the northern part of New Brunswick, a gentleman well known to us all in New Brunswick, who has been here attending the meeting of the Commission of Conservation. He told me that these stocks, 50,000,000 feet on the Miramichi and 40,000,000 feet on the Restigouche, were slightly larger than were usually wintered over, but while that was the case they were sold at a productive price and paid for and the lumbermen had been making a large amount of profit out of their operations. He further told me that the large lumbermen would cut as much lumber during the present winter as during last winter, but that the smaller operators were not able to cut so much as they had during last winter. Any one who has listened to these figures, who has heard the statement that came from the shippers, who has heard the letter of Mr. John Moore, of St. John, who is one of the best informed lumber shippers in the St. John district, will conclude that the Government have done their part and done it successfully in order to have proper arrangements made for the transportation of lumber, manufactured products and agricultural goods from Canada to the Mother Country. So successfully have they done it that the shipments this year from the winter ports of Canada, from St. John and Halifax, have been two hundred per cent in excess of what they were during any previous year, and my information is that a still more gratifying result will be shown by the shipments during January and February. At the present time transports are coming with regularity to St. John and Halifax. According to the statement I received this morning, there were seven lying in St. John, in addition to the ordinary commercial vessels, and six in Halifax. So we need not have any great fear that goods will not be carried in good faith from Canada to the Motherland, and that our people will not have an outlet for these goods so long as England remains mistress of the seas, and the navy guards the trade routes from Halifax and St. John to the British Isles and to Europe.

Passing from that, I want to refer to certain statements made by my hon. colleague from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in regard to the Shell Committee.

Mr. MARCIL: I was interested in the hon. gentleman's statement regarding lumber on the Restigouche river. Is he in a position to give the House any information as to the condition of affairs regarding lumber in the province of Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: No, I am not. I have quoted figures regarding the shipments of lumber which have taken place from Gaspé and from the province of Quebec by means of transports prior to the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence. But I was dealing with the statement made by my hon. friend from St. John, who confined his remarks to the question of lumber shipments from the province of New Brunswick, and my answer was simply directed to that. My hon. friend from St. John dealt with the question of the conduct of the Shell Committee, of which General Bertram was Chairman. I do not intend to follow him all through his argument, and his address on this subject, but I do intend to take up one or two points in connection with the question, and, first of all, I would say that it was remarkable how gently and with what soft gloves my hon. friend referred to the manufacturers of this country. What a change has come over the spirit of the dream of my hon. friend! He would do nothing to injure the manufacturers, and yet, if the argument of my hon. friend meant anything, it meant that the manufacturers had employed middlemen for the purpose of approaching this committee, that they had got their contracts by dishonest and improper means, and that

they had received money in excess of the value of the goods which they had supplied. That was the meaning of my hon. friend's statement if it meant anything. My hon. friend can not attack the Shell Committee without reflecting upon the manufacturers of the country, because his whole statement, his whole grievance, was, that middlemen had been employed by the manufacturers, and that sums had been paid for shells to manufacturers for political purposes, and that they were far in excess of the value of the goods that they had provided. My hon. friend was treading on delicate ground. My hon. friend knew, and this was the reason he did not want to offend the manufacturers, that fully fifty or seventy-five per cent of the orders for shells which had been placed by the Shell Committee had been placed with companies some of which were controlled by friends of his own and others of which had friends of his own on their boards of directors, and that if he uttered a word reflecting upon the directors of these companies, he was reflecting very seriously upon his own friends and quite as seriously on those who were associated with him politically and who supported the party on that side of the House. My hon. friend knew that in reflecting on manufacturers who were supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, he would be reflecting upon gentlemen sitting at the back of my right hon. friend opposite who are interested in many cases in these companies, and in some cases are directors of companies to whom contracts for shells were awarded. Therefore, my hon. friend, while attacking the commission at considerable length, repeated time and time again that he made no reflection on the manufacturers of the country.

4 p.m.

Now, Sir, I think everybody will admit, while I hold no brief for the Shell Committee and am in no way bound to defend it, that it had a very responsible and difficult task to perform. When it was first appointed it was to manufacture 200,000 shells, representing about $1,000,000, and then the business developed more rapidly than any business in this country or anywhere else was ever developed before. In a short time it found this business running into thousands of shells and hundreds of millions of dollars. The perfecting of the organization was a great work, and it had to be got through very quickly. If they had proceeded with mathematical precision, step by step and detail by detail, with every feature of the work, it is very probable that some money might have been saved to the country, but, while they might have been able to save a certain amount of money, they would have denied to the manufacturers and mechanics of this country the great bulk of the business which has come to them through the action of the Shell Committee, and which is still continuing under the action of the Imperial Commission.

The hon. member for St. John undertook, as men are very apt to undertake, to underrate what is done by our own people, what is done here at home, in comparison with, and in contrast to, what is done at a distance. My hon. friend undertook to praise the way in which shell contracts were awarded in Australia, and the way in which the problem has been dealt with there, in comparison with the way in which the matter has been dealt with by the Shell Committee in Canada. I do not purpose entering into an argument on that point, or answering the argument that my hon. friend has made. I will let one of his own friends answer it. I will let his own friend, the editor of the Free Press, which has been referred to as the leading Liberal paper in Ottawa, and one of the most ably conducted Liberal papers in Canada, answer the statement of the hon gentleman when he makes an invidious comparison between the Canadian and the Australian methods.

Mr. CARVELL: Can the minister do it without smiling?

Mr. HAZEN: I thought I was dealing with a serious question. I certainly should not think that any one in this House, on the other side would laugh when he found how quickly the argument that had been made on this question by the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) was answered by the editor of the leading Liberal paper here. The Free Press, in its issue of January 21, Friday last, says:

> Fair-minded men, anxious not to jump to too-hasty conclusions in regard to the general charges against the Shell Committee which handled the entire munitions business of Canada for the first fifteen months of the war, will, we believe, study the statement (reprinted in another column), made by the chairman of the committee, Sir Alex. Bertram, in December last before leaving for a much-needed rest.
>
> The keynote to the whole situation, we submit, in General Bertram's assertion that he "had difficulty in obtaining fifteen manufacturers at the outset who would take a contract." The other important fact is that at the beginning the orders placed by the War Office were so small, with no assurance that they would be

followed up by others, as to make expenditures on the necessary plant by manufacturers a very doubtful investment.

It is an easy thing now to say that, at the outset, methods should have been adopted that were put into operation later. At a time when manufacturers had to be metaphorically dragged into the making of shells, of what avail would it have been to advertise for tenders as was done last fall, when the War Office orders had been enormously increased and when manufacturers were falling over each other for contracts?

Some of General Bertram's statements, to which particular attention may be drawn, are the following:

Of the first Canadian order from England, all contracts, with the exception of one, were placed in Canada, at prices fixed by the War Office.

The exception was for 100,000 shells which were awarded at a price fixed by General Bertram, a practical machinist, at $1.45 lower than contracts awarded in the United States by J. P. Morgan & Co., the British representatives.

The first Canadian order was filled at a price $20,000 lower than the estimate of the War Office.

The statement submitted to the Duke of Connaught in June, 1915, showed contracts awarded in Canada at a saving of $14,000,000 over the prices estimated by the War Office.

The contracts awarded in Canada at the end of 1915 totalled, as audited, $345,000,000, or $42,000,000 below the War Office estimate.

The manner in which Australia is handling the business of making munitions has been held up as an example in contrast to the Canadian method of supplying British guns with shells. The current issue of the Canadian Liberal Monthly, published from the Central Information Office of the Canadian Liberal party, contains an interesting article on "Australia and war munitions." The commonwealth and State governments in that colony do seem to have tackled the problem of manufacture in an aggressive and business-like way from which excellent results may be expected. In this article we notice, however,

(1) It was not until "the call for shells came from Great Britain in the early summer of 1915" that the Australian government took any action at all towards manufacturing munitions;

(2) Up to November 1, 1915, "31 tenders had been received of which 19 had been formally accepted, the balance being still under consideration; and

(3) It was not until November, 1915, that "the first steel, after exhaustive tests, was shipped to the different States."

Now, it should be observed that all the criticisms aimed at the Canadian Shell Committee are in respect of transactions prior to "the early summer of 1915," when Australia took the first steps; that Canada began operations six weeks after the first outbreak of the war and six months before even the War Office thought it necessary to organize the privately-owned factories for the manufacture of munitions; and that by November Canada had placed orders for three hundred million dollars worth of shells in numerous factories spread all over the country, and at competitive prices, which, we are assured, are on the average lower than the "cost prices" fixed by the Australian governments.

The editor of the Free Press says that prices in Canada are lower than the cost prices fixed by the Australian Government. At first it was difficult to get people to go into the business of making shells, because it was not known how many shells would be wanted, or how long the war would last, and necessarily the price had to be fixed at a higher figure. As time passed, however, the price became lower, until now the Liberal Free Press says that the average price paid for shells in Canada is lower than the cost prices fixed by the Australian Governments. The editorial says:

If Australia had done in September, 1914, what it did in June, 1915, and on as little encouragement as Canada received from the War Office for what it did in September, 1914, then we should agree with the Canadian Liberal Monthly that Australia is a fitting object lesson; but with the facts as they are, we cannot admit that the example is very impressive.

Passing from that, Mr. Speaker, I will now refer to a statement made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), as reported on page 76 of Hansard. Endeavouring to show that the Shell Committee acted entirely from partisan reasons and placed their orders with Conservative firms in consequence, he said:

And so I am sure, if my information is correct, all over this country orders of that character were given, given to the middleman, the man who had no machinery, and given in this way for the purpose of distributing patronage and doing what was a gross injustice to those who had manufacturing plants.

Mr. Rogers: Unfortunately about 75 per cent of the orders went to Liberals.

Mr. Pugsley: Well—

Mr. Hazen: That is certainly the case in the city of St. John in my hon. friend's constituency.

Mr. Pugsley: In my own constituency? I suppose the hon. member refers to Haley Bros.

Mr. Hazen: To the Messers. McAvity and the Phœnix Foundry.

Mr. Pugsley: The Messers. McAvity got their order as a sub-order from the Canadian Car Company, as part of an order which the Canadian Car Company had obtained for shells for the Russian Government. And while my hon. friend is upon that subject, what would he say about the York and Cornwall Cotton Mill?

Mr. Hazen: What would the hon. gentleman say about it?

Mr. Pugsley: They are very worthy people and make splendid cotton. There is no better cotton mill in Canada than the York and Cornwall Cotton Mill. Their whole buildings are well filled with their cotton manufacturing plant. Their people are well employed in making cotton and I do not think from the intelligence of the gentleman—take my hon. friend Senator Thorne, one of the directors of the York and Cornwall Cotton Company, a most worthy gentleman, a gentleman of the very highest intelligence, who would not for a single

moment mistake a shrapnel shell or an 18-pound explosive for a ball of cotton.

When the hon. gentleman made the assertion that the Shell Committee acted from partisan motives, the hon. Minister of Public Works said that unfortunately about 75 per cent of the orders went to Liberals, and I followed it up by stating that that was true in the hon. member's own constituency, which is also part of my constituency. The hon. gentleman seeing how that would weaken his charge that these things were being done for partisan purposes, at once, without a moment's hesitation—although living in the city of St. John he must have known the facts, but I must presume that he did not—said that the contract awarded to Messrs. McAvity were awarded to them by the Canada Car Company as part of a contract which the Canada Car Company had obtained for shells from the Russian Government.

On the following morning I sent over to the office of the Shell Commission and asked for an answer to these questions:

1. Is it correct, as stated by the hon. Mr. Pugsley, that Messrs. McAvity received an order for shells as a sub-order from the Canadian Car Company, as part of an order which the Canadian Car Company had obtained for shells for the Russian Government?
2. Were any orders given direct to Messrs. McAvity by the Shell Commission?

The answer to the first was:

Nothing known of transaction by Shell Committee. Was awarded by Russian Government direct to Canada Car and Foundry Company.

And the answer to the second question was:

On March 15, 1915, 10,000 4.5 shells at $6.70.
On May 15, 1915, 20,000 4.5 shells at $6.00.
January 1916, 25,000 4.5 shells at $4.00.

Or, there was given direct to Messrs. McAvity by the Shell Commission these three orders for shells to the amount of $287,000.

In addition to this the Shell Commission gave them the following orders:

	Cents.
Dec. 23, 1914—25,000 brass sockets and plugs at..	60
Feb. 12, 1915—65,000 brass sockets and plugs at..	55
May 3, 1915—50,000 4·5 sockets at.. ..	70
Aug. 26, 1915— 5,000 plugs at..	25
Oct. 23, 1915—10,000 plugs at..	25

These orders made $224,500. All told, this concern in the city of St. John which my hon. friend said had got these orders from the Canada Car and Foundry Company, got orders direct from the Shell Commission for $511,500. I charge my hon. friend with impropriety in making a statement of the sort he did, intended to mislead, but if the truth had been stated to the House at the time it would have shockingly weakened the effect of his argument that the Shell Committee were handing over these contracts for political purposes. So far as I am concerned, I am glad that these contracts have gone to Messrs. McAvity. They are not political friends of mine, though they are personal and social friends. But, apart altogether from friendship, I am glad that the Shell Committee awarded to a long-established firm like the Messrs. McAvity these contracts, the carrying out of which represents employment given in the constituency I have the honour to represent. While I was approached time and time again by different manufacturing concerns in my province to give recommendations to the Shell Committee by writing, stating what I knew of their capacity and their ability to carry out contracts, I never refused any concern that was under Liberal control if I believed they were capable of turning out good work, because I was desirous of seeing the work placed with firms that would carry it out properly and naturally I was desirous also of seeing a fair and reasonable proportion of this work go to manufacturers in the province I represent.

Now I come to the Phœnix Foundry Company. And, while the hon. gentleman makes no charge—and he is quite in the habit of making no charge but deals in insinuation and innuendo—yet, as he has dragged in Senator Thorne's name in connection with the Phœnix Foundry Company, I wish to say a few words on the subject. Who are the directors of the Phœnix Foundry Company? They are James F. Robertson, manager, W. H. Thorne, Jas. Manchester, A. C. Dawson and F. P. Starr. These are gentlemen of the highest possible business standing and reputation in St. John. Some of them are Conservatives, some, I believe, are Liberals. But the hon. gentleman picked out Senator Thorne's name, basing an insinuation upon the fact that Senator Thorne is a prominent and active Conservative. These gentlemen are public-spirited and have subscribed their share and done their bit in connection with the patriotic purposes of the war, and are among the last men who can fairly be charged with making money out of the crisis which Canada faces. I refer to the matter because some gossip has reached my ears, and the mat-

ter might as well be cleared up. A contract was given to the York and Cornwall Cotton Company, of which Mr. J. B. Cudlip, of St. John, is manager. In the month of November, I think it was, of last year, about the time the talk of shell orders became general, this cotton company had been for some time running on short time. It occurred to Mr. Cudlip, who is a most expert mechanic and machinist, and who knows the cotton business from the ground up, having been through every stage of it, that it might be a good thing, as keeping the company's help employed, to obtain a shell contract. Mr. Cudlip is an expert mechanic, as I have said, and he knew that a part of the plant of the mill might be available for the manufacture of shells. He came to Ottawa, saw the Commission, and obtained an order for the manufacture of 20,000 4:5 shells at $6. This was the month of May. Mr. Cudlip, as I understand it, was taken ill, and found difficulty in connection with the manufacturing of the shells, though there was room and plant in the establishment of which he was manager that could be utilized for this manufacture. So he made a contract with the Phoenix Foundry Company controlled by Messrs. Flemming, who are not political supporters of mine—or were not at the last election, but one of whom was chairman of the committee of the hon. member for the city of St. John in Victoria ward. The Phœnix Foundry Company is an old-established and well known industry. Messrs. Flemming enjoy a splendid reputation as did their father and grandfather, the latter of whom, I understand, was the founder of the business. I understand that Mr. Cudlip had difficulty in persuading Messrs. Flemming to undertake the manufacture of shells, as they thought there was little in it for them in view of the need for the purchase of new machinery and the uncertainty of the continuance of the business. However, after discussing the matter they undertook it and the contract was handed over to them. When the Shell Commission learned that Messrs. Flemming were filling the order the name was changed to that of Messrs Flemming or the Phoenix Foundry Company, and all continuation orders were given direct to them. They got orders as follows:

Jan. 28, 1915, 25,000 18-pounder shrapnel shells at $3.80.

May 15, 1915, 20,000 4.5 shells at $6.00.

October 18, 1915, 20,000 18-pounder shells at $2.90.

January 1916, 55,000 18-pounder shells at $1.85.

I have not totalled this exactly, but it amounts to something in the neighbourhood of $300,000.

Let us follow out the other orders placed in New Brunswick and see if they bear out the statement made by my hon. friend from the city of St. John, that the commission had been placing these orders simply for partisan reasons. Large orders for boxes had been placed with the Wilson Box Company, in the parish of Lancaster, adjoining the city of St. John. They are a wood-working concern whose special business it is to make boxes. And who are the directors of this company? Their names should be known by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) as well as they are to me: T. H. Estabrooks, Stanley E. Elkin, S Y. Wilson, of Halifax, John Galey and Alexander Wilson of St. John. These names of directors do not bear out the idea that the commission were actuated by polical motives in giving these orders to Messrs. Wilson. I was glad to see this concern get the orders because it is an important industry in the constituencyI represent and I am sure that their work will be done in a way satisfactory to the public.

The Record Foundry Company of Moncton is another concern for which orders were obtained, and obtained, according to the hon. member for the city of St. John, by middlemen and on party grounds. I think the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) will know the names of the directors and will be able to judge whether or not it was for party reasons that a contract was given to the concern which is under their control. The directors are Hon. Clifford W. Robinson, president, who was until recently the leader of the Liberal party in local politics in the province of New Brunswick; Mr. F. C. Dennison, a local Liberal in Moncton is the secretary; Hon. James Barnes, of Buctouche, for years member for the county of Kent, and a member of the Government in which my hon. friend and colleague the hon. member for the city of St. John was attorney general; F. J. Shreves, His Honour Josiah Wood, Lieutenant Governor, and the late Graham Fraser. Would anybody say that it was for political reasons that this contract was awarded? It was awarded to a company composed of both Liberals and Conservatives—though Liberals seem to predominate; it was awarded because the Record Foundry Company was the only

one equipped in such a manner as to be able to fill their contracts satisfactorily.

So far as shell contracts in New Brunswick are concerned, a contract was placed in Chatham with a foundry company called, I think, the Maritime Foundry Company. I do not know who the stockholders or directors are. A contract was placed in Campbellton with the McLellan Foundry Company; I do not think that anybody from Campbellton would suggest that the gentlemen in that concern have been active supporters of the Conservative party in the past. A contract was placed in Fredericton with the Smith Foundry Company, the members of which—all of them, I think—are supporters of the Conservative party.

Mr. CARVELL: Come to Sackville now.

Mr. HAZEN: A contract was given to Messrs. Fawcett, supporters of the Conservative party. I do not know whether there are any stock-holders in that company outside of the Fawcett family or not, but Messrs. Horace and Charles Fawcett, and I presume, their brother-in-law, Mr. Ryan, now in British Columbia, are members of the concern.

Mr. MARCIL: Have any contracts been awarded in Campbellton?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that a contract for 12,000 shells has been awarded to the McLellan Foundry Company. With regard to box contracts, the following is a list of some of the firms to which contracts have been awarded: The Wilson Box Company, of St. John; Sussex Manufacturing Company, of Sussex; Hillsboro Manufacturing Company, of Hillsboro; W. H. Farnham, of St. Stephen. I do not know what Mr. Farnham's politics are. I presume that stockholders representing both political parties may be found in the Sussex Manufacturing Company. I think that the leading man in this company is Mr. S. H. White.

So much for contracts which have been awarded in my province; I presume the same is true of those that have been awarded in the other provinces of Canada. In doing what they did, the Shell Committee were guided solely by the desire to advance the public interest and the public good. They were not influenced by narrow considerations of petty party politics; they placed the contracts with those who, they thought, would properly carry them out in a manner satisfactory to the British Government, and who would provide shells of the quality necessary for our armies in the field.

I have here a list of the contracts awarded generally throughout Canada. I do not intend to read it all, but I shall read a few of the names, and ask hon. gentlemen of this House who are familiar with the manufacturing industry in Canada if they think that the names which I read suggest for one moment the idea that the Shell Committee were trying to make political capital on behalf of the party in power.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the hon. gentleman would put the whole of the list upon Hansard, it would be much more convenient for reference.

Mr. HAZEN: I would have to get it in more perfect form, but if the hon. gentleman wants it all put on Hansard, I will do it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Take it as read, then.

Mr. HAZEN: There is a little that I will read before I do that.

Mr. CARVELL: Put it all on Hansard; do not put it in your pocket.

Mr. HAZEN: I am willing to put it on Hansard. I do not wish to weary the House by reading it all, but there are certain names that I am going to read.

Mr. CARVELL: We would like to have the contents of your pocket as well.

Mr. HAZEN: That is just a covering letter, which would give no information of value to the House. What do we find? We find that in Brockville contracts were awarded to the Smart Manufacturing Company, and the Brockville Lumber Company. In Amherst, Nova Scotia, contracts were awarded to the Canadian Car and Foundry Company, Victor Wood Works, Ltd., and the International Engineering Company. These companies are each, I understand, composed of both Liberals and Conservatives. In Dartmouth a contract was awarded to the Star Manufacturing Company, which, I am told, is a very excellent concern, composed of stockholders of both political parties. At Kingston, Ontario, a contract was awarded to the Canadian Locomotive Company, which, I believe, is controlled by Mr. Harty, formerly a Liberal member of this House. At Levis, in the province of Quebec, a contract was awarded to the Lauzon Engineering Company, and to the Public Enterprise Company. I find that contracts have been awarded to the

following companies in Montreal and vicinity: Canada Cement Company, Canadian Vickers Company, B. J. Coghlin Company, Deacon Construction Company, George Labelle, Peter Lyall & Sons, Lynburner, Limited, Robert Mitchell Company, Henry Morgan & Company, Montreal Tramways Company, National Acme Manufacturing Company,William Rutherford & Company, James Shearer, Wilson-Paterson Company—and so on. In Nova Scotia the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company; I do not think this Company can be regarded as a political concern, one way or another; it has directors and stockholders on both sides of politics. At New Glasgow, a contract has been awarded to the McNeill Machine and Motor Company, and to John J. Grant. I do not think that my hon. friend will say that contracts were awarded to these companies for political purposes.

Mr. MACDONALD: The contract in the last two cases was.

Mr. HAZEN: In Sherbrooke, Quebec, the McKinnon-Holmes Company; Sorel, Beauchemin & Company; Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, the New Burrill-Johnson Company. I may be wrong, but I understand that the Burrill-Johnson Company of Yarmouth went under Liberal control. I have a list here; it is not as complete as it should be, and I do not think it takes in everything, but if my hon. friend wishes me to do so, I shall be glad to lay it upon the table of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD: Put it on Hansard.

Mr. HAZEN: I will hand it to Hansard.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. gentleman at the same time give us a list of all the firms in Canada who have received contracts?

Mr. HAZEN: I have been trying to get a completed list.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has not one-quarter of them.

Mr. HAZEN: This list may have some omissions. I did not prepare it with the intention of laying it before the House; it was for my own purposes in this debate. If my hon. friend does not want me to hand it to Hansard, I will not do so; I was merely acceding to the request of the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. CARVELL: We should like to have it, as well as a supplementary list showing all the contractors.

Mr. HAZEN: How easy it would be for my hon. friend to ask that somebody should bring down a statement showing the names of the concerns to whom contracts were awarded by the Shell Committee. I am sure that if he himself would go to the Shell Committee, they would be delighted to give him such a list. However, I will do as the hon. member for Pictou has requested; I will lay this document, as I have it, on the table of the House, and, in order to save my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) trouble I shall be very glad to go to the Shell Committee and ask them to give me a statement containing the names of those to whom contracts for shell boxes were awarded. This I shall lay upon the table of the House.

Mr. CARVELL: Will you give the dates, quantities and prices? As the hon. gentleman is in a good mood, it may be a good time to get this information.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend; I am always obliging. My hon. friend could get it for himself, but I shall be glad to send to the Shell Committee and get it for him. Under these circumstances, I suppose it is not necessary that I should put this statement on Hansard, as I told the hon. member for Pictou I would do.

I have, Mr. Speaker, quoted these names as an absolutely complete answer to his statement made to the House by the hon. member for St. John city:

> I am sure, if my information is correct—

"If my information is correct." The hon. gentleman made no independent investigation on his own account; he has simply listened to the gossip on the subject.

> If my information is correct, all over this country orders of that character were given, given to the middleman, the man who had no machinery, and given in this way for the purpose of distributing patronage and doing what was a gross injustice to those who had manufacturing plants.

I ask my hon. friend, who was the middleman in the case of the McAvity Company? Who was the middleman in the case of the Record Foundry Company? Who was the middleman in the case of the Fawcett Company? Who was the middleman in the case of the Wilson Box Company, the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and other companies all throughout this country? General assertions of this kind are very easy to make.

Mr. CARVELL: Who was the middleman in the case of the Phoenix Foundry Company of St. John?

Mr. HAZEN: So far as I know, there was no middleman. I have told my hon. friend the circumstances as told to me: that that contract was obtained by Mr. Cudlip, who, being unable to carry it out, turned it over to the Phoenix Foundry Company.

Mr. CARVELL: I will supplement that information at a later date.

Mr. HAZEN: Very good. The hon. gentleman says that he will supplement that information; we shall wait and hear what he has to say about it. The Phoenix Foundry Company, as I have said, obtained their first contract through the Cotton Company, the directors of which I have named. I am satisfied that these directors would not act as middlemen for anybody; I am sure that they would do nothing which was not in the public interest.

I now pass on to refer to a few other matters in connection with some subjects that were dealt with by hon. gentlemen opposite. First, I desire to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for St. John with regard to the investigation held by Sir Charles Davidson into the purchase before the war of the submarines at Seattle, for use in British Columbia waters. The circumstances under which these submarines were purchased are well known to this House. This matter was fully discussed here last year, and since then it has been investigated by the Commission of Sir Charles Davidson. I think I will satisfy the House that the investigation carried on by Sir Charles Davidson was of the most thorough and searching character possible. Hon. gentlemen remember that there was very great alarm in the province of British Columbia just before the outbreak of war and for some time after. It was known that certain German cruisers, the Leipsic, the Dresden and the Nuremburg, were abroad on the Pacific, and great fear was entertained that an attack might be made on the coast cities of British Columbia, Victoria especially, and also Vancouver, which were without any adequate means of defence. It came to the notice of Sir Richard McBride that there were two submarines at Seattle, which had been built for the Chilian government, and which could be purchased. Sir Richard McBride purchased these submarines, paying for them $1,150,000. They were brought

over to Victoria and proved a great source of relief to the people there; and undoubtedly they were absolutely effective in preventing a German attack on the small British cruisers on the Pacific.

Mr. TURRIFF: Were they provided with torpedoes when they were purchased?

Mr. HAZEN: I doubt whether I should answer that; there is a question to that effect on the Order Paper, which will be dealt with when it is reached, and, as my hon. friend is aware, it is contrary to the rules of order to answer a question of which notice has been given on the Order Paper.

Those submarines were bought for $1,150,000. The matter came before this House last session and the charges made were practically of a two-fold character. One of the charges was to the effect that there had been graft in connection with the purchase of these vessels. When I say charge, it was just the same sort of charge that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) always makes. He says: I do not make any charge— and then he goes on to deal in insinuation and inuendo. The result of what he said last session was that immediately after the session newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite and public speakers advancing their cause from the public platform did not hesitate to herald all over this country that there had been graft to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars in connection with the purchase of these submarines. Let me read to the House the statement made by my hon. colleague from St. John when he discussed this matter in February of last year. I quote from page 122 of Hansard.

I should like to know when I made any insinuation that Sir Richard McBride had received this $250,000? I did not do so. I have great respect for the intelligence of Sir Richard McBride, and I would not for a single moment suggest that, having paid out $1,150,000 of the money of the people of British Columbia, he would be guilty of taking back this large amount of $250,000 and putting it in his own pocket or using it for an election fund. We all admit that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows how to run elections, but who for a single moment would suggest that the Minister of Public Works would besmirch himself with the handling of election funds? Who would imagine that Sir Richard McBride would do so? But Sir Richard McBride and this Government have their friends in British Columbia, and if any one were disposed to take advantage of it, here was a magnificent opportunity. Here were two submarines, valued by Mr. Logan at $375,000 each, the price of which according to the original contract to build was only $387,000 each. They had been rejected by the expert of the government of Chili. War was on, and public opinion in British Columbia

demanded that these boats should be purchased at any price. Oh, Sir, what a temptation there was for those in the Conservative party who would like to wipe the Grits off the face of the earth, and who know so well how to use campaign funds in order to do so. What a temptation there was to take advantage of the situation. I do not, upon the information which has come to me, charge the minister with wrong-doing, nor did I do so from the beginning to the end of my address. I do not charge Sir Richard McBride with wrong-doing; I did not do so from the beginning to the end of my address.

And yet the effect of his speech, which was heralded broadcast through the party press and by their supporters, was that Conservatives had profited by this transaction for improper and election purposes to the amount of $250,000. These submarines were taken over by the Dominion of Canada on the advice of the British Admiralty. Before we confirmed the purchase made by Sir Richard McBride we communicated with the British Admiralty and they advised us to purchase them if we could get crews to man them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did not this Government inform the British Government that the reason they were not taken by the Chilian Government was that it was not able to pay for them?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not remember the language of the telegram, but it makes no difference—

Mr. PUGSLEY: It would have made a difference if they had been condemned.

Mr. HAZEN:—because the British Admiralty have, and then had, a thorough and intimate knowledge of every war vessel being built in any shipyard in the world. They knew all about these, they knew their price and everything about them; and they advised that we should purchase them if we could. And we did right in purchasing them, because the evidence is conclusive, after a thorough investigation, that there was not a dollar of graft in connection with the transaction, and that the submarines were most efficient, and have continued to give good service down to the present hour. Let me read to the House the statement made by Sir Charles Davidson at the opening of the inquiry. He said:

> Our sittings will be held in the sight and hearing of all men. Our determination is as it has been throughout our past sittings, to pursue the investigation of any matters which may need inquiry, with great thoroughness and earnestness. I had, at the outset, the good fortune to secure the consent of Mr. John Thompson, one of His Majesty's Counsel at the Ontario Bar, to act as counsel to the Commission. He will examine the witnesses and I am sure he will welcome any information which may reach him from any source, and which are germane to our future duties.

At the inquiry, which was open to all men—it was open to my hon. friend had he chosen to attend, and he was in the neighbouring city of Vancouver when Sir Charles Davidson was holding his inquiry in Victoria.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not my hon. friend know that Sir Charles Davidson distinctly refused to allow any counsel to be present to examine or cross-examine witnesses?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend is making the same interruption that he made the other day. What Sir Charles Davidson did decline was something quite different. He was vested with the duty of probing the matter to the bottom, and other matters that came before him—and a better man for the purpose could not be obtained. He is a judge of high standing and great experience. He had a large practice at the bar and was regarded as an able practice lawyer. Sir Charles had the advantage of the assistance in that work of Mr. John Thompson, K.C., a prominent member of the Ontario bar, a son of the late Sir John Thompson. In addition to that, at every inquiry, the Auditor General was present. As each witness was examined, the Auditor General was asked if he had any further question to put to him, or if there was any further witness whom he would suggest should be called for examination. The fullest opportunity was given for the fullest possible hearing. What Sir Charles Davidson did decline was something quite different. A counsel appeared before him and said that he appeared on behalf of the Liberal party of British Columbia. Sir Charles declined to allow him to act as counsel and examine and cross-examine witnesses—and I would ask where the end of this thing would be if that sort of thing was permitted. He permitted him to suggest any question, and I shall read from the evidence of the Auditor General in a moment what he said about the matter. I shall read the evidence of the Auditor General because I think the Auditor General was the man responsible for this inquiry being held, and possibly for the discussion with regard to the matter. I find that Mr. John Fraser, I.S.O., was examined by Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

> I asked Mr. Auditor General to come to Victoria in advance of the sittings of the commission to ascertain, if possible, any further in-

formation with regard to the purchase of these submarines—have you been able to obtain any evidence or any source of information which would lead you to the opinion that anything has not been disclosed in evidence that should have been disclosed?

Mr. Fraser: No, I have not.

Mr. Thompson: Generally speaking, have you anything to suggest that I may further inquire into, with regard to the purchase of the submarines?

Mr. Fraser: Nothing, unless it may be advisable to examine officials of the Electric Boat Company, if they are willing to be examined.

Mr. Thompson: I think that is the intention of the commissioner.

Sir Charles Davidson: You mean the officials of the Electric Boat Company in New York?

Mr. Fraser: Yes.

Sir Charles Davidson: That is our immediate purpose, so far as the commission is concerned. The moment we return East we will seek at Montreal or at their own homes to secure their evidence, and we hope they will facilitate our inquiry.

That is what Mr. Fraser said, and I quote it to show that the Auditor General, who went to Victoria to find out everything he could in regard to the matter of the submarines, was asked to suggest any questions that had not been asked, to suggest any line of examination that had not been undertaken, or any line of inquiry that had not been pursued, and that the only suggestion he made was as to the examination of certain officials of the Electric Boat Company, which examination was carried out.

There were examined before Sir Charles Davidson, Sir Richard McBride, James Venn Paterson, F. L. Crawford, Manager of the Bank of Commerce; Capt. William Henry Logan, Mr. H. Barnard, M.P., the Auditor General, Mr. Taylor, auditor for the Electric Boat Company; Mr. E. B. Frost, Vice-President of the Electric Boat Company, and Mr. Carse, President of the Electric Boat Company. The whole inquiry was in the nature of an inquisition. Questions were asked of a character, which, if they had been asked in a court of law governed by the ordinary rules of evidence, would never have been permitted. The inquiry was broad, comprehensive, searching, and thorough. I am sorry I have not the time at this late hour in the afternoon to go into the evidence more fully; I do not wish to tire the House unduly by reading too large portions of the evidence, but there is one portion I should like to read. The question was first brought up on June 25, 1915, when Sir Richard McBride voluntarily appeared before the Commission at Ottawa and was examined with reference to the question of commission, as follows:

Mr. Thompson: There is just one question I may ask you—

I am dealing with the question of graft; the question of efficiency will come later.

There is just one question I may ask you—do you know of any rebate or money being paid to any private individual or any official by way of commission?

Sir Richard McBride: Absolutely not one cent.

Sir Charles Davidson: Directly or indirectly?

Sir Richard McBride: Directly or indirectly.

Sir Charles Davidson: Either as a matter of commission—

Sir Richard McBride: Or otherwise.

Sir Charles Davidson: Or as a matter of contribution to election funds, because that has been mentioned?

Sir Richard McBride: I can say positively that I know of no commission that was paid directly or indirectly to any person or persons, corporation or corporations, in respect to this operation.

Sir Charles Davidson: Or contribution?

Sir Richard McBride: Or of contribution.

Then later on:

Sir Charles Davidson: Mr. Auditor General, are there any questions which you would suggest as being desirable to be put to Sir Richard McBride?

Mr. Fraser: No.

Sir Charles Davidson: If there are any, I hope you will freely mention them.

Mr. Fraser: I do not know that there is anything more than Mr. Thompson has asked him, and the suggestion that Mr. Paterson, who is the one who can clear up the suspicion, or rumour, should be examined.

Sir Charles Davidson: What was the suspicion and what were the rumours?

Mr. Fraser: That there was a very large commission paid.

Sir Charles Davidson: Did you hear anything further than that?

Mr. Fraser: There were some rumours that I would not care to put on record here; I do not think it would be fair to do so.

Mr. Thompson: You considered them not substantiated?

Mr. Fraser: Not substantiated.

Mr. Thompson: Not substantiated at all events sufficiently to make a statement with regard to them before the Commission?

Mr. Fraser: Yes.

Sir Charles Davidson: Is this the whole of the correspondence which you have in your department respecting submarines?

Mr. Fraser: Yes.

Sir Charles Davidson: Private or otherwise; have you private correspondence?

Mr. Fraser: I had some, but not in connection with any of the people dealing with the matter at all.

Sir Charles Davidson: Of what character?

Mr. Fraser: Sometimes people might have been giving me some information.

Sir Charles Davidson: Have you pursued that information?

Mr. Fraser: As far as I could.

Sir Charles Davidson: And?

Mr. Fraser: Without results, as I say. I think the only man who can clear it up is Mr. Paterson.

Then we have the examination of Mr. Paterson:

Q. And no commission was paid yourself?—A. I did not pay it to myself, I had it.

He referred to the fact that for his services he got $40,000. Here is the examination by Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. What we want to ascertain, Mr. Paterson, is whether any part of this money was waylaid or improperly paid?—A. You mean, whether I have got some underhand way of getting out of answering a straight question?

Q. No, I am not making any reflection on you at all.—A. That is what it means to me. There is only yes or no about that thing. The question is, was there or was there not a commission—there was none.

Sir Charles Davidson I desire, just to put to you an enlargement of the question which was put to you before by Mr. Thompson—was there any contribution directly or indirectly to any association or interest in Canada made by you or your company?

The Witness: None at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend read that again, please?

Mr. HAZEN (reads):

Sir Charles Davidson: I desire just to put to you an enlargement of the question which was put to you before by Mr. Thompson—was there any contribution directly or indirectly to any association or interest in Canada made by you or your Company?

The Witness: None at all.

Sir Charles Davidson: Nothing whatever?

The Witness: Nothing at all, nothing was paid in Canada, at all, or to any Canadian.

Sir Charles Davidson: Or to any association?

The Witness: Or to any association in any way whatever.

Sir Charles Davidson: And you say there was absolutely no irregularity in connection with that?

The Witness: Absolutely no irregularity.

Then we come to the evidence of Mr. F. L. Crawford, the Manager of the Bank of Commerce. The Commission even went to the extent of examining the books of the bank, so thorough and searching was Sir Charles Davidson's inquiry.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the bank at Victoria.

Mr. HAZEN: The bank that cashed the cheques and sent the drafts. (Reads):

Q. Do you know of any account in your bank in Victoria which has any suspicious circumstances about it pointing to a commission on these submarines?—A. No, none.

Q. None whatever—A. No.

Q. Have you any account which would show any payment which would appear to be an indirect commission on these submarines?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Were there any payments made into any account in your bank shortly following or appreciably a short time after these cheques were issued, which excited your suspicion that there was a commission on the purchase of the submarines?—A. No.

Q. Was a payment made in respect to the sale of the submarines that you know of?—A. None.

Q. I am using the term in the broadest possible sense, and you say that there is not in the books in your bank any account which would excite your suspicion in that regard?—A. None to my knowledge.

Capt. William Henry Logan was also called. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) suggested that Capt. Henry Logan, who negotiated for the purchase of the submarines, was simply asked a question, "Did you pay any commission to any one?" As a matter of fact, he was examined and cross-examined most thoroughly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend has forgotten what I said. In commenting upon what I thought was the insufficient examination of Mr. Logan, I said that while he sought to convey to the Commissioner the idea that he was simply called in a cursory way, that he had had a conversation at the club about the submarines, and had said he knew very little about submarines; it was stated in the Order-in-Council of the British Columbia Government that it was Mr. Logan himself who, after considerable negotiation, had purchased those submarines.

What I argued was that it struck me as strange that he was not thoroughly examined as to why he did not know the price after negotiating for two weeks, and was practically merely asked as to whether a commission had been actually paid.

Mr. HAZEN: I will read the examination of Capt. Logan as I have it here

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. Did you make any claim for commission?—A. No.

Q. You did not render a claim for commission?—A. No.

Q. Of any sort?—A. Not of any sort, nor did I get any commission of any kind from anybody.

Q. Did you not render an account to the Dominion Government for commission?—A. No, sir, I did not.

Q. Did you receive any commission from J. V. Paterson?—A. No, sir, I did not.

Q. Did you receive any promise of a commission from him?—A. No, sir, I did not.

Sir Charles Davidson: Or other benefits?

The Witness: Or other benefits of any kind.

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. You received no indirect benefit from anybody?—A. I received no indirect benefit of any kind in connection with that matter, or with that purchase.

Q. And you received nothing from the Seattle Dry Dock and Construction Company?—A. I received nothing from the Seattle Dry Dock

and Construction Company, or from anybody else.

Q. Nor from the Electric Boat Company?—A. No.

Q. Nor did you receive any promise of any contribution to any political party funds?—A. Not at all, of no kind. I say most emphatically that I got nothing from anybody or from anywhere.

Q. You say that all you received, either directly or indirectly, in connection with this matter is the amount you received on that account to the department for $620?—A. Yes, that is my account.

Q. And you did not on that occasion ask him whether he would reduce the price?—A. No.

Q. Did you ask him over the telephone whether he would pay a commission?—A. No, sir, I did not; I never mentioned a commission.

Q. When you saw him in Seattle, did you ask him if he would pay you a commission?—A. No, all I mentioned then was the boats.

Q. Did you ask him whether his company would pay you a commission?—A. No.

Q. Or whether the Electric Boat Company would pay you a commission?—A. I never mentioned a commission of any kind.

Q. Neither on behalf of yourself or any other person?—A. Neither on behalf of myself or any other person.

Q. Nor did you suggest it in any way?—A. Nor did I suggest it in any way. I did not get any commission. The only thing I got was a lot of abuse since that time. I have heard nothing but dishonourable insinuations and innuendo since the last twelve months, and I have, in a small way, shared in the heap of abuse piled on the Premier of this province. I feel indignant and disgusted over the whole thing; I think it is enough to make a man who is inclined to do anything for his country stand aside.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that all he was asked?

Mr. HAZEN: That is all I have in this quotation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have not seen this evidence.

Mr. HAZEN: I should judge not from my hon. friend's speech.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have not; but it seems to be word for word what I saw in the Victoria papers, and, therefore, it shows how accurate was the report in the Victoria papers. Will my hon. friend let me ask him this? How does he explain the fact that this Capt. Logan was stated by Sir Richard McBride in the order in council to have negotiated for these submarines and to have purchased them, and that yet for fifteen days before they were bought not a word was said as to the price?

Mr. HAZEN: As I did not draw the order in council and have not consulted with Sir Richard McBride I have nothing to say about the matter at the present time.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would not my hon. friend have though, that Sir Charles Davidson would have asked him about that?

Mr. HAZEN: In view of that apparently Capt. Logan is recalled, and I have here some further evidence given by him. Sir Charles Davidson apparently had him recalled for the purpose of putting these questions to him and the report of his evidence on this point is as follows:

Sir Charles Davidson: I would desire, Mr. Thompson, that you should put to Capt. Logan the questions in the same broad form that you put them in to Mr. Barnard, as to payments or commissions in connection with these submarines, because your previous questions were identified with his personal acts.

Mr. Thompson: I ask you now, Capt. Logan, whether you know of any commission being paid to any official or unofficial person in Canada, by Paterson, or the Seattle Construction and Dry Dock Company, or the Electric Boat Company, or by any person or company, or by any person on their behalf, either directly or indirectly, in respect to a commission on the purchase of these submarines?

Capt. Logan: None whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the question always limited to the words, "in Canada"?

Mr. HAZEN: Not always. We have the question there whether any commission was paid "in Canada" and we have the question whether it was paid "either directly or indirectly." Then the examination proceeds:

Sir Charles Davidson: Or gift or benefit?

Capt. Logan: No, sir, nothing of any kind, from anybody.

Mr. Thompson: Or a promise of anything?

Capt. Logan: No.

Mr. Thompson: Either to any person here or as a contribution to any party fund?

Capt. Logan: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. Thompson: Or for any political purpose?

Capt. Logan: Nothing at all, sir, I do not know of anything of that nature.

Sir Richard McBride came back to the stand. You will see how careful Sir Charles Davidson was that no question should be left unasked:

5 p.m.

Mr. Thompson: Did Logan make any suggestion to you as to a commission?

Sir Richard McBride: No.

Mr. Thompson: Of any sort?

Sir Richard McBride: No, sir.

Mr. Thompson: Or did he suggest that the Seattle Construction and Dry Dock Company would allow a commission?

Sir Richard McBride: No.

Mr. Thompson: Or did he suggest that Paterson would?

Sir Richard McBride: Absolutely no.

Mr. Thompson: Or that the Electric Boat Company would allow a commission?

Sir Richard McBride: No.

Mr. Thompson: Or that any of them would make a contribution to party funds?

Sir Richard McBride: Absolutely no.

Mr. Thompson: Did anybody else suggest that?

Sir Richard McBride: Never, except Mr. Pugsley in the House of Commons, and the Auditor General, I believe, has a suspicion; at least he so expressed himself at Ottawa, that the transaction was not an honest one.

Here is further evidence by Sir Richard McBride?

Mr. Thompson (to Sir Richard McBride): Before we conclude taking your evidence in Ottawa, I asked you on the subject of a commission, and I put to you the questions that have been put to other witnesses. I ask you now, do you know whether Paterson, or the Seattle Dry Dock Company, or the Electric Boat Company, paid any commission to anybody, either official or unofficial?

Sir Richard McBride: I recollect that you asked me that question, and my answer was: no.

Mr. Thompson: Or whether they made any contribution of any money, or whether they made any promise of money, to party funds, or anything of that kind, of an indirect or direct nature?

Sir Richard McBride: No, sir, neither directly, nor indirectly, did any person or persons, or the agent of any person or persons, in any capacity whatsoever, mention the subject of commission to me, or to any one of whom I know.

Mr. Thompson: Or paid any?

Sir Richard McBride: Or paid any.

Mr. Thompson: Or promised to pay?

Sir Richard McBride: Or promised to pay anything, or paid anything, or undertook to promise anything.

And so on. I cannot read all this because time will not permit. I have the evidence of Mr. John Fraser, Auditor-General, who had been asked to go to Victoria in advance of the commission. He tells Mr. Thompson that he has nothing further to say, nothing to ask, and he only suggests that the officials of the Electric Boat Company might be examined. So, the officials of the Electric Boat Company are examined. Mr. Taylor, the auditor of the Electric Boat Company came to Montreal to give his evidence and this is what he said:

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. Did you pay anybody whomsoever any commission out of that money?

"Anybody whomsoever"—not anybody in Canada, but anybody anywhere?

A. We did not.

Q. Did you make any allowance to any person by way of commission out of that money?—A. We did not.

Q. Neither directly nor indirectly?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any part of that money held in suspense by way of commission for any person?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has there been any suggestion to your company that any part of that money should be paid by way of commission to any person?—A. I think Mr. Bailey claimed that he ought to have a commission.

Q. Bailey was your agent, was he not?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you encourage that?—A. We did not.

Q. Is it finally settled and disposed of that he shall not get a commission?—A. Finally settled.

Q. What was he asking in the way of commission?—A. I do not think he named any sum; I think he left it to the company.

Q. Is Bailey working on commission, or is he on salary?—A. On salary.

Q. At any rate, you decided finally not to allow him any commission?—A. Yes.

Q. There is no outstanding question now about any commission out of that money, or any part of it?—A. None whatever.

Q. And your company has used the whole of that money for its own purposes?—A. Yes.

Mr. Elihu B. Frost, vice-president of the Electric Boat Company, gave this evidence on the question of a commission:

Mr. Thompson: With the exception of the $40,000 which Paterson obtained, I understand that your company received the full amount of the purchase money paid by Canada, and, excepting, of course, the legitimate bills which were paid and owing to the Seattle Construction Company.

Mr. Frost: Less the sum which went to Mr. Paterson, which was about $40,000, and the 130,000 odd thousand dollars which was due to the Seattle company and paid to them, the Electric Boat Company received all the money that Canada paid for the submarines.

Mr. Thompson: And you eventually refunded to the Chilian government the amount they had paid you on progress estimates?

Mr. Frost: We did.

Mr. Thompson: Did your company pay any commission to anybody?

Mr. Frost: Apart from the Paterson commission, no.

Mr. Thompson: Neither directly nor indirectly?

Mr. Frost: Neither directly nor indirectly.

Mr. Thompson: You paid nothing whatever to any Canadian?

Mr. Frost: We did not.

Sir Charles Davidson: How do you consider the commission to Mr. Paterson, as to it being reasonable?

Mr. Frost: I think our people think that it was a fair commission and not exorbitant.

Mr. Carse, the president of the Electric Boat Company, was examined in New York, and the question was put to him:

Mr. Thompson: Do you know of any commission being paid to any person other than the $40,000 paid to Mr. Paterson?

Mr. Carse: There was absolutely nothing paid to anybody outside of that.

Now, I have gone hurriedly over this. I say that the evidence shows that this inquiry was of the most thorough and searching character possible. Sir Richard McBride was examined and cross-examined and re-examined. The manager of the bank

at Victoria, the president, the vice president, the general manager and the auditor of the submarine companies were examined. Everything was done that could be suggested by the Auditor General; every precaution was taken to elicit the truth; and while I do not know what Judge Davidson's finding on the evidence will be, it seems to me that only one conclusion and one finding can be come to. It is unfortunate, however, that this discussion has been precipitated before we have Judge Davidson's report and before the evidence has been laid on the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The discussion was provoked by the Solicitor General.

Mr. HAZEN: While my hon. friend admits that he has made a very serious charge; while he has criticised the evidence, while he has made the charge against Mr. Thompson, a lawyer of standing, that questions had not been asked which a law student of six weeks' experience would have felt it necessary to ask, while he has commented upon the standing of Judge Davidson, and while this commission has been referred to as a whitewashing commission, it appears that after all, my hon. friend has made his criticism of Judge Davidson's conduct of his commission before reading the evidence submitted to Judge Davidson. It is true that my hon. friend read some evidence in the newspapers—

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not correct.

Mr. HAZEN: It is correct with this limitation: My hon. friend says he read the evidence as published in the newspapers. Every hon. member knows—and a lawyer of the standing and experience of my hon. friend knows very well—that no lawyer would depend for his facts in addressing a jury or in summing up before a court on the summaries of evidence that are printed in the newspapers, but that he would have before him the whole official evidence if he intended his remarks to carry weight. It is a matter of regret that my hon. friend could not have waited for a little while until Judge Davidson had made his report, before bringing this matter before the House and endeavouring to base his remarks on evidence as published in the daily press.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Solicitor General provoked the discussion.

Mr. HAZEN: The Solicitor General asked my hon. friend a question, and at once my hon. friend went into the whole matter and told how badly the witnesses had been examined and how badly the investigation had been conducted. I appeal to any hon. member who will read the evidence carefully, if my statement, which has been made several times already to the effect that the inquiry was a most thorough and searching one, is not absolutely true, and if it is not supported by the evidence which Mr. Justice Davidson has taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My honourable friend says he appeals to every member of this House if he is not correct. Let me ask my honourable friend this question, as he has the official evidence before him: Did the commission, when it was in New York, examine the books of the Electric Company, and was there any explanation of how it came about that this $1,150,000 was divided into three amounts, one being a draft on Seattle for $250,000, less exchange, one being a draft on New York for the net sum of $500,000 and the third being a draft on New York for the sum of $400,000, less the bank exchange and charges?

Mr. HAZEN: I am sorry I have not the whole of the evidence here. As I recall it, it affords ample evidence with regard to the division of the cheques.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My honourable friend ought not to make statements unless he has the whole evidence before him.

Mr. HAZEN: Is it the desire of my honourable friend that I should read the whole evidence from first to last?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My honourable friend will pardon me. This is what I say: when my honourable friend appeals to the House to say whether or not there was a full and complete examination, he ought to be able to answer a question which a member puts as to whether there was any examination, upon a most vital and important question, namely, whether the books were examined to see what actually became of those two drafts on New York, as well as of the draft for $250,000 for Seattle.

Mr. HAZEN: I have read enough of the evidence to satisfy the honourable members of the thoroughness of the investigation that took place and of the absolute unfairness of the criticism directed by my honourable friend against the manner in which Judge Davidson conducted the examination. When Judge Davidson's report is received and is laid on the table of the House, as it will be, if my honourable friend wants to discuss the matter further, there will be ample opportunity for him to do so; but I

think it is a matter to be deplored that a gentleman of the high standing and ability of my honourable friend should have undertaken to cast aspersions upon the professional standing of Mr. Thompson and upon the bona fides of Judge Davidson, before reading the evidence produced before them, and before the report of Judge Davidson is submitted to the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I cast no aspersions upon the gentleman whom my honourable friend calls Judge Davidson. He is no more Judge Davidson than the Minister of Justice is Judge Doherty. He has retired from the bench. I cast no reflections upon the Hon. Sir Charles Davidson; but what I said was that there has occurred in this case what will always occur when you have a lawyer upon one side only. Unless you have both interests represented, so that witnesses may be examined and cross-examined, there is apt to be the very gravest possible injustice done, and the commissioner is not responsible for that because he takes the evidence which is presented to him, and in this case he evidently relied solely upon Mr. Thompson who simply represented one side of the case.

Mr. HAZEN: My honourable friend wants the statement to go broadcast throughout the country that there was a lawyer on one side of the case only.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, there was.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Thompson did not appear before the commission as representing Sir Richard McBride or the Department of Naval Service of this country; Mr. Thompson was there representing the people of this country, just as Sir Charles Davidson was. The provisions of the Inquiries Act—

Mr. PUGSLEY: He was representing the Conservatives.

Mr. HAZEN: When my honourable friend says he was representing the Conservatives he is making a statement that is not correct. My honourable friend cannot browbeat the House in that manner. Mr. Thompson was representing the people of this country. Every requirement of the Inquiries Act was complied with by Mr. Justice Davidson and every question that had any bearing upon the matter was asked. The Auditor General of Canada, who was here before the commission to protect the treasury of Canada, was asked to go to Victoria and make suggestions; every witness he suggested was examined, and every question he suggested was asked. The inquiry was thorough and fair, but I do not wish to say anything further about it until we receive Judge Davidson's report. Now I have been speaking so far with regard to the circumstances connected with the purchase of the submarines and of the attempt made to make the people of this country believe there was something dishonest in connection with the transaction.

I wish now to refer briefly to the other ground of attack, namely, the question of the efficiency of the submarines. I find that on that point evidence was given by Commander Jones, Mr. Paterson, Admiral Story, Commander Hose, of the Rainbow; Engineer-Lieut. Wood, Admiral Kingsmill and Mr. Elihu B. Frost, vice-president of the Electric Boat Company of New York. The first witness is Commander Jones, who gave this evidence with regard to these boats:

Q. Did you inspect them?—A. I inspected them, yes.

Q. Did any other officer accompany you?—A. The Chief Engineer of dockyards.

Q. Is he in Canada at present?—A. He is in the dockyards now.

Q. Is he available as a witness?—A. Yes.

Q. What is his name?—A. Engineer-Lieut. Woods.

Q. Did he inspect them with you?—A. He inspected them with me.

Q. Both of them?—A. Yes.

Sir Charles Davidson: Is he of the Royal Navy?

The Witness: He is Royal Canadian Navy now, he was in the Royal Navy.

By Mr. Thompson K.C.

Q. Did you make a thorough inspection of them?—A. I made a thorough inspection, yes.

Q. After you had brought the submarines to Canada, did you make further tests of them?—A. As soon as we had them we commenced practising with them and training crews.

Sir Charles Davidson: What had been your previous experience?

The Witness: I had been five years in the submarine service at home.

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.

Q. What was the result of your further tests?—A. The results were that the boats behaved very well and as far as I remember it was the day following or may be two days after they arrived, one boat was diving outside the harbour training the crew. We started on one boat because it is very difficult to train two crews at the same time.

The instruction staff was limited.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the hon. gentleman state what took place when one of these boats sank to the bottom?

Mr. HAZEN: I will come to that. I have noticed, in many years' experience of the hon. member for the city of St. John, in the legislature or in Parliament, that it is with great difficulty that the hon. gentleman can remain quiet while any one else is

speaking. He has got into the unfortunate habit, if he will allow me to say so, of interrupting one who is trying to present an argument. I continue the citation:

Q. And after the crew was trained, was it placed on the other vessel or how did you arrange about that?—A. I think it was a fortnight after the arrival of the boats that one boat had a complete crew trained, and we proceeded with the training of the second crew, and at the end of August both boats had complete crews, and we were diving and carrying out exercises daily.

This evidence is somewhat lengthy, and I can not read it all and finish my remarks by six o'clock, as I desire to do. But, generally, Commander Jones states that the boats were efficient and very desirable in every respect.

The next witness was Mr. Paterson, who also told about these boats. Then we have the evidence of Admiral Story. He is an admiral in His Majesty's Navy. He was living in Canada at the time the war broke out, and was appointed by the Naval Service Department of Canada to take charge of naval affairs at Esquimalt. This is his evidence:

Q. I would like you to make a statement as to the efficiency or otherwise of the two submarines purchased by Canada.—A. I consider these two boats as very efficient boats in their way. Since I have been here I have been in touch with the officers in command and they have always expressed themselves as satisfied with the behaviour of the boats. They have been continually at work. When I first came to Canada they went out to sea alternate days and kept to the sea. Since then they have been going out every week for exercise, several days in the week, and this has been going on all the time, except when they were having their annual refit. On one occasion one of the boats went out to Flattery, early this year. There was a heavy sea on, and the officer that was in charge of the other ship that was with this boat told me that there was a heavy sea on and that the submarine rode the water like a duck, and the officers generally have said that the boats are very handy in every way and compare very favourably with the English boats of the same class.

Q. Do you know whether or not the cost of repairs has been normal or abnormal in the case of these vessels, comparing the cost of repairs with that of similar vessels in the Royal Navy?—A. The amount of repairs has been normal, what would have been expected. They are new boats. They had their annual overhauling and as new boats a certain amount of work would be expected, especially when they were built by people not used to that class of work. There was nothing but that might be expected.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How long have the submarines been in dock since they were acquired?

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. HAZEN: A very short time. One met with a small accident which involved some repairs, and then, of course, every vessel must have its annual overhauling.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How did it meet with an accident?

Mr. HAZEN: That is all given in the evidence. Something was wrong with one of the valves. It was believed that she struck something crossing from Seattle. It was a trifling matter, and soon repaired. Probably the hon. gentleman refers to something that is mentioned here in the evidence:

Q. It was reported that a portion of the side of one of the vessels had been removed for some purpose or other and Lieut. Jones stated that no part of the hull had been removed, but that a part of the superstructure had been removed in order to have the hull painted?—A. Yes, that is quite correct. When they were having their annual refit it was found that some of the rivets in the stern tube had to be attended to, replaced, and the only way to get at it was to removed these plates belonging to the superstructure. That is, the part above the cigar-shaped hull, but the same plates were put back; you could not get at it without removing them.

Q. Had Number 2 submarine been at sea as much as Number 1?—A. Oh, quite.

Q. And used in the same way in practice and so on?—A. Yes, exactly.

Q. And no distinction is made between these two vessels.—A. No distinction whatever made between the two.

Q. It has been said that the crews are afraid to go to sea in Number 2 submarine, on account of the danger attending cruising or diving in that vessel. What do you say to that, have you heard anything about it?—A. I never heard one single word of any sort or description about it.

Q. Has any complaint been made to you by any of the crews?—A. No.

Q. Or any representations?—A. None. Certainly I should have heard it if it were true.

Q. You would be the first person to whom such reports would be made?—A. Certainly.

There is further evidence about it, but it simply shows that idle reports got abroad for which there is no foundation. No doubt some of these idle reports have reached the ears of members of this House.

Engineer-Lieut. Wood gives evidence as to the efficiency of the vessel. I will give just one answer which is typical of the whole of Engineer Wood's evidence:

Well, I think so, so far as submarines go, they are in every way efficient.

Similar evidence was given by others. And now I come to the evidence of the director of the Naval Service, Vice-Admiral Kingsmill, which I will read in full. This is Admiral Kingsmill's evidence:

Mr. Thompson, K.C.: You will recollect, Admiral, that Canada purchased two submarines

at a cost of $1,150,000 just on the eve of the declaration of war, would you give the Commission your opinion as to the cost of these vessels, considering the conditions under which they were purchased?

Admiral Kingsmill: My opinion of the cost of the vessels was that under the conditions of war it was not an excessive price to pay. It was a price less than that paid by the Admiralty for the same class of vessels, when they paid a heavy premium for them being finished within a certain time, which was much what we were doing in this case. The submarines would have been no use to us two months later. I presume that the price we paid, although it was a very heavy price, was worth it.

Mr. Thompson: What do you say as to the expediency of acquiring those submarines at that time?

Admiral Kingsmill: As a matter of expediency, I consider that the British Columbia Government which had made the purchase, acted promptly and rightly. The fact of these submarines being there, I am perfectly certain in my own mind, saved the city of Victoria, if not the city of Vancouver, from serious damage.

Mr. Thompson: That is on the part of the German Navy?

Admiral Kingsmill: On the part of the German Eastern squadron, which had left Kiau-Chow almost on the outbreak of the war, and which we know were cruising in the Western Pacific at the time.

Mr. Thompson: I understand that at the time these vessels were acquired, an officer named Lieut. Commander Keyes was at Victoria, or arrived there shortly after they were acquired.

Admiral Kingsmill: Lieutenant-Commander Keyes was a retired lieutenant-commander in the Royal Navy, who had been an expert in submarines. At the outbreak of the war, I happened to hear of him being in Toronto in the employ of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and I telegraphed him and he arrived here the same morning, I think, that we received the information that the submarines were being delivered, and he immediately went out. He picked up one or two experts in Toronto, men he had happened to meet, who were ex-service men, and he went out there and gathered a crew and took the vessels over from the Electric Boat Company, or the vendors —I forget who they were without looking at the file. At all events, he took them over from a Mr. Smith and he tested these vessels. When I arrived in Victoria, some time afterwards, he informed me that the CC-1, that is the first one, was in excellent condition, and quite serviceable. He admitted he would not like to say the same about the other one without having her docked, as there was some leak somewhere that he could not detect. So the vessel was docked and it was found that she had struck something and that there was a slight leak which prevented her from maintaining her buoyancy, but otherwise the vessel was in excellent condition, and both of them were efficient. I may say that from that day they have continued ordinary work, out for practice, firing torpedoes, submerged and on the surface. With the exception of minor defects and one or two accidents they have had, there has been nothing to complain of in the vessels at all.

Mr. Thompson: My recollection is that Commander Jones is now in command of these two submarines.

Admiral Kingsmill: Lieutenant-Commander Jones, after the Scharnhorst and Emden had been sunk, Mr. Keyes returned to the Admiralty and subsequently served in the Dardanelles.

Mr. Thompson: I understand from the evidence of Commander Keyes that the defect which existed in one of the vessels that was brought across from Seattle was in one of the valves not being properly seated; would that be caused by an accident, such as you spoke of, before they were acquired?

Admiral Kingsmill: It might have been caused by the vessel striking some submerged object.

Mr. Thompson: I understood from Commander Jones that that was a very minor defect.

Admiral Kingsmill: All the defects have been minor; there was no serious defect at all.

Mr. Thompson: After these defects were remedied, was submarine No. 2 as efficient as submarine No. 1?

Admiral Kingsmill: Yes, quite.

Mr. Thompson: What are the qualifications of Commander Keyes to make a report on such vessels?

Admiral Kingsmill: Commander Keyes happened to be a man who had served in all of our earlier submarines and had been out in all their tests. I asked him, when he came to Ottawa: "Do you happen to know anything about submarines?" I did not send for him because he knew anything about submarines, but because he was an ex-naval officer. He said: "I happen to know a great deal about them; I was out on the tests for buoyancy and stability in nearly all of the A class." When I heard this I suggested that he should go to Victoria, which he did. His reputation as an expert is very high.

Mr. Thompson: Is he in the service at present?

Admiral Kingsmill: He is in the service at present, and lately has been honoured for good work at the Dardanelles.

Mr. Thompson: What do you say as to the efficiency of these vessels as compared with vessels of a similar class in the British Navy at the present time?

Admiral Kingsmill: From all the information we can get, and from Keyes' own report, he says they are quite on a par with anything they have.

Sir Charles Davidson: What as to buoyancy?

Admiral Kingsmill: That I could not remember without the files; that is a technical question that I did not know I was going to be asked.

Sir Charles Davidson: The Chilians made that a ground of rescilliating the contract.

I think rescinding is what is meant.

The boat company rather suggest that the Chilians did not want to continue the bargain for another reason, and I would like, if possible, to know what your official opinion is.

Admiral Kingsmill: As to their buoyancy?

Sir Charles Davidson: Yes.

Admiral Kingsmill: The submarines are efficient in every way. They are continually out and diving and firing their torpedoes. The statement that there was anything wrong with their buoyancy or anything wrong with them in any other way is absolutely false, because from the very day that Keyes got hold of them he went out. In my presence in Victoria these submarines have gone out and submerged and done their work and come back again.

Mr. Thompson: Were ever any complaints made in any way that there was a lack of buoyancy in these vessels?

Admiral Kingsmill: No, except in CC-2, which, as I have mentioned, struck something.

Mr. Thompson: That, I understand, was before the defect was remedied.

Admiral Kingsmill: That was before the defect was remedied.

Sir Charles Davidson: The contract between the Chilian Government and the Electric Boat Company called for tests with two months' provisions on board. Have they ever been tested in that respect, or is it required that they should be so tested in the service they perform for the Canadian Government?

Admiral Kingsmill: It would not be required of them. They have never been away from their parent ship to that extent, and that test has never been made to my knowledge. They were not built for overseas submarines; they were built for coast defence—at least they were used for coast defence—what they were built for I do not know. They cruise with their parent ship.

Sir Charles Davidson: They were built to go to Chili?

Admiral Kingsmill: Yes, but they could do that coasting.

We have no information on our files as to anything the Chilians asked for. That has been obtained by the Commission, I presume, but we have no knowledge of what the Chilians asked for. We have only the report of our own officer as to the efficiency of the boats for the purposes for which they were needed by us; that is, the protection of the British Columbia coast.

Mr. Thompson: What would you consider would be the probable normal cost of building such vessels in Canada in normal times?

Admiral Kingsmill: That is a very vexed question. We have never been able to solve exactly what it would cost us here. We did not propose to build any submarines, but Australia did, and at the Conference in 1908 they said they could build them for £55,000 each in England for the Australians, and later on the Australians, in their estimates, put down nine submarines for £810,000, which would bring it up to about £90,000 each. But in this country we could not do it. If we added about 40 per cent to this £55,000, which is what we were going to add when we proposed to build Bristols here, that would bring it up to about $450,000 each.

Mr. Thompson: Would that be a submarine of the same class as these two that Canada purchased?

Admiral Kingsmill: That estimate was made then for a sea-going class, which is a little different, and not quite as elaborate. There are improvements in this class, which they have not got in the sea class.

Mr. Thompson: Do these improvements cost more?

Admiral Kingsmill: They cost considerably more. They have submarine telephone and different small items like that, and they would have had a greater surface speed than the sea class. Altogether, these are a better class of vessels than were going to be built by Australia in 1909.

Sir Charles Davidson: Would the price you mentioned include overhead charges?

Admiral Kingsmill: That is roughly the actual cost to the Government in building them. But in August of 1914, Messrs. Vickers offered to build for the Canadian Government submarines at a cost of $572,000 each, a similar boat to these on the Pacific coast, and six months afterwards, when the question was again raised, they asked $600,000 for each boat. The Admiralty paid more than $572,000 for each boat, because they paid a very heavy premium that the vessels should be built within a certain time. That is a matter of Admiralty information that I have not got on our files.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does he say what the length of the submarines was?

Mr. HAZEN: Similar boats, he says.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understood that they were larger boats. They were built in a shipyard at Massachusetts.

Mr. HAZEN: They were assembled at Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Ten were built at the Fore River Shipyards, and then assembled at Montreal. I understood that they were larger boats, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. HAZEN: These boats were built at the Vickers-Maxim works in Montreal; when I say "built," my hon. friend knows what I mean. The material that entered into their construction came from the Fore River Shipbuilding Company, and, I think, the Union Iron Company of San Francisco. The parts were assembled at Montreal. It was in respect of this contract that Admiral Kingsmill says the British Government paid more than $572,000 a boat.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is said that one of the submarines assembled at the Vickers-Maxim works in Montreal is the submarine that sank a large German cruiser in the sea of Marmora. Can my hon. friend give me any information on that subject?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know whether or not that is the case, but I have been informed that these submarines have done excellent work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a pity that Canada did not turn out more of them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it a fact that the Vickers-Maxim people employed about 1,000 people in the construction of these submarines?

Mr. HAZEN: They employed a good many people; I do not know how many. Admiral Kingsmill's evidence continues:

Mr. Thompson: The premium would be in addition to the $572,000?

Mr. Thompson: The premium would be in addition to the $572,000?

Admiral Kingsmill: The premium and the cost of building, which Vickers charged, is more than $572,000. I only know there was a premium because Mr. Tynan, the representative of the company who were building at Vickers, told me so.

Sir Charles Davidson: What is the character of the premiums concerning which you have spoken?

Admiral Kingsmill: It is a premium if the vessels were built within a certain time.

He is asked to state the extent and so on, and he says he cannot. I think there is nothing further in the evidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did Sir Charles Davidson ask any of these experts what was the actual weight of the supplies? I would like to know what weight of supplies these ships could carry.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not see that question here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A vessel ought to carry some supplies. If it did not I would regard it as defective.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood from the extract that Admiral Kingsmill, in reply to a question as to the buoyancy of the boat, said he could not answer the question without reference to the files. Does he refer to the departmental file here?

Mr. HAZEN: I suppose that is what he means. He says that the boat is absolutely satisfactory, but he means that he could not give scientific and technical data without reference to the files.

Mr. MARCIL: I wish to ask the minister just one question.

Mr. HAZEN: I am beginning to think that I am on the witness stand, being cross-examined by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is all very interesting, this question of the submarines, and I think it is a pity that the Government have not seen fit to give us more information.

Mr. HAZEN: The evidence of Mr. Frost, Vice-President of the Electric Boat Company, was taken at New York. He says:

To my knowledge the boats were very effective and efficient boats.

I think the evidence I have quoted must satisfy any one whose mind is open to be satisfied of three facts? First, that the transaction was honestly conducted and honestly carried out, and that there was no foundation or justification for the charges made with regard to Sir Richard McBride or the people who had to do with the transaction. Second, that the boats were efficient. The evidence of all the experts, Admiral Storey, Commander Keyes, Admiral Kingsmill, and others all goes to show that. Third, the evidence of Admiral Kingsmill goes to show that the boats, bought as they were in a hurry, were bought at a price not as large as the price that the British Government subsequently paid for submarines of similar type. When the report of Sir Charles Davidson is laid upon the Table, and when we have an opportunity to read Sir Charles's summary of the evidence, we will have an opportunity for further discussion if my hon. friends care to pursue the subject further.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) referred to another matter of great importance, that is, the pensions paid to Canadian soldiers. I have in my hand two tables, one showing comparative rates for pensions for totally disabled soldiers, the other, comparative rates for widows of officers and men killed on active service. This is not the first time the matter has been referred to in the House. I turn to Hansard of last year, March 24, 1915, and I find that on that day Sir Robert Borden laid on the table of the House the draft Order in Council that had been prepared containing an amended scale of pensions. He said:

It is very desirable that the House should be made acquainted with what we propose and that an opportunity should be given for discussion, if desired. Therefore, I shall lay upon the table of the House a copy of the proposed Order in Council. It has not yet been passed, and will not be passed until the House has had an opportunity of making suggestions and expressing an opinion upon it.

That was three weeks before the prorogation of Parliament. The matter of pensions was referred to only once afterwards in this House, at page 1450 of Hansard, when my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) who sits beside the right hon. leader of the Opposition asked the question, when the Minister of Militia was making a statement on some other subject:

Will the pensions be paid according to the rank which the men held in the militia of Canada or according to the rank in which they have been serving in the war?

There was some little discussion on that point, and that is the only time it was referred to. The Order providing for the pensions was on the Table of the House for three weeks, open and available to every member of the House, and no discussion took place in regard to the rates to be provided. That, however, is no reason for not discussing it now. It is a perfectly proper subject for discussion, and I think the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is within the bounds of legitimate and proper discussion in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, because it is one

which, for my part, I would be very sorry indeed to have regarded from a party standpoint. I wish, however, to give a few facts to the House and then, if the House will permit me, I shall ask permission to have the tables which I hold in my hand inserted in Hansard. It would take a very long time to read them and they would hardly be grasped by the members. I shall give a few figures first. In Canada the unmarried soldier who is totally disabled is paid $264 per annum. I am speaking now of private soldiers. In Australia he is paid $253 and in Great Britain $316. Thus, in Great Britain, the unmarried soldier who is totally disabled gets more than in Canada and still more than in Australia. But in Great Britain no provision is made for extra pension if the man is married; while in Canada if a man is married his pension becomes $396, in Australia $380, and in Great Britain $316; in Britain it is just the same as he would receive if he is a bachelor. The pension paid to a soldier who has a wife and one child is, in Canada $456, in Australia $443, and in Great Britain $348; a wife and two children, in Canada $516, in Australia $506, in Great Britain, $380; a wife and three children, in Canada $576, in Australia $569, and in Great Britain $412. If he has a wife and four children he receives in Canada $636, in Australia $633, and in Great Britain $444.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the minister tell us the difference between the amounts paid to officers in the two countries?

Mr. HAZEN: In Canada a lieutenant who is unmarried would get $482, in Australia $443, and in Great Britain $700. The higher officers get larger sums in Great Britain, in proportion, than they do in Canada and Australia. A lieutenant with a wife and one child, in Canada gets $774, in Australia $727. With a wife and four children, a lieutenant gets $990 in Canada, and $917 in Australia.

Mr. CARVELL: What about Great Britain?

Mr. HAZEN: As far as I can tell, the pension there does not increase on account of his being married. I have a note saying:

> In addition he receives a gratuity of one year's pension the first year.

That is in Great Britain. I am not clear about the state of affairs in the United States, but I think their pension there, for total disability, is higher. It is lower in other respects. In the United States, as far as I can learn, there is no fixed amount covering the term total disability, as the rate varies according to the form of disability, without regard to rank. I see it is $400 a year for total deafness and it runs up to $1,200 a year for the loss of the sight of both eyes. It is fixed according to the nature of the injury, without generally saying total disability, and for total disability I should say that in the United States a larger amount is paid than in Australia, Great Britain, or Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that $1,200 to a private soldier?

Mr. HAZEN: I think it is. I am told that there is no distinction as regards rank in the United States. However, we want to obtain further information on that point.

Now, I come to the question of the rates paid to the widows of officers and men who were actually killed. In Canada, the widow of a private without any children, under the pension scheme laid on the table, would get $264. The widow of a private in Australia would get $253.

Mr. MARCIL: That is, so long as she remains unmarried.

Mr. HAZEN: In Britain she would get $126, and in the United States $144 or $120 less than the widow in Canada. In Canada the widow with one child would get $324, in Australia $316, in Great Britain $189, and in the United States $168. The widow with four children in Canada would get $504, in Australia $504, in Great Britain $283, and in the United States $240, and so on. I will place these tables upon Hansard so that hon. members may have an opportunity to study them for themselves.

TABLE I.

Comparative Rates of Pensions for totally disabled Soldiers, Active Service.

Rank.	—	Unmarried Soldier.	Married Soldier and wife.	Soldier Wife and 1 Child.	Soldier Wife and 2 Children.	Soldier Wife and 3 Children.	Soldier Wife and 4 Children.	Remarks.
		$	$	$	$	$	$	
Rank and File (i. e., Corporals and Privates).	Canada	264 00	396 00	456 00	516 00	576 00	636 00	Rates may be increased ⅓ if constant services of an attendant are required.
	Australia	253 00	380 00	443 00	506 00	569 00	633 00	
	British	316 00	316 00	348 00	380 00	412 00	444 00	
	United States.	There is no fixed amount to cover term of "total disability", as rates vary according to form of disability, without regard to rank, viz; from $480.00 a year for total deafness, up to $1,200 a year for loss of sight of both eyes.						
Sergeant	Canada	336 00	504 00	564 00	624 00	684 00	744 00	
	Australia	340 00	496 00	560 00	623 00	701 00	764 00	
	British	366 00	366 00	398 00	430 00	462 00	494 00	
Warrant Offiuer	Canada	480 00	672 00	732 00	792 00	852 00	912 00	
	Australia	377 00	566 00	630 00	693 00	756 00	818 00	
	British	506 00	506 00	538 00	570 00	602 00	634 00	
Lieutenant	Canada	482 00	702 00	774 00				
	Australia	443 00	664 00	727 00	846 00	918 00	990 00	
	British	700 00			791 00	854 00	917 00	
	United States.	Same rates as above for men.						In addition receives a gratuity of one year's pension the first year.
Captain	Canada	720 00	990 00	1,074 00	1,158 00	1,242 00	1,326 00	
	Australia	492 00	737 00	800 00	864 00	927 00	990 00	
	British	1,000 00						In addition receives a gratuity of 1 yr's pension the 1st year.
Major	Canada	960 00	1,260 00	1,356 00	1,452 00	1,548 00	1,644 00	
	Australia	565 00	847 00	910 00	973 00	1,037 00	1,100 00	
	British	2,000 00						In addition receives a gratuity of 1 yr's pension the 1st year.
Lieut-Colonel	Canada	1,200 00	1,560 00	1,680 00	1,800 00	1,920 00	2,040 00	
	Australia	638 00	956 00	1,019 00	1,083 00	1,146 00	1,200 00	
	British	3,000 00						In addition receives a gratuity of 1 yr's pension the 1st year.

TABLE II.

Comparative rates of Pensions for Widows of Officers and Men killed on Active Service.

Rank of Husband.	——	Widow without Children.	With one Child.	With two Children.	With 3 Children.	With 4 Children.	Remarks.
		$	$	$	$	$	
Private	Canada	264 00	324 00	384 00	444 00	504 00	Receives also a gratuity equivalent to two months' Pension in the first year.
	Australia	253 00	316 00	379 00	442 00	504 00	
	British	126 00	189 00	233 00	258 00	283 00	Pensions vary according to age; on attaining to 35 increase of $30.00, and a further $30.00 at 45.
	United States	144 00	168 00	192 00	216 00	240 00	
Sergeant	Canada	336 00	396 00	456 00	516 00	576 00	
	Australia	340 00	403 00	466 09	529 00	592 00	
	British	138 00	201 00	245 00	270 00	295 00	Increase on attaining 35 years and again at 45.
Warrant Officer	Canada	384 00	444 00	504 00	564 00	624 00	
	Australia	377 00	440 00	503 00	566 00	629 00	
	British	175 00	238 00	282 00	307 00	332 00	Increase on widow attaining 35 years and again at 45.
Lieutenant	Canada	444 00	516 00	588 00	660 00	732 00	
	Australia	443 00	506 00	569 00	632 00	695 00	
	British	400 00	475 00	550 00	625 06	700 00	
Captain	Canada	540 00	624 00	708 00	792 00	876 00	
	Australia	492 00	555 00	618 00	681 00	774 00	
	British	500 00	590 00	680 00	770 00	860 00	
Major	Canada	600 00	696 00	792 00	888 00	984 00	
	Australia	565 00	628 00	691 00	754 00	817 00	
	British	700 00	805 00	910 00	1,015 00	1,120 00	
Lieut-Colonel	Canada	720 00	840 00	960 00	1,080 00	1,200 00	
	Australia	638 00	701 09	764 00	827 00	890 00	
	British	900 00	1,020 00	1,140 00	1,260 00	1,380 00	

There is one important point which requires consideration. If any one looks over the casualty lists of the Canadian forces, especially those of the spring and early summer, he will find that in a great many cases the next of kin of the men who went from Canada, and who were killed, were residents of the British Isles, so that the pensions we pay will go to people who live in Great Britain, to the children, widows, or mothers, as the case may be. That is going to give rise to this state of affairs, that the next of kin of the soldiers who have gone to fight from Canada and who have been killed, living in Great Britain will get pensions very considerably higher than those paid to the next of kin of British soldiers who live in Canada or Great Britain. I think that is a matter worthy of some consideration.

The new scheme of pensions was drawn up by a committee of the Militia Council in consultation with a subcommittee of the Privy Council who had before them the scales of pensions paid in other countries. The pensions for totally disabled soldiers are based, to a very large extent, on those introduced by the Parliament of Australia. In the case of totally disabled soldiers, it will be noted that the Canadian rates are slightly higher than the Australian rates, and considerably higher than the British rates. In the United States there are a number of rates for different classes of disability, and these are awarded without any regard to the rank of the individual, with the consequent result that the rates for disability of soldiers is much higher than in any other country; but it should be noted that special provision exists in the Canadian scale by which the pension may be increased by one-third if the soldier requires the constant services of an attendant.

As regards officers—in the case of those who are single—my summing up is that the Canadian rates are higher than the Australian rates, but considerably lower than the British rates. The Canadian rates for the widows of soldiers are almost exactly the same as those recently provided in the Australian Act, and they are practically double the amounts authorized for the widows of British soldiers, although in Great Britain the rates have been materially increased since the outbreak of war. The rates allowed to widows of soldiers of the United States are considerably lower than the Canadian rates. As regards officers the Canadian rates for widows of lieutenants and captains are almost exactly the same in Canada, Australia, and Great Britain, with the advantage slightly in favour of Canada. As regards officers of higher rank, majors and lieutenant-colonels, the Canadian rates are higher than the Australian, but less than the British. In both Canada and Great Britain on the widow re-marrying, a gratuity equivalent to two years pension is granted on re-marriage taking place. The only other point worth mentioning is that in Great Britain an increase of pension of $30 a year is given to a soldier's widow on attaining the age of 35 years, and another increase of $30 on attaining the age of 45 years, but even with this increase the rates do not come up to the Canadian rates.

This, as I said, is a proper subject for discussion in the House, and the Government will welcome the discussion of it and any suggestions that may be made. I do not think there is a man in this House who would attempt to make political capital out of the question of pensions. We are all striving to provide a pension rate that will be fair to the brave men who are going forward to the front to fight the battles of Canada and of the Empire.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will permit me to transgress a little and prolong my remarks beyond six o'clock. There are one or two other matters with which I would like to deal, and I think my remarks would come sooner to an end if I were allowed to continue before the adjournment for dinner. My hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made certain references to the extension of the term of Parliament. My hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) also referred to it. He has always been a stout upholder of the Constitution of this country, and I have always respected his opinions on matters of this sort, for I know him to be sincere. He pratically told us he had an open mind on the subject and that although he was always prepared to stand behind the Constitution he might vote in favour of an extension. My hon. friend from St. John, however, has discovered that the question is a most serious one, that we have to interfere with the British North America Act, and that that is a most serious thing to contemplate. Yet, it is no more serious now than it was on 15th September last, and on the 15th day of September last my hon. friend from St. John knew as well as when he delivered his speech on the Address that, if there was to be an extension

of the term of Parliament, there would have to be an amendment to the British North America Act, because without legislation by the Imperial Parliament this Parliament has not the power to extend its term. I find that on the 15th September last my hon. friend from St. John, in the city of Winnipeg, declared to a reporter of the Free Press:

> The present circumstances are so grave from the standpoint of Canada and the Empire that it would be deplorable in my opinion to have the people divided upon party questions.
>
> Another of the reasons why I favour putting off an election until after the war is because I think it would be a great pity to hold one just when the energies of all the people of Canada, and especially the members of the Government who are primarily charged with the duty of attending to the recruiting and equipment of the soldiers should be devoted to this one end.

Why this sudden change? Why is he so impressed with the importance of the matter now when he was not so impressed with it in September. It may be due to the fact that in September last the Government was supposed to be contemplating an election, and my hon. friend thought he would put himself squarely against such a proposal as something opposed to the best interests of the country. But now, when the Government comes to Parliament and asks for an extension of the term, my hon. friend must again be against the Government and so he is deeply impressed with the importance of the question, an importance which he did not see in September when he was interviewed by the Winnipeg Free Press.

But my hon. friend from St. John was not alone in making such a statement. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) whose criticisms, as I said before, are always moderate, and none the less effective because of their moderation, also placed himself squarely on record as opposed to an election during the period of the war. Then my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has practically said the same thing in speeches he has made and in interviews he has had throughout the country. I might refer to the address he gave in the House of Commons on 19th of August when he said:

> Speaking for those who sit around me, speaking for the wide constituencies which we represent in this House, I hasten to say that to all these measures we are prepared to give immediate assent. If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done or should be differently done, we raise no question, we take no exception, we offer no criticism and we shall offer no criticism so long as there is danger at the front.

Then the right hon. gentleman in a speech delivered at the Montreal Reform Club on December 12, 1914, declared that:

> As soon as war was declared we thought it was part of the duty we owed, not only to our policy, but also to our country, to lay down for the time being, all party discussion, and to give our whole thought and energy to the new problems which were brought by the war, and not in any way embarrass the Government, but on the contrary to facilitate its duty which this new situation created for the Government.
>
> At the present time the only thing we have to think of is to finish the war, and to adjourn to a future date those domestic problems which will have to be taken up later.
>
> The war is still on. Upon the policy introduced by the Government to discharge the duties we owe to the Mother Country, we have taken no issue with the Government. We have supported their policy, and therefore there is no cause for an appeal to the country.
>
> I am as strong a party man as there is in Canada, but at the present time I overlook all my connection as a party man, simply to remember the duty which I owe to the Mother Country, England, and I must add to France also, the land of my ancestors.

The hon. member for Pictou, N.S., (Mr. Macdonald) was interviewed by the Toronto Star on September 17, on which occasion he made this statement:

> An election while the struggle is raging for liberty and humanity would be a crime. An election during the war would divide the Dominion; there should be no election during the war.

The Toronto Globe on September 6, 1915, said:

> If the war is still in progress.... Liberals will be just as keen to postpone a general election as Conservatives. Election talk should cease. It distracts attention from the greatest work Canadian statesmen and the Canadian people have had to do since Confederation.

On October 20 the Toronto Globe said:

> To secure an absolute insurance against partisan strife in our national political arena there must be an agreement for the extension of the Parliamentary term until a period some time after the close of the war.

The Toronto Star, on September 9, said:

> We do not want an election now, or during the war.

The Star again says:

> As there is a general agreement of opinion that there should be no election during the war there should be no difficulty in making the arrangement referred to (extension of parliamentary term). It would be an advantage, not only to have the election deferred until after the war, but to put an end to the nuisance of periodical election rumors.

The Winnipeg Free Press of August 23, 1915:

A bitter party election in Canada would be a deplorable diversion of national energy.

The Chronicle, Halifax, April 12, 1915:

We need not pause to remark that election day should not come until the war is over. Every decent-minded Canadian, regardless of party, knows and admits that.

In the Chronicle of September 13 and also of September 16 a similar opinion is expressed. The Recorder, Brockville, says:

Both parties in Great Britain have agreed that there will be no election until after the war is over. From Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and every other outlying part of the Empire come similar announcements. Canada alone talks of a party conflict at a time when 'none should be for party, but all be for the state.' This country would present a fine spectacle to the Empire, and to the rest of the world, if an acrimonious conflict should held while the Empire is fighting for its very existence.

The Herald of Montreal, in December last, put the case against an election very strongly and the Free Press, Ottawa, on May 11, said that at the next session Sir Robert Borden should introduce enabling legislation extending the life of Parliament. The Ottawa Citizen on April 14, said that it did not believe that the people of either party wish a general election and the Times of St. John, N.B., the particular supporter of my hon. friend from St. John, says:

All that Sir Robert Borden needs to do is to announce that there will be no election until after the war.

Yet, in spite of his own previous declarations, in spite of all these pronouncements by prominent men in the Liberal party and their leading journals, my hon. friend has discovered that it is a very serious thing to talk about amending the British North America Act so as to provide for the extension of the parliamentary term.

The hon. member for Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Kyte) spoke the other night about the evidences of patronage in connection with shell matters in Cape Breton and more particularly in connection with the appointment of inspectors. My hon. friend stated that nobody could be appointed as an inspector unless he had a recommendation from the Borden Club or some other political organization there. I am not quoting my hon. friend's exact words but that was the effect of them. What are the facts, as I am informed? I am informed that the chief inspector of the district of Cape Breton is Mr. A. E. Strubel, whose appointment did not come through the Borden Club, or any Conservative candidate, or any political pull of any kind whatsoever. He had been the chief inspector for the Canadian Inspection Bureau, which is the bureau that inspected shells that were manufactured under the direction of the Shell Committee, or of the Imperial Munitions Board. He had been chief inspector for the Canadian Inspection Bureau before the Government inspection service was organized and he continued the work under the new arrangement. I am informed by my correspondent that he does not believe that there are a dozen persons on either side of politics in Cape Breton county who know on what side of politics Mr. Strubel is, and as far as anybody knows he has never yet cast a vote in a Dominion or provincial election in this country. The inspector who stands next to Mr. Strubel, I am informed, in the matter of salary received, is Mr. D. E. Ross, a Liberal in politics, secretary of the Sydney Fielding Club, and son of Mr. A. C. Ross, formerly the Liberal member for Cape Breton North and Victoria. Another inspector is Mr. Wells Woodill, who is a Liberal, whose father was a Liberal, and all of whose brothers and immediate relatives belong to the Liberal party. For the appointments which have been made during the past six months, I am told, Mr. Strubel gives the assurance that he himself is personally responsible. Naturally he has received letters of solicitation from politicians, but he has never been influenced by them. Some time ago he wrote to a gentleman who had urged an appointment for political reasons, advising him that all appointments would be made on merit, and that preference would be given to Canadian wounded soldiers who had returned from the front. I am told that there are at present six inspectors under Mr. Strubel, three Liberals and three Conservatives. Mr. Strubel, I am informed, is not in any sense a political partisan or connected with any political organization in any way. The statements made by my hon. friend from Richmond are wide of the mark, and he must have received inaccurate information in regard to the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who is my hon. friend's authority?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not the right to give the authority now, but I will see if I may be permitted to do it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I might suggest to my hon. friend that if any question be raised as to why Mr. Ross had received his

appointment, the answer would be that it was because his father had renounced the religion of his fathers.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know anything about that. I am simply giving the House the information I have received.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am giving my hon. friend the correct information.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know Mr. Ross, but I come to the conclusion, from the hon. gentleman's remarks, that Mr. Ross must be a very sensible man. I must trespass no further upon the time of the
6 p.m. House, which I have already occupied too long. When I addressed the Canadian Club at Boston a few months ago, I pointed out that after the war is over there will, no doubt, come a period of reconstruction for Canada, as for all the other countries engaged in the conflict, which will be followed, I believe, by an era of tremendous expansion, so far as our Dominion is concerned, caused by an immense influx of population, attracted to our country by its fertile lands, its moderate taxes, its democratic institutions, and the opportunities which it affords to every man within its borders of acquiring for himself a happy home, and of winning position and distinction if his talents and character entitle him to do so. We have no doubt in Canada of what the ultimate result of the war will be. While no man can foretell its duration, we conscientiously believe that our cause is just, and that there is an unflinching determination to make it triumphant. In the language of Sir Robert Borden, any reverses that have come or may come in the future will only inspire us with deeper courage and a greater determination.

All that our fathers fought for and achieved, all that we have inherited and accomplished, our institutions, our liberties, our destiny as a nation, the existence of our Empire, are all at stake in this contest, and we are confident that the resolution, the determination, the self-reliance, and the resourcefulness that have never failed Canada in the stress and trials of the past will assuredly not fail her now.

Since Parliament prorogued in April last we have had some disappointments, and events have not moved so rapidly and favourably as we then believed they would, but the spirit of the Allies of Canada and of the Empire is undiminished, and there is an even greater and more serious determination than existed months ago to bring the war to a successful close. Recruiting in Canada has proceeded satisfactorily, and in Great Britain political difficulties that at one time seemed threatening and serious have largely disappeared. No matter how long the war may last, or how serious the sacrifices, personal and national, that must be made, and which Canadians, in common with the inhabitants of other portions of the Empire, are fully prepared to undergo, we will always remember that:

> Freedom's battle once begun,
> Bequeathed from bleeding sire to son,
> Though baffled oft, is ever won.

It is freedom's battle that is now being waged, and the Canadians in the battle line are fighting for freedom's sacred cause.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth session of this Parliament and the third session since the war began, and I think it might not be out of place, in speaking to the Address in this third war session to recall briefly the changing events, so far as Parliament is concerned, since August 1914. We all remember that, like a bolt from the blue, the news of conflict came, and the representatives of Canada in Parliament, called suddenly together, came here to take counsel as to what our attitude was to be in a war, the extent and consequence of which we had then but little knowledge. With one accord, disregarding party lines and previous political disputes this Parliament voted to give all that was necessary in the way of money, and of men in the field to help the Empire. There came a period of doubt and suspense when throughout this land as well as throughout the whole of the English-speaking world, there were discussions as to the effect of this White Paper, and that Yellow Paper, and as to which nation was responsible for the initiation of the war. These discussions, without any marked event, attracted a great deal of attention until we met about one year ago. And even then, I think it will be conceded, that honourable members of this House as a body were not impressed with the deep consequences of this mighty struggle.

We came through that session with a shadow overhanging us, yet we were not given up wholly and exclusively to the contemplation of what our duties and our rights were in the circumstances. Honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House claimed our attention for some time

with what I think will be recognized to-day to have been a rather singular measure in view of the peculiar world situation, a proposition that we should send to Flanders—and, as it would appear now, to the Dardanelles also—to take the votes of the boys who had gone out to fight for liberty. That proposition was seriously discussed one year ago. In the light of events since then, I think it will be conceded that that proposal and that discussion seem very singular indeed. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) told us that the country was demanding in thunder tones some remedy for the alleged evils arising from the decisions of the other branch of this Parliament. I do not believe that the people were demanding this in any kind of tones, to say nothing of thunder tones; but I cite these facts to establish the truth of what I say, that we in Parliament last year hardly realized the position in which the whole world and our own nation stood in relation to this great conflict.

Since that time there has been, I am sure every one will concede, a great and marvellous change not only in the feelings of the majority of members of this House but in the feelings and sentiments of the whole Canadian people. We had hardly reached our homes when we were shocked by the news that the German nation had violated every rule of the code which is supposed to guide the relations of belligerents and had sent to the bottom of the ocean hundreds of people in the steamer Lusitania. Then came the word of the disaster at St. Julien and Langemarck, when the Canadian boys for the first time felt the stress of conflict, and which cast a shadow of sorrow upon many a home in this land. Then came the after results, the splendid position maintained by our sons at Ypres, where, it is now conceded not only by Canadians but by the sons of Empire everywhere, the bravery, intellligence and capacity of our Canadian boys prevented the Germans from coming through to Calais. In the intervening days there has been this strange, peculiar association of Germany with the Balkan principalities and Turkey, the outcome of the immense ambition of this man who rules the German nation, this personality actuated by the lust for world-wide power, bringing home to us the dangers and seriousness of this war in a measure in which they had never come to us before. Hence it was that from all portions of this land our boys have gone forth to the conflict, animated with the highest ideals. Here in this House there are vacant chairs of members who have gone to the conflict, while all around us are men whose sons are at the front or are preparing to go at the earliest opportunity. And into the homes of many of our people has come the sorrow for the one who will never return, and there are returning to us the maimed and the blind whom it will be our duty to maintain and provide for in the future.

So, we have met this year under conditions different from any that have characterized the opening of any session of Parliament in the history of our country and, I believe, under a deeper sense of our duty than we have ever had before. I think the majority of us are animated with the desire in our deliberations to correct the mistakes of the past and to correct them in the full light of day. If this is done it should not call forth complaint or criticism from those who may be responsible for those mistakes. I believe that we desire to provide those things and take those steps which our duty calls for, and, so far as we can look into the future and provide not only for the soldier boys who shall return, but also for the people who shall live in this country happy and prosperous under the benign rule of the great nation to which we belong. Looking over the history of the year, we, the representatives of a free people, may express ourselves in an adaptation of Lincoln's immortal words: "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that, under God, this nation shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth."

With these feelings I approach the consideration of the questions that come before us as representatives of a free people at this time. And I say again, that if there have been mistakes in the past, let us frankly ascertain and correct them; if there are abuses, let them be righted, and let us prepare with all sincerity for our future.

Shortly before the New Year the Prime Minister announced that, in addition to the 250,000 men who have already been called to the colours, 250,000 men are to be called and are to form a quota of Canada's contribution. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that according to the census returns of 1911 there are, or were at that time, only 1,537,581 men in Canada between the ages

of 20 and 45. That means that if we are to get the 500,000 men, we must take one man out of every three. Without conscription you can get those men only by living up to the highest ideals; you can get them only by impressing them with the fact that the consequences of this conflict are so great that this Government and this Parliament are willing to throw aside the considerations which in the past have furnished ground for complaint and for proper investigation, on the part not only of the Opposition, but also of Parliament as a whole and of the people at large. If hon. gentlemen opposite fall short of this ideal; if they are not guided in every respect by the highest motives, how can they expect one man out of every three in this country to come forward and fight? They need not expect them; they will not come.

The other day the Solicitor General, referring to the hon. member for St. John city, said that he "isolated" him from the other members of the House. Language of that kind from any member of the Government is entirely out of place. If the freedom for which our boys are going out to fight and to die is a really valuable thing, then here where we have freedom we must maintain it. And if hon. gentlemen, speaking as representatives of the free people of this country in the debate on the Address—where they get an opportunity of pointing out their grievances and asking for redress—are to be told that they shall be isolated because they give expression to that which is heard on the streets, read in our newspapers, spoken by supporters of the Government; if, I say, they are to be told that they shall be isolated, I for one protest most emphatically.

I noticed in the Conservative papers that the hon. Solicitor General was stated to have referred to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John City as being along the line of treachery. I find on looking at Hansard that the Solicitor General did not go that far, and that his remarks were misinterpreted by the press. But the hon. Solicitor General must not be so sensitive of criticism. If this Government will conduct the affairs of the country fairly and honestly, along proper lines, and with the highest ideals in view, they will receive from the Opposition the utmost possible consideration at this time. If, on the other hand, they disregard these ideals; if they sink to lower levels; if they are guilty of mistakes or acts of malfeasance, they may expect criticism; they will receive it, and have no right to complain because of it. No government in any British country has a right to set itself up as a body which ought not to be criticised. Just as we object to the domination of the German autocracy, so do we object to the Government's declaring itself to be above the people. We want no kaisers in this country; we want no field marshalls and no crown princes to say that hon. gentlemen on this side are guilty of lese majeste if they criticise the Government. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House realize to the full the tremendous importance to the Empire of the present situation. Let hon. gentlemen on the other side, many of whom realize the seriousness of the situation to the fullest extent, remember that they are the representatives of a democracy, and that that democracy must have its fullest expression in this Parliament, as it should in every other parliament over which the British flag flies.

My hon. friends opposite complain of criticism. Let me suggest to them a very ready way of relieving themselves of a great deal of criticism. Let them abolish the patronage system in the Militia Department in regard to war expenditures; for it is the case that only a Conservative can sell supplies to the Militia Department. The people of this country will find their ideals rudely shattered if that continues to be the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite. After all, a time will come when these men who have the patronage will not be able to expect from other men, actuated by the highest ideals, the highest form of sacrifice in this war. My hon. friends, who are so very sensitive to criticism, can settle that difficulty by simply declaring that they will do as is done in Great Britain; that they will tell the party heelers and the men who want to control the distribution of favours in this, that, or the other constituency, that the nation is in too serious a position for them to potter with dealings of that kind. Let hon. gentlemen opposite take this opportunity of doing away with that system for ever in Canada. My hon. friends maintain a list in the Militia Department. If, as is the case in my county, no medical man who is not a Tory doctor may examine a recruit who desires to go to the war, I want to know what kind of idealism you are going to have from the Liberal doctors in that and the other Liberal constituencies in Canada.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART: There is nothing in that statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why is it that my hon. friend, who is supposed to be a major in the medical corps, is not down earning his money in Nova Scotia and attending to his business? I want to tell him that I know more about the county of Pictou than he does. I want to tell him that I can give him an instance where men who were supposed by Conservative medical men to be not satisfactory to the gentleman who has the patronage in my constituency were prevented from examining and reporting upon recruits who wanted to go to the war; that the reports were not received, and that the applicants were compelled to go to a man who was named by the man who had the patronage. My hon. friend, who is a major in the army medical corps in Nova Scotia, should correct that abuse. There is no reason why any duly authenticated medical practitioner in this country, no matter what his politics may be, should not, at first hand, be permitted to certify as to the physical qualifications of the men who want to go and fight. I mention that merely to indicate to my hon. friends that I make this statement on my responsibility as a member of the House, knowing the circumstances as they exist in my county—and having a son who is preparing to go to the front. Will it be said—it is just as well to be clear on this point—that anyone was guilty of treachery or lèse majesté last winter when we discussed the question as to the wisdom of taking $75,000 out of the Militia Department and giving it to Mr. Foster of Kings to spend in buying horses. Was it improper that that matter should have been investigated? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance should see to it that no department of this Government permits seventy-five thousand dollars or seventy-five thousand cents to be paid out in the way in which that $75,000 was paid out.

The fact that $75,000 can be taken out of the treasury of a department of this Government and given to any man to spend carte blanche is not sound and proper administration and the Minister of Finance knows it.

That brings me to the consideration of the matter which was brought up by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). And let me say that the intimation which has been made by some hon. gentlemen opposite as to that hon. gentleman occupying a position of isolation on this side of the House is entirely beside the mark. When you find a paper that is a consistent supporter of the Government, like the Montreal Star, asking an investigation, when you find the Montreal Daily Mail asking for an investigation; when you find this question of shells discussed all over this country in the papers, why should an honourable gentleman be declared to be in an isolated position because, as a representative of the free people, at a time when, under the constitution, these things should be brought to the attention of Parliament, he does so? Does he commit any wrong in doing so? These things are a matter of public notoriety, they are known to the press, they are discussed in all the business centres of Canada. Hon. gentlemen know that. The Government come here and, through their Solicitor General and their Minister of Marine and Fisheries, absolutely decline to take any position by way of defence of the Shell Committee. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said this afternoon: I hold no brief for the Shell Committee. The Solicitor General said: I do not stand here as a sponsor for, or as one responsible for the conduct of the Shell Committee. I am not here to defend the Shell Committee. I am here to offer some remarks in regard to what they have done, in regard to their status and character, in regard to their responsibility, in regard to our duties towards them. But when my hon. friend says further, as he does:

> I am not saying and I do not wish to be taken as saying that there cannot be any attack made on the Committee. The Committee may be open to criticism. Nor will I say, under proper authority and at the proper time, there should not be review of the work of that Committee.

That is the position taken by the Solicitor General. The Minister of Marine says: I hold no brief for this committee. He will not undertake the responsibility of defending them. But while he and the Solicitor General take that position and say: We are not responsible for the Shell Committee at all; yet they are able, in some mysterious way, to get from this committee, which they say is connected with the Imperial authorities only, the information which the minister was able to bring to the House this afternoon. It is a very strange committee this, if it is a body having relation entirely with the Imperial Government, for which this Government has no responsibility whatever, if ministers of the Crown here, who wash their hands clear of it, can go and get this information and bring it

down as they did to-day. The position of the Solicitor General in regard to the Shell Committee is very much the position of the lawyer who goes into court and says: I am going to demur to the plaintiff's statement of claim, not upon the ground that it does not disclose good cause of action, not upon the ground that it is untrue in any way, and I say the court in which he has brought suit is not the proper court; he should go to some other court. That is the position of the Solicitor General when it is simmered down. Or it might be compared to another position sometimes adopted in court. He confesses the case, but he pleads in avoidance, as we say: It is true that this committee should be investigated, there is no doubt about that, and some time in the future we or somebody else may investigate it, but the man who ventures to stand up in Parliament to-day and say anything about it, is isolated from his friends and from the House, because he ventures to bring to the attention of Parliament this very thing which we say ought to form a matter of investigation.

I want to say in regard to the hon. member for St. John that there are few men in this House, apart from our revered leader, whom we hold in higher esteem. He is a man whom we regard as a great parliamentarian, a man of great ability, as he has demonstrated in this House over and over again, and he has the confidence of every one of us.

No other hon. gentleman in this House but the Solicitor General, with his casuistry, would venture to dispute the soundness of the doctrine which has come down from the days of the revolution, so far as constitutional principles are concerned, that wherever Parliament or the country, for which Parliament stands, or of which it is a representative under British institutions, has had anything to do, directly or indirectly with the spending of money, the expenditure of that money is a proper matter for investigation by Parliament. I stand for that proposition, and I take the statement of the Minister of Finance who told us the other day—and as he indicated in Toronto in his speech before the Board of Trade—that Canada was arranging for credits for Great Britain, more particularly with reference to munitions. They have told us that Canada is going to pay for these things, both munitions and other things that are going over to the other side. Yet the Solicitor General comes in and says: It is true that the Shell Committee requires to be investigated; I will not defend them for a moment; it is true that they were changed and in some mysterious way a new body called the Imperial Munitions Board came into existence; it is true that we threw them down and all that, yet if anybody wants to make a charge against any Minister of the Crown, we will investigate that, but we will not allow an investigation of the Shell Committee. I assume the papers are going to be brought down. I say that in this Parliament every gentleman should be actuated by the highest ideals, and if this Government refuse to go on and look into this whole matter in this Parliament, they will be falling short of the ideals they are holding up to the boys of this land whom they are asking to go out and fight for liberty. Let us see where we are on this question. It is well to understand it fully, because these issues are apt to be beclouded. We had the story given to us last year by the Prime Minister in regard to the Shell Committee. He told us how it was constituted. It was constituted by the Minister of Militia.

> On the 8th of September, 1914, at a meeting held by the minister at the Dominion Arsenal the following Committee was appointed to organize the work throughout the Dominion.

And he gives the names:

> About two weeks after the organization of the Committee Mr. Carnegie of London, England, was appointed by the minister as ordnance advisor of the Shell Committee.

He goes on to tell what they did:

> The executive work of the committee has been very wisely entrusted to the chairman, Colonel Bertram—

The strange part is that this statement is signed by Col. Bertram, in which he states that the executive work has been very widely entrusted to him.

> —who reports weekly to the Minister of Militia and also to the committee when it meets, which is usually monthly, or more often at the call of the minister.

At this point, I should like to correct my hon. friend the Solicitor General, who I am sorry to see is not here, in regard to the statement he made about the Minister of Militia and Defence in connection with this committee. "Why," says the Solicitor General in that positive way which he assumes, "the Minister of Militia was present at this Shell Committee only twice, once when it was going out of office and once when the new committee came in;" whereas Col. Bertram says here that when

this committee was appointed all the executitve work was entrusted to the chairman who reported weekly to the Minister of Militia, and also to the committee which met once a month, or more often at the call of the minister. As I shall show as I go along, the Minister of Militia must have been in close touch with the committee at every stage of its operations; it is so stated here. Who passed the bills after all? The chartered accountant of the department, says Col. Bertram:

A chartered accountant recommended by the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, checks the accounts of the committee every month. These are then forwarded to Mr. J. W. Borden, chief accountant for the Militia Department.

Now, why were these accounts forwarded to Mr. J. W. Borden, the Accountant of the Department of Militia? What had he to do with them? "Why," says the Solicitor General, "we divorced ourselves from this committee," or rather he says, "we divorced the committee from us,"—a curious kind of transfer which I think was hardly legal. "We divorced the Shell Committee from the Canadian Government in the matter of responsibility," says the Solicitor General; "we made it a committee under Imperial authority." I would like to know the date when this wonderful divorce took place.

Mr. MURPHY: After they were found out.

Mr. MACDONALD: There never was any divorce; there could not be any divorce. It was not a case of "whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder." It was a case of a father disowning his own child. That was the trouble; there could be no question of divorce.

Mr. ROGERS: Has my hon. friend proved the consummation of the marriage yet?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works did not catch what I said. I said it was not a case of marriage or of divorce; it was the case of a father trying to disown his own child. It was a case of leaving the baby on somebody else's doorstep. Now, I assume that the Government will bring down these orders in council, and tell us all about this thing. This is the proposition seriously put forward by a responsible Minister of the Crown; that this Government could call into being a committee having the powers which they had in regard to performing the wonderful duties set out by Col. Bertram in his report, which was read by the Prime Minister last year, and that on their own volition they proceeded to make that creation of theirs a committee under Imperial authority. Well, this Government has done some pretty queer things, but they could not do that, and they have not done it; there is no way in which they could do it.

Let us go on and see what Col. Bertram says. These bills were all made out and sent to the Accountant of the Department of Militia.

The Minister of Militia called a meeting of the committee at Ottawa and, after discussing the matter, cabled to Lord Kitchener, pointing out that much larger contracts could be undertaken by the manufacturers of Canada.

Now, I think the Solicitor General will be bound to admit that he is wrong in regard to the Minister of Militia being present at only two meetings, for already we have seen that he was present at three or four. Col. Bertram goes on:

It was proposed by several of the manufacturers that a deputation from the committee should be sent to the War Office, London, to put their claims before the Secretary of State for War. The Minister of Militia decided on the recommendation of the committee, to send Mr. David Carnegie, as he was familiar with the whole situation.

Is that not a very strange thing, that this body, constituted by the Government, divorced in some mysterious way from the Government, that this body, having been in existence for quite a period of time, should send Mr. Carnegie over to England to tell the Imperial authorities what they could do, or what they could not do. When did this transfer from the Canadian Government to the Imperial Government take place? He goes on to say:

He also informed the various officials at the War Office that it was the intention of the Minister of Militia and his committee, to make ultimately the copper bands in Canada.

So we have this situation: we have this committee constituted by the Minister of Militia, we see that the accounts went to the man who passes the accounts of the Militia Department; and there is no evidence at this moment that in any order in council any powers were given to this body as an imperial institution; on the contrary the evidence shows it has always been a Canadian institution operated by the Minister of Militia as a side wind of his department.

I do not wish to go into detail with regard to the various matters that might

be urged and have been urged from time to time in regard to the Shell Committee; but coming, as I do, from a constituency where, I think, the first shells made in Canada were made by the Nova Scotia Steel Company, I have followed this matter very closely. Colonel Bertram and Mr. Carnegie are the gentlemen who seem to have been running this committee in regard to the allotment of contracts, and when it is said that there was no politics in the inspection of shells—I do not care how many letters my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) may read from people in Sydney—if my hon. friend goes to my constituency, he will learn what everybody in the community knows, what my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who lives in my constituency, knows, something in regard to the carrying on of the industry. We have two systems of inspections in regard to shell construction. There is an inspection which is carried on by the Canadian Inspection Company of Montreal, the inspectors being experts whose business and duty it is to pass upon the quality of the steel that enters into the ingot that makes the shell. I have no complaint to make in regard to the inspectoral duties carried on by these experts. Their duties are very technical; and have to do with the analysis of the quality of the steel. In that respect a careful inspection has to be carried out, but when it comes to measuring the shells when they come from the presses—why, who are the men employed as inspectors? There is one political heeler from Cape Breton; there is another who had been engaged as a party scribbler in the Conservative press, a man who is known by every Liberal in my own constituency. And so it is down the whole list; that class of inspection is entirely under the control of the gentleman who has the patronage in my county. Hon. gentlemen need not come here and make any statements with regard to there being no politics in the matter, because these are the facts so far as my county is concerned, facts that cannot be questioned.

I am not going further into the question of the creation of this committee. I assume that the Government will bring down all the information that they have in their power to give in regard to that, that is, all the information which relates to the expenditures that have been made, all the information that they can bring down having regard to the limitations placed upon such questions in time of war. I wish to reiterate in the strongest and most emphatic way that so far as any evidence is before us at this moment, my hon. friend the Solicitor General has no warrant for the statement, either as a matter of law or as a matter of parliamentary practice, to say that the right of investigation is not in this Parliament. If my hon. friend the Solicitor General or any other hon. member of this Government, came into this Parliament and said: Yes, we believe that this Shell Committee is a body which has done that which is honest and right, and, while it may have made mistakes, still, it is not entitled to be criticised; if any minister of the Crown ventured to take that position in regard to it and was able to satisfy Parliament and the people that that was a tenable position, that would be one thing; but when the Solicitor General and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say: We will neither defend nor will we excuse, nor will we say that we yield any principles to this institution which we have divorced ourselves from and attached to the Imperial authorities in some imaginary way; we think it may have been wrong and that it ought to be investigated and all that, but the Imperial authorities, or some other people, are to do it—if, I say, they take that position, and if they expect from this House, and from Canada a continuation of those ideals which many of us entertain in regard to this war, it is an impossible position, a position they cannot take in the face of Canada and of this Parliament in regard to this question and they must realise it.

My hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) was put up the other day to deal with this question and to answer it. I want to say what one of their own papers said about that. We will leave out the Toronto Telegram. There is no use of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries coming to us and stating what the Free Press said, and thereby settling the whole question. Why do not these hon. gentlemen tell us something themselves, something that they know about, instead of taking the Free Press and saying that excuses the whole thing. What does the Free Press know about making shells? What has it had to do with the shell business? If it knows all about this thing, the Minister of Militia ought to attach the editor of the Free Press to his staff and put him in charge of the business of making shells. The ministers themselves do not appear to know anything about it; they run away from the situation and say we will not stand up for the Shell Committee, and abuse my hon.

friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). This is what the editor of the Montreal Evening News says with reference to the extraordinary remark which my hon. friend from North Essex made in the House the other day:

> General Bertram and his associates may well cry to be saved from their friends.
>
> There should be no stirring up of strife over a few old horses and a few shells.'
>
> The remark was made seriously and will be taken seriously. . .
>
> In the face of the evident unwillingness of the members of the Dominion Shell Committee to defend their honour, the country must look after its own honour which is also compromised in the charges that have been made. . . . The apologists of General Bertram must be told that they are doing a great disservice to that gentleman and his colleagues, to themselves, and to the country by their ostrich-like policy. As for the remark of the member for North Essex, it condemns itself. It is indeed beneath contempt.

I have attempted to emphasize as strongly as I could the duty which this Government owes to the country and to Parliament of endeavouring, first, by the abolition, and if not the abolition, the restriction at least, of patronage during the war, and by the taking of an attitude having a semblance of justice and fairness in regard to the situation which has been created with reference to the Shell Committee, to put themselves in such a position that they can hold up to the 250,000 Canadian boys who will rally round the flag that ideal and those sentiments which they must have if they are going to come forward to fight for their country.

But there is another thing that I think this Government should do in this regard having reference to the sentiments of the Canadian people. I am sorry that the hon. the Secretary of State ((Hon. Mr. Blondin) is not in the House. There is a certain duty that these hon. gentlemen who are his colleagues are charged with and one which they will not perform in regard to him. We all know the constitutional principle of the collective responsibility of the members of the Government in regard to their views upon important questions. That is laid down by all the constitutional writers. I am speaking from the seat of a colleague admired and esteemed on both sides of this House, who is now in a German prison in Berlin because he was taken in Antwerp engaged in the humane task of giving succour by his medical science to Belgian wounded. Speaking by his authority, and repeating what he said to me, I want to say that there sits in this chamber in this time of stress when the heart of the nation is stirred, a man who in 1910 on a platform in the province of Quebec, in the presence of Dr. Beland, fell on his knees on the platform and with hands uplifted in the attitude of prayer besought the Holy Virgin and all the saints that the young men of the province of Quebec might be saved from the awful calamity that would come upon them if this Laurier naval law went into effect and they were asked to go and fight the battles of Great Britain upon the sea and be compelled to lose their lives on the deck of a British battleship. I am aware that the former Minister of Inland Revenue, now Secretary of State, has a habit of denying these things. But there is something more that he said from his place in this Parliament in 1910. I find by reference to Hansard, page 44-53, 1910, that he said this:

> I feel that I am bound to protest loudly against the policy of the Government and against that of my own party as regards the question of creating a Canadian Imperial war fleet or of making a cash contribution.

He loudly made that protest in Parliament, those of us who were here heard him, and you will find the statement in Hansard. In these days when all our hearts are stirred, when our boys are going out to fight, when the bodies of some of our friends are being left in Flanders and the Dardanelles, are we to have in this Government a man who has made this statement, which I have repeated here, and who has never taken it back as he should have taken it back right in this House. It will not do for this gentleman, with his last hour repentance, to make recruiting speeches in which he never disavows a single one of these utterances. What ideals will the boys of this land have in regard to governmental management when you find within its leadership a man who has never taken back these words and who will not now stand up in Parliament and declare that he has abandoned forever his nationalistic principles as he should do. I declare that this is a time for the searching of hearts upon questions of this kind, and it is up to the Secretary of State to let us know whether these recruiting meetings of his are wholly mockeries or whether he has foregone those sentiments which he reiterated all over Quebec.

Now let us take another honourable gentleman. We have not got to know him very well yet. He, (the Hon. Mr. Patenaude) is the successor of the former Minister of Inland Revenue now the Secretary of State. Mr. Bourassa declared, I am told, in Le Devoir that he was one of his great friends at St. Remi and other places in Quebec and

it is interesting to know what he thinks of the attitude of the Canadian people in war time. The Hon. Mr. Taschereau, whom, honourable gentlemen will recall, is the Minister in the province of Quebec who had a verbial encounter with Mr. Armand Lavergne, a week or so ago, spoke in the city of Toronto in the year 1909. Loyal and true Canadian, and lover of Britain he is, then as now entertaining sentiments to which we would all give adhesion. Mr. Taschereau, expressing his views said:

> We consider that Canada develops in a marvellous manner; we feel that she is on the highway to nationhood; we recognize her as a part of the greatest Empire that ever existed; we think that Canada should bear her share of the burden that falls to the lot of all prosperous and growing countries; we believe that, for a long time to come, our future is bound up in the advancement and integrity of the Empire; we believe that a call coming from the Mother Country should be heard.
>
> Will our sons serve on that fleet? In answer to that question I will cite the following fact: In one of our public squares, some years ago, a monument was erected in honour of eleven of our brightest youths of Quebec who had given their lives in South Africa. There were one thousand of them to go forth; those who fell sleep under the sands of the dark continent, but their memories live in bronze to remind our children of the courage and loyalty of the Quebecers.
>
> Gentlemen, what Quebec did in the past she will do again in the future, and when the trumpet calls, in true Canadian style, we will answer "present."

That is an extract from the speech of the Hon. Mr. Taschereau delivered in Toronto in December, 1909. In the following session of the Legislature, this motion was proposed by Mr. Prévost:

> Whereas in December last, during a trip to Toronto, which the speech from the Throne has invested with an official character, the Minister of Public Works and of Labour declared himself, in the name of the province of Quebec and in presence of the Prime Minister, to be in favour of Canada's participation in the wars of the Empire, the formation of a Canadian war navy or of any other measure which the Federal authorities might deem proper to adopt in that regard;
>
> This House regrets that one of the ministers of the province should have, without any mandate, upon subject foreign to the jurisdiction of the Government whereof he is a member, and under circumstances that impart a significant meaning to his words, made indiscreet declarations which are calculated to place the views of the electors of this province in a false light.

This resolution was voted upon, and I have the division list in my hand. Amongst other names appear those of Mr. Armand Lavergne and Mr. Patenaude in very singular proximity.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who is Mr. Patenaude?

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. MACDONALD: He is the new Minister of Inland Revenue. At this time when naturally our hearts call for unity in all things, these two gentlemen, if they have ceased to entertain those sentiments and feelings which they entertained in 1910, should come forward and in the light of day before this Parliament and this country declare that such is the case, so that the boys who have gone out to fight and perhaps to die, may know that the men who compose the Government of this country are in earnest in regard to this question and are not fooling with them.

Mr. PARDEE: When was the Minister of Inland Revenue sworn in?

Mr. MACDONALD: Some time last fall, I think. The remarks which I have made with regard to these gentlemen have not been made with any personal feeling, but under a deep sense of the serious attitude which I entertain towards this war and its consequences. There are hundreds of men in this country who entertain the same sentiments that I do; in fact, every one does who knows of these things, and I ask the Government under the circumstances to see to it that these men declare where they stand in this year of grace 1916, in view of the situation in which this country and the Empire now stand owing to the war.

We had this afternoon from my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) a lengthy and interesting speech in which he dealt with a variety of subjects. In regard to one or two of the matters to which he referred I think he claimed a little too much credit. In the province from which I come, the lumber trade had last year reached the highest possible point. My hon. friend rather indicated that he was entitled to some especial credit by reason of the fact that in July, 1915, the Naval Service had taken some steps to arrange for vessels to carry lumber and other products to Great Britain, and the figures which he gave to the House were to the effect that more lumber had gone from our Maritime ports in the year 1915 than in either of the two immediately preceding years. That is true, and I am very glad to know that the hon. minister has made those arrangements in regard to the carrying of lumber. I am not quarrelling with him on that score; but from business dealings with clients and others connected with the lumber business, I know that in so far as that business in our part of the

9 p.m.

Maritime Provinces is concerned, the arrangements for the sale of the lumber and for the carrying of it by Norwegian vessels were all made in the winter of 1914-15. Yet my hon. friend, if I understood him correctly, did not begin to make any arrangements until July, 1915. Therefore, while I am perfectly willing to give the minister all credit for any efforts put forth by him to encourage the transportation of our products to Great Britain, in that respect I think he is not entitled to the credit which he claims.

We hear from many sources that the ministry is overburdened with work. The stress of this war upon these hon. gentlemen is so great that they have to appoint commissions to do this, that and the other thing. Let us be perfectly frank about this matter. I recognize fully that the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country has at this critical time in our history, a very great and serious burden placed upon his shoulders, one which is probably the most onerous that any man in this country has ever had to bear. I make the same statement with regard to the gentleman who fills the position of Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), and also with regard to the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). These three gentlemen have very serious and responsible duties to perform; but when I am told that my genial friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) has worked harder at his duties since the war began, I am asked to believe too much, because I fail to see where in the slightest degree this war has added to my hon. friend's burdens. We are told that only large public works are going on, and that the thousand and one details, that I have no doubt troubled the minister in the past, are absent. I see, however, that the expenditure is still maintained at a great height, and I wonder whether my hon. friend is really as busy in connection with this war as he is alleged to be. I believe that if we are able thoroughly to appreciate the situation, we shall find that the Minister of Public Works has very little to do in connection with war matters. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) has so little to do at the present time that he is running not only his own department but the Department of Railways as well, and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) is taking the time for a jaunt across the ocean to see his sons. That is a very laudable thing to do, and I have no complaint to make with regard to it, except that I wish to look perhaps a little frankly at the situation and see how much there is in this mystery about the burden of care that is weighing these hon gentlemen down, with the exception of the first three whom I have mentioned.

Take the Minister of Inland Revenue to whom I referred a moment ago. How much is he worrying about the war? Or the Secretary of State (Mr. Blondin), how much is he worrying about it? Then there is the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), he is having no immigrants to look after, and not many homesteads are being taken up. He is not working as hard as he used to. And the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) is not looking as if he were worrying about things. He goes about spending a good deal more money than his predecessors spent and adding a great number of people to the service, and though he has taken a large amount of money from the people he manages to acquire a deficit, which deficit is not due to the war in the slightest degree. The statement that it is due to the war will not bear analysis. So, I go through the list of these gentlemen and I find that when one of their supporters talks about the awful burdens resting upon them, I wonder at the imagination of those who can believe it.

Take my hon. and genial friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the Naval Service (Mr. Hazen), he has been leaving undone the things he ought to have done ever since the war began. He has not been attending to his business at all. Let me show you in what respect he has failed. Take the Island of Newfoundland, the smallest of the British Dominions, with a population of a little over two hundred thousand, or about half that of the province of Nova Scotia. In addition to sending its quota of men to fight in the field, Newfoundland has sent a thousand men as a naval brigade to fight upon the seas. Take Australia and New Zealand; three thousand of their boys have gone out as part of the naval service and have done marvellous work in the peninsula at Gallipoli. Then there is South Africa—South Africa with whom we were fighting only a short time ago. Why, Cape Colony sent to the naval brigade a first instalment of 1,692 men and has been sending reinforcements ever since. All these other oversea dominions have been there with naval assistance but, though we enjoy as they do the protection of the British navy, we have not done a single thing; the Minister of the Naval Service

has not even tried to do anything since this war began.

And, mark you, the need has been very great. Let me read to you an advertisement that appeared in the British papers. People talk about the necessity of having trained sailors, trained mechanics, in order to be of assistance in the naval brigade. But here is the advertisement:

Royal Naval Division—Public School Battalion.

The Admiralty have given official permission for raising a battalion of 1,000 men, which will be strictly limited to public school or university men and who will serve together as a unit.

Training is now going forward.

Applicants desiring to enrol should apply at once to

Royal Naval Division,
6, 7, 8, Old Bond Street, London, W.

Here is what they said last week in the Imperial House of Commons when this question was before them. An amendment was adopted to the Bill in regard to compulsory service by which the Admiralty was given first call on men desirous of enlisting in the navy. And the First Lord of Admiralty stated that a supplementary estimate would be presented for the expense of 50,000 men for the navy by next March. And here is what Mr. Ashmeade Bartlett, the brilliant war correspondent of whom we all have read, says, in regard to the naval conditions in the Dardanelles:

Mr. Ashmead Bartlett states that in some of the vessels off the Dardanelles there is hardly an active service rating on the upper deck. "There are many men between 48 and 56 years of age; nearly all are fathers and many are grandfathers. They have reached that age when, after a hard life at sea, they might reasonably expect to look forward to passing their declining years surrounded by their children and grandchildren, in the happy enjoyment of their small pensions, and engaged in the civilian pursuit each may have adopted at the conclusion of his period of active service."

That means simply that the condition is so serious that these men who had passed through all the stages of active service and had gone home have to be called out again in order to fill up the positions in the navy. We talk about having done our duty. Think of our tremendous sea-coast, stretching on the Atlantic from the Maine border around the province of New Brunswick, from which my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) comes, around what is almost an island, the province of Nova Scotia, then on the eastern side of New Brunswick away up the Baie des Chaleurs and around the peninsula of Gaspé and all through that tremendous St. Lawrence territory; and then our British Columbia coast running from Puget Sound up to Alaska. Can any man say that we are doing our duty when not one sailor boy has gone from Canada to assist the navy in this time of stress? South Africa has put us to shame. See what General Botha, who was fighting the Empire in 1900, said when the South African naval contingent started on its voyage to the scene of hostilities, where it has done such splendid service:

"Please convey to the commander, officers, and men of the Naval Contingent, South African Division of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, my warmest good wishes on their departure. It gives me and my government great pleasure to think that the Admiralty, by asking for their services, has recognized the good work and efficiency of the only naval unit which South Africa has yet been able to organize for the common cause. I feel confident that all ranks of the contingent, by constant devotion to duty and by irreproachable conduct, at all times, will show that South Africans, even though few in numbers, are worthy to be represented in that great naval service which is the pride and bulwark of the Empire, and now striving, as ever, to guard our most precious inheritance of justice and liberty."

And we have not got a man there at all. This is what Dr. Macnamara said in regard to the South African naval contingent:

Dr. Macnamara, in reply to a question by Commander Bellairs, states that the offer of the services of a number of the South African Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve was gladly accepted by the Admiralty, and the men are now attached to the Royal Naval Division in this country. It was understood that they wished to serve as a unit representing their corps.

Now, there is this to be said about the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), that he has been energetic. Whatever criticism may be directed against his actions, and whether he has done right or wrong, a point which I am not considering at this moment, he has been busy; he has been "on to his job." But the Minister of the Naval Service has not done anything, nor has he tried to do anything. I have information to the effect that in 1912 a number of enthusiastic young men in Victoria, B.C., and surrounding districts, conceived the idea of forming a volunteer naval reserve similar to the one recruited in South Africa. I am instructed that although that reserve was formed in 1912, they were unable to obtain any recognition from the Department of Naval Service until after the war began. I have looked through the reports—I have them under my hand—and I can find in them no mention of the Royal Volunteer reserve until, in the report of last year,

Admiral Kingsmill referred to the fact that such a body was in existence. Gentlemen from British Columbia will know whether or not what I say is correct. I am told that Sir Richard McBride, who was in England after the war began, wanted to raise a naval brigade in British Columbia; that this Government was approached in connection with the matter, and that—I am simply stating the information that comes to me from what I consider to be authentic sources; if I am not correct, hon. gentlemen will tell me—nothing was done either to encourage or to assist the project. In January and March, 1915, after that volunteer naval reserve had been formed, an order was issued notifying the men who had come together in that body that they had permission to retire from that service and to join the army instead of the navy. If these are the facts, I should like to know from this Government why that condition of affairs has been allowed to exist. Shall we say that we are going to do nothing for the Empire upon the sea? Shall we say that we will not try to do anything? If so, the Newfoundland boys had better not have gone, the Cape Colony boys had better have stayed at home; and so with the boys from Australia. I am not going to renew the old discussion of naval matters; I am going to deal with this matter simply and solely from the standpoint of whether or not we should be doing something upon the sea to aid Great Britain. I say that we should.

Hon. gentlemen tell us that this war was foreseen; that we should have done this, that or the other thing. But it was a strange thing if anybody in connection with the Naval Department foresaw the war. Here is the official report of 1914 in regard to the recruiting of men for the Canadian ships:

> No recruits have been entered since 1st October, 1912, pending a decision being arrived at as to the future naval policy. The repairs to the Niobe were completed in December, and trials were carried out, which proved satisfactory; the ship is now in an efficient seagoing condition, but is not able to undertake cruises, owing to a deficient complement, the active service ratings having been sent back to England without being replaced.

Which means that all men who could engage in active service on the Niobe in that year had been sent back to England, and nobody had been supplied to take their places. The same thing occurred in regard to the Rainbow. The report says:

> The Rainbow made various cruises on the coast of Vancouver island until August, 1912, when the active service ratings were sent to England and were not replaced, since when the ship has remained at Esquimalt, with occasional cruises to keep engines in an efficient condition.

That is the way things stood in 1912; let us see what where they were in the next year. The report says:

> The Government having decided not to continue H.M.C. ships Niobe and Rainbow in full commission, no recruiting was carried on during the year, and the programme of exercises and training laid down for these ships was not continued. During the year free discharge was given to those Canadians who entered the service as boys and wished to avail themselves of the offer; in addition, many of the ranks and ratings lent from the Imperial service have completed their engagement under the Canadian Government, and returned to England, without being replaced.

That was the situation in April, 1914, just before the war broke out. Having read this report, I say to hon. gentlemen that if they had any prescience of the war, they were dealing with it in a very strange way.

In September, 1915—that is, last year—we find mention for the first time of the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve. The report says:

> The R.N.C.V.R., chiefly recruited at Esquimalt, have been actively and usefully employed both ashore and afloat, and have shown, both officers and men, commendable zeal in the performance of their duties.

That, mark you, was the first time we ever heard anything about a volunteer reserve of any kind. When the war broke out—it is told here in the books, and needs no amplification—the Niobe was tied up at the wharf, with not a man on board but the few officers who made their homes there. No recruiting had been done. While the Niobe was tied up at the wharf the valuable German vessel Willehad left Quebec, came down around the coast of Nova Scotia, passed the harbour of Halifax, and reached the port of Boston in absolute safety. According to these books, the Rainbow was in exactly the same position as the Niobe, and we were indebted to Japan —Japan, mind you—for the protection of our western coast during a period of time after the beginning of the war and until the Newcastle came. It is just as well that our people should know the facts in connection with these matters. As soon as possible after the war, but too late to catch the German vessels now interned in New York and Boston, Great Britain sent out ships. The Niobe could have captured these German vessels; every naval officer will tell you that; they told me in Halifax that they could have captured these ships

had the Niobe been afloat and ready for operation. About a month after that the Niobe came out. What for? To intercept any German ships that might be in the vicinity of the coast. These were soon cleaned off the seas by Craddock and Sturdee—and what are our ships doing now? What have they been doing all summer? It is the humiliating fact that the flagship of the squadron, which was off our coast last summer, was the Sidney, which had been built and equipped by the overseas Dominion of Australia. That was the flagship which headed the fleet that was off our coast last summer, and which was there chiefly for the purpose of guarding the trade routes to and from United States ports. When our transports wanted to cross the ocean last summer were they consorted by British ships? Not at all. If it had not been for the vessel with which Mr. Jack Ross presented the Government, the Grilse, which had been fitted up as a torpedo-boat destroyer, and which escorted practically all, if not all, of the transports which went from Quebec there would have been no protection against German submarines in the vicinity of the Atlantic coast. The Government of Canada did absolutely nothing in that regard. The people in the Maritime Provinces, in Montreal, and elsewhere in the province of Quebec, last year heard a good deal about the danger from German submarines. German submarines had found their way to the Mediterranean; in order to operate at a long distance from home waters, all they had to do was obtain a base of supply for oil and provisions.

A vessel of a neutral nation, say from Norway or Sweden, could carry these supplies to some inaccessible spot. Any one who knows anything of the geography of our sea coast knows that, and men who are connected with naval matters were fully convinced that it was possible last year that German submarines could have made a base anywhere along the western coast of the old colony of Newfoundland, or on the northern portion of Cape Breton, or on the southern portion of Nova Scotia. There was no reason why submarines could not have come out and operated from a base in any of these districts. If they had done so what protection had Canada? Mark you, the larger vessels are not the protection which countries have against submarines. There has been a wonderful development in regard to naval construction as the result of this war. Look at the stories of the battles that have taken place in the North sea, where the destructiveness of the submarines has sent to the bottom vessel after vessel of the ironclads of Great Britain, which were unable to protect themselves against the silent and stealthy message of death that came from the nose of these submarines. The only way to protect a vessel against these submarines is by a torpedo boat destroyer or another submarine. The minister said nothing in regard to that. Why has not the minister gone to the Vickers-Maxim Company in Montreal or some other industry and kept them busy during this winter building some submarines for the protection of our coast? Great Britain took the submarines that came from the Vickers-Maxim shipyards across the sea, under their own power. We have not a single submarine in Canada to defend ourselves. Why has not the Minister of the Naval Service done something in this regard? It is quite natural that gentlemen who do not live near the sea—and I do not wish to be understood as speaking in an offensive way—should not be fully alive to this matter; but I would strongly impress on this House and on this country that, through this Department of the Naval Service, some steps should be taken to defend both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts from submarine attacks. There is little danger of a large German ironclad getting out. One might pop out from the North sea and get around the north of Scotland, but it could be easily caught. But the submarine could come out undetected, have her base on the St. Lawrence or Cabot strait, and from there send to the bottom our transports crossing the ocean, for all the protection that Canada has. Every one in the Maritime Provinces says that and knows that; I am not stating any fact that is not fully known. The minister should even now proceed to provide protection by the construction of submarines and of torpedo-boat destroyers, which can be built in Montreal or elsewhere. I do not wish to go into this old argument of what Canada can do and what it cannot do do. But we have done it. We have gone ahead by the enterprise of our own people in this way, and have built submarines, and they have sailed across the ocean and, as the hon. member for St. John said this afternoon, one of them has performed marvellous work and rendered splendid service in the sea of Marmora. Shall we do nothing on the sea for Great Britain? Will we not even protect ourselves? I say to my hon. friends from British Columbia, who, I be-

[Mr. Macdonald.]

lieve, are very much interested in this question, that I regard it as the bounden duty of every one to face this situation and, if the facts are as I have stated, the situation is one which must be dealt with, and dealt with speedily. I am not able to understand why the minister has not dealt with this question. I visited the dockyard in Halifax two weeks ago or a little over, and I was astounded to find that at that moment there was only one vessel that was able to go to sea out of all the vessels around the dockyard belonging to the Canadian Government. That was on the 2nd of January. The Canada was in the marine slip at Dartmouth. Here were two vessels purchased in the United States last summer for which large prices were paid. They were taken to Montreal and a very great amount spent upon repairs. Then they were brought down there, and the information given to me very freely in the dockyard was that the captain of one of these vessels absolutely refused to go to sea. That was the condition of affairs on the 2nd of January, 1916, with this war on. All the British vessels at that moment were down in the West Indies, there was not a single one within hundreds of miles of the Nova Scotia coast, except one vessel, a sort of lame duck, which was able to struggle out. There was quite a regiment of little tugs and other small boats which were of no use whatever. Again, here in this dockyard, built by the money of the Imperial Government, which the Imperial vessels use but very rarely and to a very slight extent, anybody who looks honest to the Dominion policeman who stands at the gate of the dockyard can walk in and go anywhere he pleases. I say the Minister of the Naval Service should have that dockyard under the control of men who are there attached to the Niobe. There are seven or eight hundred men there on the Niobe, which was being dismantled, at least her guns were being taken off.

Mr. CARVELL: Again?

Mr. MACDONALD: Again, the guns were being taken off her, she was practically being torn to pieces. I asked some of these seven or eight hundred men what they were going to do and they said they did not know. There was nobody guarding the dockyard gate except a Dominion policeman. If this Naval Service is not the most awful farce that any Government ever intended to carry through in any country, do you not think that they would have some of their men detailed to guard the gates of this dockyard at the city of Halifax, which is supposed to be the great centre of the Atlantic squadron on this side of the ocean? Yet that was the situation. It seems to me surprising, I am bound to say I was astounded,

I bring this matter to the attention of Parliament not from any desire to be partisan in placing the matter before the House; but I believe that these conditions are such that Parliament should know of them, the country should be informed of them, and the matter should be dealt with accordingly. What are we to do in regard to this matter? I should like to have any hon. member of the Government tell me why, with our magnificent Atlantic and Pacific sea coasts, we should not send over to England some men to help the fleet, to join the naval division, to take the places of those hardy old men who have been dragged from their homes to go out and fight at Gallipoli because the younger men could not be had. We have been doing splendidly in sending boys to fight on the land; but around the sea coast of this great Dominion there are as many men, just as good and stout hearts, who go down to the sea in ships, and make their living amid the perils of the life of a fisherman, who would make splendid material for the navy. There are many more of these men in Canada than there are in the colony of Newfoundland. Why are these boys not asked to go and join the Imperial fleet? I venture to say that in the county of Guysborough there are hundreds of men who would be willing to go and who would acquit themselves nobly as the boys from Newfoundland have done. Will anybody say why they should not go? Among hon. gentlemen living in the interior of this country in our great inland centres, from Montreal to the Rocky mountains, it is quite natural that there should be apathy in this matter. I can quite appreciate the fact that the man who lives in Winnipeg or in Western Canada generally, who is away from the Great Lakes, would not know, as those of us who have lived on the seaboard from boyhood know, just what the possibilities are in that regard. I know there are boys in my county who would much rather go into the navy than into the army, but they have never been asked to go; no opportunity has been given to them to go. I am sure that that is true of the constituencies of hon. gentlemen on both sides of politics, and I would ask the minister to seriously consider the

matter, and let us have a statement at some later period as to whether or not it would be possible to offer to Great Britain a naval brigade, and so do what South Africa, Newfoundland, New Zealand and Australia have done,

I would like to ask, too, in view of the tremendous amount of money which we are spending in connection with this war for all kinds of purposes, whether there is any reason why we should not have two torpedo boat destroyers on our Atlantic seaboard. We have the Grilse, a converted steam yacht, but outside of the Grilse there is no boat that could catch or cope with a submarine if it happened to come through the Straits of Belle Isle. Why should there not be destroyers in course of construction at Montreal which would be ready for the summer, and why should not the same condition exist in regard to the Pacific coast? I seriously urge upon my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that this is a problem which ought to be dealt with at once. In these matters we must look ahead, as well as at present conditions. The old theory that we could not build steel ships in Canada has been entirely exploded; there is no longer any room for argument in that respect.

What are the people of this country going to do when the war is over? Already you hear mutterings from our western friends in regard to the transportation of the great wheat crop, complaints as to freight rates, and as to the failure of the Government to get ships to carry the grain; and these conditions will continue, I warn the Government, until Canada sets herself to provide and equip herself properly for transportation upon the sea just as she has equipped herself so magnificently upon the land. To-day we have three transcontinental lines stretching from one end of this country to the other, and after the war is over we look for an immigration which will exceed anything we have had before. Add 100,000,000 bushels of grain every year to the production of western Canada, bring them down to our seaports, and then what are you going to do? Are you never going to build ships; are we never going to provide for transportation on the sea just the same as on the land? I say, Sir, that this is the time for the examination of the conditions of the future. Unless the Government at this juncture immediately proceeds to give special encouragement to transportation so that we may have a merchant marine upon the seas, those who live inland may be pardoned if, with their inexact knowledge of marine matters, they think probably that their business will be paralysed. When this terrible war is over, we must look forward to a readjustment of conditions. Mr Speaker, I have already talked too long——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MACDONALD: I hope that the imperfect remarks I have made will not be misunderstood. I have spoken strongly on some questions, but I have refrained from approaching the consideration of those problems, in so far as it is possible to do so, in the spirit of keen or aggressive partisanship.

An hon. MEMBER : Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend who wears the uniform ought to be earning the money for it and should refrain from sniggering. When hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from Lunenburg come into this House as majors of medical corps, I am bound to say that I do not understand why, if they are on active service, they are not attending to their medical duties instead of coming here, or how their medical duties are performed in their absence. They should either do the one thing or the other. There are certain hon. gentlemen whose imputations I might not resent, but I do resent any such imputation as that thrown upon me by my hon. friend when he suggests that I have approached these questions upon a partisan plane. I have endeavoured in all sincerity to approach them on a higher ground than ordinarily. The views I have presented in regard to this whole matter have reference to questions which the people of this country and the Government ought to seriously consider at this juncture. I am sincerely desirous that at this stage in our country's history we should endeavour in Parliament to hold up an example to the boys who have gone and who are going to the front, and that when we go to recruiting meetings and ask our young men to make sacrifices in order that our liberties may be maintained, we should show them an example and convince them that we know what we are talking about. We must correct the mistakes of the past and of the present as we go along; that is what Parliament is here for, that is our duty as representatives of a free people. Not only that; we should look forward to the future. Moreover, our duty to-day is not only in regard to these material things. Let us remember what was said at the time of the American war. Let us strive to finish

the work we are in and to bind up the nation's wounds, and let us do the best we can for the widows and the children of those who are fighting for Canada and the Empire.

The question of pensions, which was discussed this afternoon by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is one of great importance, and one which I was delighted to see my hon. friend approach in the manner he did, because I regard it as one of the most important matters which could be considered by the members of this House. Hon. gentlemen will probably remember that a gentleman in Toronto, Mr. Frank Darling, prepared a pamphlet which discussed the question of pensions in a most interesting way. After that pamphlet had been brought to my attention, I placed on the order paper a notice of motion in regard to this matter, so that the whole question may come up for discussion at a later day. However, I appreciate very much indeed the action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in placing upon Hansard the information which he gave us this afternoon, because it is a question in which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, no matter what their political predilections may be, are interested, and one with which they are anxious to deal fairly.

Over and above that, there is a question which has not, perhaps, been specially mentioned. One of the great problems, apart from pensions, is, what is to be done with the soldier who comes back partly injured and entitled to receive a pension, but who desires to avoid living a life of idleness. I understand that the Government have appointed a commission to deal with that question, with Senator Lougheed as chairman, but I wish to suggest, as I am interested in that question, having taken it up in Nova Scotia, that that committee is too large. The matter should be taken hold of by a minister, and dealt with by him on his responsibility as a minister. The relations between the Federal Governemnt and the Provincial Governments are very close and intimate in regard to this matter, and require attention in a greater degree than can be given by a commission. Provincial committees have been appointed also to deal with this matter. Complaints have been made as to the difficulty of getting together and working out these problems. I want to make a suggestion with all deference to the gentlemen who compose that commission, and I do so without making any reflection upon them, but living as they do, in various portions of the country and being engaged in various occupations, it is almost impossible for them to get together and have that concentration and community of ideas which is necessary in order to work out that problem. It is becoming more acute every day. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) referred to cases that have come under his observation. There are young men who have come back to our part of the country and they are in the same way. While drawing their pensions, their future should be anticipated. Then, there comes in the problem of the development of technical education. By careful consideration of the possibilities of technical schools you may be able to give all these veterans that species of education which would enable them to fit themselves for earning an honest livelihood for themselves and their children, in addition to receiving their pensions. Then, there would be the avoidance of those conditions which we have heard from story and history, are always to be found after a war—the lack of employment and the lack of interest in the men who have fought for the nation. That has occurred in the Old Land, and history always repeats itself. My suggestion in regard to that question would be that some one of the ministers should take that matter under his direct control with his own staff and deal with it, and be the means of communicating directly between this Government and the various Provincial Governments whose assistance and co-operation may be desired.

The problems of the future for Canada are very serious. Already they are engaging the attention of our press. I see that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) has made an address upon this question and has been looking to the future in that regard. How these things will shape themselves is a matter which is most difficult, no matter how far seeing any one may be, to tell with any degree of certainty. This much we do know, however, that there ought to be coming to this land from the older countries an immigration of even greater extent than that which came in the past. There ought to be special attention paid by the Government to this problem.

Again let me say that I have no faith in these commissions that this Government persist in appointing. The British system in relation to constitutional government is that the members of the Administration of the day, on account of their having been

trained in public affairs, and with that sense of responsibility which is always possessed by men in public life to a greater degree than those who have not had the experience, with that intimate knowledge of the conditions of Government that only men on the treasury benches can have, are the proper ones to deal with these questions, and, if they have the ability to do it, they should be seized of their responsibility and should endeavour to formulate and lay down whatever plans they can conceive for the future. Whatever our notion may be about the position of this Government in that regard is one thing, but this duty is one which ought to be seized by the Government themselves. If there is any device, any method by which attention can be properly directed to Canada when the day of victory comes, this plan ought to be thought out and developed by a responsible minister who would have the advantage of being able to provide in advance in their executive administration for the conditions which would produce the desired result.

It has occurred to me that a suggestion might be made in that regard as to how to deal with a condition that has been found a difficulty in the past. We find it in our province and I am sure it exists elsewhere. Take the small farmer in a European country and bring him out and put him on a farm in the East or the West; he buys a farm in the east of 100 or 150 acres and if he goes west he gets a homestead of 160 acres. Both of these farms are entirely too big for him, they are beyond anything he ever had to do with before and the consequence is that he is endeavouring to deal with a problem so far beyond anything he has ever attempted in his own country that he gives up after a short time and drifts into the city. You should endeavour to provide him with a homestead, or to put him in possession of a holding, smaller in area and under conditions more in consonance with those of the country from which he came and more in keeping with the conditions that exist where he grew up. In that way you would have a collection or a colony of people who, living together, would have a community of interest and you would develop all those conditions that go to make happy homes and to make life interesting. That is a problem, however, which I am quite sure hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who know the West better than I do are more able to deal with than I am. I only throw out that suggestion because it appears to me to be one that is well worthy of consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken very much longer than I had intended. In this third war session, with a deeper appreciation throughout the country and in the hearts and minds of every one of us as to the position in which we are at this time, I think that, in so far as it is possible for us to do so, we should endeavour to proceed to our duties with the understanding that the interests of Canada shall be advanced first and last, and that if possible division and dissension may be avoided upon non-essential matters. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have no right to complain, and must not complain, if there have been errors in the administration, if there have been mistakes which are injurious to the commonwealth, if we, in pursuance of our duties, as members of Parliament, point them out. If investigations should be had they should be granted at this time more than any other time. We owe this duty not only to ourselves, but to the people, who are watching to see how the affairs of Canada are being carried on.

As yet there are very few signs of the beginning of the end. There have been many dark days in the year and a half since this war began, but every one who has studied the story of the great nation to which we belong remembers that all down through the stormy pages of the history of the islands where to-day and for so many years has been found the centre of this Empire, there have been times when things looked far darker than they do to-day. Recall the days of the Crimea; the older men who lived in that period told you of the sad hearts in England, and of the doubts and fears which existed there as to whether or not the issue of the war would be favourable. Following that were the days of the Mutiny, of horrible atrocities in India with the great nation in that southern land which had always been associated with Great Britain in revolt against the Mother Country, and under conditions which indicated that that revolt very likely would be permanent. These days of gloom passed by. So will, I feel sure, these days of doubt and uncertainty; they will be dissipated, and if we Canadians, as true believers in that constitutional government which we have inherited from our fathers, will do our duty so that we may transmit to our children those principles of freedom

and justice which have come to us, we will be fulfilling in some measure our ideals, and will be laying the foundation of that future prosperity and greatness which I hope and believe we in Canada will see with certainty.

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

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, the House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Tuesday, January 25, 1916.

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

REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation, of proceedings under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, for the year ended March 31, 1915.

MUNITIONS CONTRACTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): I desire to ask the acting leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) if the Government is prepared to lay on the table a statement of the contracts for shells in Canada, with names, dates, amounts, and places, as promised by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen), yesterday afternoon.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): May I ask my hon. friend to renew his question when the Minister of Marine is in his place?

Mr. CARVELL: I expect to discuss some of these matters this afternoon, and it would be convenient to have the information now.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Possibly the Minister of Marine is attending to this matter, which was presented for his consideration yesterday.

Mr. CARVELL: Then, before the Orders of the Day are called, I call the attention of the Government to an article in the Ottawa Free Press of yesterday, headed, "Ask Lloyd George about Inquiry Over Shells." This article goes on to say:

> It has been stated that when Mr. D. A. Thomas came to Canada to represent Hon. Lloyd George in putting the munition basis on a new footing, several members of the Canadian Government suggested to him that there should be a public investigation of the manner in which munitions contracts had been let; they wished that this should be done to satisfy the criticism which was heard in Toronto and Montreal.
>
> Mr. Thomas stated that when he left England he had been directed by Mr. Lloyd George to do nothing to stir up trouble in Canada, or to give publicity to any points of friction. Therefore, he declined the suggestions which were made to him.
>
> The Government in communicating with Mr. Lloyd George expects to receive an intimation from him that investigation at this time is not desired, and to settle in this way the agitation in Parliament.

I desire to ask the Government if there is any truth in the statement in the latter part of that article, and if any representations along that line have been received of recent date by the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry to be obliged to ask my hon. friend to renew this question when the Prime Minister is in his place. The matter referred to is not in any way within my knowledge.

RECRUITING—THE COLOUR LINE

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: May I ask the attention of the Minister of Militia, or, in his absence, of the acting minister, to a somewhat urgent matter. I have a letter from a coloured citizen of St. John, stating that some twenty young coloured men were anxious to enlist and that they were sent to Sussex, and thence back to St. John. While at one time they were told that their services might be required, they have not yet had an opportunity to enlist, as they are anxious to. My purpose in rising is to ask if there is any colour line drawn for service overseas. It is a matter of great importance that any young men in Canada who are anxious to serve the Empire in these days should not be prevented from so doing because of their colour. I ask the leader of the Government what is the policy of the Government in this respect; and will he kindly have the matter looked into? I shall be glad to give him any information in my possession, and to show him the letter which I received from a very respectable citizen of St. John who speaks positively as to the facts I have mentioned.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be very glad to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia the statements my hon. friend has made. Personally I have no knowledge of the facts mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, January 24.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me to join with many other gentlemen who have spoken in congratulating you on the distinguished position which you occupy. I do not need to express the hope, for I have the knowledge, that during the time you occupy this position the affairs of this House will be presided over with dignity and ability.

We meet this session under conditions very different from those which have characterized any other session of the Canadian Parliament. We are here when the Empire of which we form no inconsiderable part is not only in a world war, but in a war which practically means a life and death struggle; a struggle the outcome of which will decide whether civilization shall rule the world, or whether barbarism shall be its guiding influence for the next century, and perhaps longer. When we attempt to discuss public matters under such tragic conditions, our feelings and thoughts cannot but be greatly different from those which have animated us in former times. If, in the observations I shall make to the House to-day I shall feel compelled to make some plain statements, I wish it distinctly understood that every statement I make is one which in my judgment it is necessary to make in order to bring the peoeple of this country, and the Government as well, to a better realization of the terrible conditions which exist at the present time.

When the great war was declared in August, 1914, the Parliament of Canada was called, and in a four-day session we voted $50,000,000 to help to defray Canada's war expenses for the remainder of the fiscal year. That money was voted without a dissenting voice, without argument, without discussion. We said to the Government at that time: take this $50,000,000 and use it in the conduct of the war. We leave the matter entirely in your hands; all we ask is that you use it honestly and properly. When the next session of Parliament was called, in January, 1915, the Government asked for an appropriation of $100,000,000, which was voted just as readily and just as gladly as was the $50,000,000 in the preceding year. I assume that the Minister of Finance will, in a few days, ask Parliament for an enormous sum of money —I do not know how much, but in all probability it will not be less than a quarter of a billion dollars. I should not be surprised if the amount to be asked in order to carry on the warlike operations of this country during the next twelve months should run up to $400,000,000 or $500,000,000. In view of this enormous outlay I do not think that any man in this House ought to be called disloyal, or ought to be charged with exciting party animosity, or with conducting himself in an improper manner if he discusses financial matters, and asks the Government to give an account of their stewardship in respect of the $150,000,000 that we have already voted, and of the three, four, or five hundred million dollars, which, in all probability, we shall vote during the present session.

I am anxious to hear what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will say with regard to the financial situation of the country. I am willing to confess, Mr. Speaker, that I ake a very pessimistic view of this matter. In the month of August, 1914, our public debt was something around $350,000,000. According to the latest announcement, our public debt to-day is something over $500,000,000, and, in view of the enormous current expense, I believe that by the close of the present fiscal year, on March 31 next, the public debt will be nearer $600,000,000 than 500,000,000. In any case, it will be somewhere between these two figures. If my belief as to what may take place in the next fiscal year is well founded, then, at the end of March, 1917, this little country—little in point of population—will be saddled with a debt of about $1,000,000,000. This is such an enormous sum of money that possibly no person in the country can realize its extent. I imagine that the Finance Minister, who gives a great deal of attention to these things, has tried to picture in his mind what a billion dollars means. I confess that it is almost beyond my comprehension. But, Mr. Speaker, I do know what the interest on that $1,000,000,000 will be. To-day we are paying 5½ per cent for our money; probably by the end of the next fiscal year our interest rate will be 5¾ or 6 per cent. While it is true that, in respect of a part of our debt, the interest is at a low rate, I think I am safe in saying that it will average

5 per cent, which will mean an annual interest charge of $50,000,000.

In addition to that, we have an obligation—an obligation which must be met—to care for the maimed and wounded soldiers, and for the wives and families of those who have laid down their lives on the battlefields of France, and Flanders, and other parts of Europe. This is a duty which, no matter who may be Finance Minister, no matter which party may be in power, must be carried out bravely and manfully. I wish to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the frank manner in which he dealt with the subject of pensions yesterday afternoon. Supposing we should have half a million men, which is very doubtful, but suppose we have even 400,000 men in the army at the close of the war, I do not believe that we can possibly get along with a pension list of less than $30,000,000 a year, and it is more likely to run up to $40,000,000 or $50,000,000. In order to provide for interest and pensions, you will have to take every dollar of the unappropriated revenue, and you will have to look elsewhere for the money to carry on the business affairs of the country. Or, to put it in another way, in order to carry on the affairs of the country you will have to raise pretty nearly $100,000,000 in addition to the revenue we are raising at the present time. As I have said, I am willing to admit that I am somewhat pessimistic in regard to these financial matters. I realize that this is a new country; I realize that there are tremendous possibilities in our natural resources, and that we have a bright and active population; I realize that there may be some immigration at the close of the war—although I am not as optimistic on the subject of immigration as some hon. gentlemen opposite, and as some editors throughout Canada who are writing on this subject—and in view of this serious prospect of affairs, have we not a right to discuss financial matters in connection with the conduct of the war? Have we not a right to call the Government to strictest account, not only for every dollar they are handling as trustees for the British people, but also for every dollar they are handling as administrators for the Canadian people? The nature of the attacks made upon the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), because of his having brought some of these matters to the attention of Parliament, would seem to indicate that there is something behind the indignation of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that there must be fear as well as indignation on their part. Otherwise, I think we would not find the Solicitor General splitting hairs, bringing up the narrowest possible points of police court law, and telling that because the Liberals in 1902 did not give an investigation into a few tons of hay, the present Government are not going to grant an investigation into the expenditure of $400,000,000 or $500,000,000. I do not believe that the people of this country will stand for that. I do not believe that gentlemen on this side, including the hon. member for St. John city, will be censured by the people of Canada for bringing these matters to the attention of Parliament, and, through this medium, to the attention of the whole people.

A good deal has been said about shells, shell boxes, and all sorts of military contracts. We have heard two defences of the action of the Government, one by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the other by the Solicitor General. Perhaps you will pardon me, Sir, if I deal with these in a very cursory manner, and in opposite order to that in which they were given to the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries always talks very glibly. His sentences are well rounded; he usually reads his speeches, and, therefore, he makes no mistake in diction. I must say that he did not depart from his usual custom yesterday afternoon. I have no doubt that a copy of that speech was sent down to his personal newspaper in the city of St. John, and if we could see that newspaper to-day we would see a front page of vermilion with a twelve-inch square photograph of my hon. friend in the centre. Of course, he made exactly the same speech that he always makes every time he speaks in this House. He berates the hon. member for St. John city, and tells the people of St. John what wonderful things he is doing for them. For the next month the Standard newspaper will not cease telling what the hon. gentleman told them yesterday; the whole burden of their story will be what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is doing for the port of St. John. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on a number of things. I congratulate him that in his discussion of the remarks of the hon. member for St. John he did not get as far as the mud of Courtenay bay. We fully expected that he would land there, but, fortunately, he kept out of it. Neither did he get as far as the tumble-down wharves on the other side of the harbour; possibly he

may reach them before the session closes. Neither did he tell the reason why the only fighting ship Canada has on the Atlantic coast has been dismantled; a most remarkable thing which was mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou last evening. That announcement must have horrified this House and the country to a greater degree than any other announcement made public in Canada for the last twelve months. What object could there be in dismantling the Niobe? Indeed I do not have to ask. We know the object of dismantling her before the war. The assertion was that the Niobe was no good; that she was only a tinpot vessel, that she was a death trap for Canadian sailors, and they dismantled her in pursuance of their pre-election contract with Bourassa and the Nationalists in Quebec. They kept the Niobe dismantled until the war commenced, and, then four or five weeks after, they sent the Niobe to sea, when she should have been at sea the day before the declaration of war. We who live on the Atlantic coast know that if she had been at sea and in her proper place, more prizes would have been taken from the Germans in the first forty-eight hours of the war than would have paid for a dozen Niobes. But why in the world she has again been dismantled at this late stage, is something I cannot understand. My hon. friends are not in a position to fall back on their argument of four or five years ago, that it was only a tinpot vessel and a death trap, because if you read the history of this war you will find that the first naval engagement off the bight of Heligoland was conducted by Admiral Beatty in a ship the exact counterpart or sister ship of the Niobe. I am not going into the discussion of naval affairs here; I do not think this is the place. But I want to tell my hon. friends opposite that so far as I am concerned—and I am speaking now for my party—we will welcome a full discussion of naval affairs at any time hon. gentlemen opposite want to bring it on, either in this House, in the press, or anywhere else in Canada. If ever the Liberal party or any party was justified in its attitude by the course of events, the Liberal party has been justified in the attitude it maintained on the navy in the years 1909 to 1911. The policy of that party was the building of ships of war, the manning of ships of war, the paying for them; having a navy in the biggest sense of the word, instead of being mere hangers on of the Mother Country.

The remarkable part of the speech of the Minister of Marine, as I understand it, was a defence, or a reply, to the gentle intimation made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that political considerations entered into the contracts for the manufacture of shells in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that these shells were being purchased by an entirely independent Imperial Commission for the Imperial Government. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called attention to what has taken place in our own province. I do not purpose following him through all that tortuous course, but I shall refer to one or two matters, and, perhaps, the House will then see that everything is not as well as the Minister of Marine would try to make us believe. My hon. friend referred to the fact that the McAvity's got a contract. So they did—and I am not going to discuss the details of it, and I think the Minister of Marine knows why I am not. I can tell the House that the Minister of Marine knows how and why the Messrs. McAvity got a contract. If he wished to enlighten the House yesterday he had every opportunity in the world to do so.

I come next to the other firm to which he referred, namely, the Phœnix Foundry Company of St. John. The Minister of Marine told a very nice, plausible story, a story which was glossed over very nicely, a story which, if left there, might sound all right, and would give the impression that there was no middleman in the transaction. No man in Canada knows as well as the Minister of Marine the true story, no man knows as well as he who were the middlemen, no man knows as well as he how much money was paid for the contract. He had to admit yesterday that a contract was given to the York and Cornwall Cotton Company for 25,000 shrapnel shells. They have no facilities for manufacturing shells; they are running a cotton mill; they have no turning lathes, they have not room and space for the work, they have not operators, they have not machines.

Mr. STANFIELD: Does not my hon. friend know that all cotton or woollen mills of any size have lathes?

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, my hon. friend runs a woollen mill and has a little machine shop, ten by ten, with a little lathe and possibly a twist drill. But neither he nor any other man with his little lathe and his twist drill could make shells; he knows that and he knows that the York and Cornwall Company could not make shells and never intended to do so. The manager of that com-

pany—and I am not charging the directors of the company with any wrong-doing, I take the explanation that the minister gives—but the manager, through political influence—and you would not have to go very far to see where the influence came from if you knew who Mr. Cudlip and his friends are in St. John—Mr. Cudlip got a contract for 25,000 shrapnel shells and immediately went to James Flemming & Son, the Phoenix Foundry Co.—and just here I want to endorse every word stated by my hon. friend when he said that there is no better manufacturing concern in Canada for its size. They are an old-established firm, established, I believe, by the grandfathers of the present owners, they do a lot of marine work, as must be the case in a port like St. John, and they are men who know what they are doing. Mr. Cudlip promptly went to these men and handed over the contract. But it was not handed over as quietly as the Minister gave us to understand yesterday. The Flemming people had to pay a commission of 10 per cent, and there is no man in Canada who knows better than the Minister of Marine that Flemmings have already paid on that contract a commission of nearly $5,000 to the York and Cornwall Cotton Co. But the Minister of Marine did not mention that yesterday when he was explaining this thing away, and showing that there is no politics in the shell business in New Brunswick. My hon. friend did not tell something else that he knows, and that is that when Mr. Thomas, the representative of Mr. Lloyd George, came to Canada to investigate, he went to St. John; he went into the foundry of Flemming Bros., and said it was the finest equipped machine shop he had found in Canada. He found them doing business under better conditions than any other factory in Canada, at least so he stated. But when he found the stamp "Y & C" on these shells he began to ask questions, and then the whole story was unravelled. It is said that a shell with "Y & C" on it was on exhibition in the Union club, St. John, and it is also said that Mr. Thomas first saw the letters "Y & C" on a shell at that club. Be that as it may, he found them. Finally the story was unravelled, and he found that instead of the Flemmings working directly under the Shell Committee, they were manufacturing on a contract on which they were paying a commission of 10 per cent to a Conservative middleman. He told the Flemmings that there was no necessity for men in Canada who had an institution such as they had, paying a commission to anybody, that so long as shells were manufactured in Canada, they would have all the contracts they wanted, and that they would be kept going by the Imperial Government without even having occasion to say thank you or anything else to the Shell Committee or to the Conservative party of Canada. My hon. friend did not tell you that. I told him yesterday that I would supplement the information which he gave, and I will tell you more. If he has any doubt about the accuracy of what I have said, let the Government give us a committee of Parliament, and we will prove it. Well, Sir, I do not want to follow the vagaries of my hon. friend any further; anyhow, that is all the defence he made of the conduct of the Government.

I come next to the defence put up by hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). If there is a man in Canada who can take up a bad case, argue from one corner to another, draw a line here, and put in a word there, and draw nice distinctions, it is the Solicitor General. I give him that credit; I give him the credit of being the lawyer par excellence in Canada who is able to perform that operation. Out of his ingenuity my hon. friend did his utmost to defend the Government in regard to the letting of those shell contracts. In order to be perfectly fair I desire to state what I understood were the two main propositions in his speech. The first was, that the Government of Canada had nothing whatever to do with the conduct of the affairs of the Shell Committee; that that committee was appointed entirely by the Imperial Government, or rather that it was appointed by the Canadian Government and handed over to the Imperial Government, that it is responsible only to the Imperial Government, and that it has nothing whatever to do with the Canadian Government. For fear that I might be charged with not stating the case fairly and frankly, I am going to read a few extracts from the speech of my hon. friend, delivered in this House on the 20th inst. You will find practically his whole statement of the case on page 131 of Hansard:

> In the present case the Shell Committee, from its inception, has been answerable for its work to and has conducted its work under the guidance, jurisdiction, and superintendence of the Imperial Government. There is that distinction. . . . The committee, however constituted, and whatever its personnel, was, from the time of its institution, a committee acting under the authority of the Imperial Government.

Now, Sir, I do not know that any words of mine could make the case any plainer. I think I have rendered fairly the state-

ment made by my hon. friend the Solicitor General, but in case I have not given it fully I will read a quotation which will be found on page 125:

> We divorced the Shell Committee from the Canadian Government in the matter of responsibility; we made them a committee of the Imperial authority. I am not here to say whether they did wrong throughout or whether they did right throughout; they are answerable to the Imperial authorities for what they did. The Imperial authorities have so recognized; they have acted upon it; they have conducted investigations; they have made reports; they have exercised their sovereignty over that committee; they have given their verdict.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they gave their verdict; there is no doubt about that. This committee was organized, as I understand, about the month of October, 1914, and immediately commenced to do business. I cheerfully admit that the manufacture of shells was an entirely new industry in Canada, but after all it is not a very serious proposition. There was not only one firm in Canada, but dozens, aye, hundreds, who were in a position at that time to manufacture shells, and who only needed the incentive of the business being given to them.

As to whether this committee is responsible to the Imperial Government or to this Government, it seems to me that that matter has been thoroughly settled by the statements made by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), who cited the Prime Minister himself as having, from his place in this House, on the day of the prorogation of last session, made the statement that the committee was composed of eight gentlemen, the last four of whom represented the Minister of Militia and Defence of Canada. My right hon. friend admitted more than that; he had asked for and had received a report from this committee as to what they had done, and altogether it was a wonderful panegyric of the virtues of the Minister of Militia and Defence. If you want any more evidence that this committee is entirely amenable to the Government of Canada, you had it yesterday afternoon. I would like to know what right had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in order to bolster up a weak case, to bring here extracts from the records of that committee if that committee has nothing to do with the Government of Canada. The very fact that he produced those records, and that without hesitation he agreed to bring down a report and lay it on the table of this House as to the work of that committee, as to the amounts paid, the dates, and so forth, is the best evidence that in his heart of hearts he recognizes that this is a Canadian committee, and not an Imperial committee. It is only an Imperial committee in name. It is a Canadian committee, created by the Canadian Government, and under the control of the Canadian Government for all practical purposes. I go further and say that it is a political committee of the Conservative party of Canada, created in order to work out what they think best for the interests of the Conservative party of this country. If any man has any doubt about that, I think I can remove his doubt. I know that the reading of documents in the House is not a pleasant occupation, but in order to make this record clear, I must trespass in this respect to some little extent. They say that the Canadian Government had nothing whatever to do with those contracts. They say that those contracts were given out by the Shell Committee, when, how, and to whom seemed best to them, without interference and without hindrance on the part of the Government. We on this side have not the advantage of having the records of the Shell Committee in our hands; but we have a lot of data, and we have some degree of common sense. We know how ordinary mortals act under ordinary conditions, and, placing the facts together, I do not think there is any man in Canada, no matter what his politics may be, who will not come to the conclusion in his heart of hearts that this committee is nothing more nor less than a commission created by this Government, manipulated by this Government, and worked by this Government for the benefit of this Government and its political supporters in Canada.

Mr. BURNHAM: This is a truce.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no truce so far as boodling in Canada is concerned. We hear nice platitudes about the abilities of this Shell Committee; and just here, before I go into discussion of another branch of the subject, I want to refer to the old Shell Committee. I am very sorry to be compelled to do it, but there comes a time in the public life of every man, of every party, and of every nation, when men are compelled to do things for the public good that may not be to them a pleasant task. The chief exponent of the virtues of the old Shell Committee in Canada, outside of the Minister of Militia and Defence himself, is a publication in the city of Ottawa called the Ottawa Free Press, a paper which, on

the day that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made some remarks, came out with an article severely castigating the hon. gentleman for having referred to the matter at all, telling him that he was all wrong, that everything was well with the old Shell Committee, and that it was unpatriotic on his part or on the part of any one else to say one word against it. That editorial has been hawked around from Ottawa to every Conservative newspaper in Canada, since that date. No, I will not say that much; I am happy to say there are a few notable exceptions. There is one notable exception in Montreal, and another notable exception in Ontario, but all of the smaller fry, all of the papers outside of the big cities, outside at least of Montreal and Toronto, have reproduced this article as conclusive on the subject, as the final word, as the absolute ablution of the old Shell Committee.

An hon. MEMBER: Absolution.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, absolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Ablution.

Mr. CARVELL: Ablution might do as well, but absolution is the word I want to use. This paper is reported as being the great Liberal journal of Ottawa; the great journal of the Liberal party of Canada.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as I am concerned, I do not allow the Ottawa Free Press to speak for me. I do not believe there is a man sitting around me in this House of Commons who is willing to allow the Free Press to speak for him. It is not the organ of the Liberal party of Canada, it is not the organ of the Liberal party in the city of Ottawa, it is not a Liberal paper, it is not owned by Liberals, it is not controlled by Liberals, and it is in no sense whatever a Liberal journal. When I say this, I am saying nothing against the two estimable gentlemen who attend to the managing of that paper at the present time. These two gentlemen may have voted Liberal at some time, or they may not have. I care not how they may have voted. They are just as much entitled to their opinions on the virtues or vices of the old Shell Committee as I am, and in so far as they are voicing their own sentiments I have no fault to find. I am finding fault, not so much with the management of the Ottawa Free Press as with the Conservative party which has taken the words it has printed and heralded them broadcast over the country, as a castigation of my hon. friend from St. John by the principal exponent of Liberalism in this portion of Canada. Less than 33 per cent of the stock of that company is owned or controlled by the men who are running it, and the remaining stock of the company is owned and controlled by a Conservative lawyer in the city of Toronto, acting as a trustee for certain newspaper interests in the city of Ottawa, one of whom is very close to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). That company cannot pass a by-law without the consent of the Conservative trustee; that company cannot sign the minutes of a meeting without the consent in writing of that Conservative trustee and under no possible conditions can the ownership of this paper pass out of the hands of that Conservative trustee until some time in the year 1923. With these statements of fact before us, unpleasant as the duty has been to me, I hope we will hear no more in this connection, or see no more quotations in the Conservative newspapers from the Ottawa Free Press as the great organ of the Liberal party in this portion of Canada.

As soon as this Shell Committee got to work it was only natural that men should commence to look for contracts. I want to ask this question: Why should not manufacturing firms get contracts? I do not have to argue it, when I ask you to agree with me in the statement that there never was a time in the history of the British Empire when we were as near going over the precipice as we were in the months of April, May, and June of 1915. There never was a time when the fate of this Empire trembled in the balance as it did during these three months. I have talked with returned militia officers, who have told me that the way in which our troops were sent into battle was almost legalized murder, because we did not have the munitions to back them up. It was a necessity, they had to do it, they had to go into battle under most unequal conditions, and they did it bravely and nobly. In one battle something like 12,000 or 15,000 brave Canadians laid down their lives in order to save this Empire, and they did it with the knowledge that there was not a sufficient supply of munitions behind them to make good any advantage they might gain by their heroism. Under these circumstances it was the duty of this Government; it was the duty of every government in the British Empire, to make shells, munitions, and everything that possibly could conduce to the winning of this war. It was their duty to manufacture, or buy, everything that was required, and to look after the smallest de-

tail which would make the British Army more efficient. In so far as they gave contracts to big concerns which were able to turn the work out in a hurry I have no criticism to offer.

There have been a lot of taunts flung across the floor of the House at my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) because he happens to be an officer of a company called the Canada Foundry and Forgings Company. The Canada Foundry and Forgings Company is one of the oldest institutions in Canada. It has been making this very class of material for years, and when the war broke out, outside of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, there was no big company but the Canada Foundry and Forgings Company which was able to do the work for which they had received an order. Who is going to blame them for receiving an order, and who is going to blame the Government for giving it to them? It was not a question of getting money; it was a question of getting shells, and of going to the men who could supply the material from which shells could be made. I would not care if at that time the leading industrial company in Canada which was in a position to make shells had been controlled by the Prime Minister himself; there would have been no criticism from me if they had given him an order. But, what we do object to, the thing with which we do quarrel is the fact that there were dozens and dozens of big manufacturing establishments who wanted to do work for the Empire, who went to the Shell Committee and demonstrated that they were in a position to do the work more expeditiously than anybody else, and who, because they did not have political influence, were unable to get an order, while millions of dollars' worth of work was given out to little mushroom companies, organized, operated and controlled by Conservative politicians and Conservative voters all over Canada.

You may ask me: what proof have you of this? Well, Sir, I usually try to produce the proof for any statement I make, and the first proof I am going to produce is something that took place in the little town of Woodstock, N.B. There is a firm of foundrymen and machinists in my town called the Dunbar Engine and Foundry Company. I am not putting them forward as the biggest manufacturers in the country, but it is a firm composed of Scottish mechanics, men who can build, and who, in the last twenty years, have built anything at all which can be built out of iron and steel; men who have built logging engines which are nearly as large, and more intricate, than an ordinary railway locomotive; men who have been in the business for years and years, men who are backed financially, to the knowledge of the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen), by the biggest manufacturers in the province of New Brunswick, a firm of lumbermen who annually cut, manufacture and sell more than 100,000,000 feet of ordinary lumber, and who are worth an enormous amount of money. They wrote to the Shell Committee and asked for a contract. I shall read this, not because I am putting them forward as men in the class of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, or the Canada Foundry and Forgings Company, but to show you the system that was adopted by the Shell Committee in dealing with the people who wanted to work for the Empire. The first letter is dated February 25, 1915, and it reads:

February 27, 1915.

The Dunbar Engine and Foundry Co.,
Woodstock, N.B.

Dear Sirs,—Yours of the 22nd forwarded to us by the Master General of Ordnance, Ottawa, regarding possibility of getting contract for machining shrapnel shells, and would advise that we have already allotted to the various companies in Canada all the shells which we have contracts for from the British War Office, and regret to advise that we will not be letting further orders for at least three months.

Yours very truly,
Shell Committee,
A. Bertram, chairman.

Mark the date, Feb. 27, 1915. I now come to a memorandum prepared by one of the biggest manufacturers in Western Canada. I am not going to give his name at the present time, but when the committee is appointed he will appear here to substantiate the facts in this memoranda, which I now hold in my hand. This man —and I can tell my hon. friends from Western Ontario that he is big enough and such an honourable man, that when he makes his statement here they will not be able to gainsay what he says—this man started a correspondence wanting to get business away back on Feb. 4, 1915, but as I started this series of correspondence from the 27th of February I will come now to the letter dated March 12, 1915, from Colonel Bertram to him, advising that:

All orders for shrapnel shells have already been placed and that the order referred to as being placed with Wm. Kennedy & Sons, Ltd., Owen Sound, is for steel casting only for 4·5.

Then on May 8 this man wrote a letter to the Shell Committee inquiring:

Have you any additional orders to place for shells now, and will you please favour with specifications on sizes required, etc.?

That was answered by Colonel Bertram on May 13:

Would state for the present there is no further order to allot, and we have sufficient factories now equipped to carry on the orders we have on hand.

Mark you, that letter was written on the 13th day of May, 1915. The next is a letter to the committee dated May 14, and inquiring whether they had any additional orders to place for shells, and asking that they kindly favour with specifications as to size and detail. In this letter they were not asking for orders, but merely for specifications in order that they might be ready to tender when orders were available. That is followed up by a letter dated June 4 stating the urgent need of Great Britain for munitions as indicated by recent appeals of Lloyd George, and that Great Britain would doubtless call for still more shells from Canada. The letter concludes:

Will you please keep our request in mind, and as soon as you have further orders to allot favour us with advance specifications, etc.?

That was answered on June 7, by H. A. Bertram, assistant:

Expect that the British War Office will be placing additional shell orders in the future, but of course we are not conversant with the size of the shell which they will order.

That is followed by a letter from the Shell Committee to the Dunbar Engine and Foundry Company, my own constituents, as follows:

June 1, 1915.

The Dunbar Engine and Foundry Company,
Woodstock, N.B.

Gentlemen,—Acknowledging yours of the 28th ult., as stated in our favour to you on the 27th of February, all orders for shells have been allotted. Should we receive additional orders from the War Office, we will be pleased to consider your application further.

Yours very truly,
Shell Committee,
H. A. Bertram, asst. to chairman.

The next is a letter dated July 8, as follows:

July 8, 1915.

Messrs. Dunbar, Engine and Foundry Co.,
Woodstock, N.B.

Dears Sirs,—We beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 30th ult., inquiring if there are any prospects for shell contracts at present, but regret to advise that the situation at present is that we have a much larger machining capacity than our contracts call for and cannot offer any encouragement whatever.

Yours very truly,
Shell Committee,
H. A. Bertram, asst. to chairman.

16½

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that the correspondence I have read began on the 27th of February and continued with the different firms to the 8th day of July, 1915.

4 p.m. Let me now show you some of the things which this non-partisan Imperial Shell Committee did between the 27th of February and the 8th day of July, 1915. I would not mind them deceiving—I cannot use a milder term than that—if it were necessary, and if they would admit that they were placing orders with big manufacturers; but when they deliberately play the game of politics, when their friends all over Canada were organizing mushroom companies by the score, without plant, without location, without material, and many of them without money, and were receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of orders; surely when I have proved that, I have gone a long way towards proving my assertion that this was a political game.

I will now give some evidence on that point. You will remember, Sir, that the correspondence I have read began on the 27th day of February, 1915. I have here a list of companies organized after that date and before June 8, and I will give you in as concise manner as possible their history, their capital, and the amount of orders they received.

The first is the Metal Drawing Company, Ltd., of St. Catharines, Ont., a mushroom company incorporated under the Ontario laws, March 5, 1915, with an authorized capital of $50,000. They took over the plant of the Reo Motor Car Company. The president of this mushroom company is Mr. J. D. Chaplin. Mr. Chaplin is the Conservative candidate in the county of Lincoln, and will contest that constituency in the next election, and this company of his, organized after the Shell Committee had said they had no contracts to give, and that their machinery plants were all established, received, I am informed, contracts amounting to four million dollars! You might say that there is some justification for that, as this mushroom company took over a motor car plant fitted up with lathes and other machinery. I have been in the plant and know something about it. It is a fairly good-sized factory where they assemble American motor cars. I now come to the smaller companies.

Mr. EDWARDS: When was the order given to the St. Catharines company?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot imagine an order being given before the company was incorporated.

Mr. EDWARDS: When was it given?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know, but if my hon. friend means to say that the Shell Committee gave orders to their political friends before a company was organized, and then sent their friends over Canada to organize a company, they were much worse than I thought they were, and they stand convicted out of my hon. friend's own mouth.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not want to interrupt, but——

Mr. CARVELL: I prefer not to enter into a discussion now.

Mr. EDWARDS: We will have it later.

Mr. CARVELL: The next company is the Kerr & Goodwin Machine Company, Limited, another mushroom company incorporated under Dominion charter, April 28, 1915, with a capital stock of $30,000. The principal persons interested in this company are W. K. Kellett, D. O. Johnson, Dr. Marquis, and Mr. Brewster and others. All of these gentlemen are Conservatives except Dr. Marquis, and they were able to secure an order for at least $150,000.

The next company is the G. W. McFarlane Company, Limited, of Paris, Ontario. While this Mr. McFarlane was at one time in the employ of Penmans, Limited, and afterwards took contracts for the laying of sidewalks, it can be stated with accuracy that the G. W. McFarlane Company, Limited, is nothing more than a mushroom company, as they had never undertaken the manufacture of anything approaching shells until after the war started. Owing to political influence, Mr. McFarlane was able to secure an order of over $75,000 for shells, and he immediately proceeded to Paris, Ontario, and made arrangements to install a plant in an old town hall; where he is now manufacturing shells in a somewhat slow manner. They secured the order some time in April and commenced working some time in October. And yet they say there is no political influence in the giving of these contracts, and that there were no orders to give at that time.

Next we have the Cobourg Steel Company, Limited, with head office at Toronto, and works at Cobourg, a mushroom company, incorporated under Ontario laws, May 10, 1915; authorized capital $40,000; the provisional directors being the members of the law firm of Elliott and Hume of Toronto. This concern secured an order for something approximating $150,000.

Then we have the St. Lawrence Machinery Company, Montreal, Clarence F. Smith, president, a mushroom company, incorporated under the Dominion law, with a capital stock of $15,000, of which $5,000 is paid up. They were able to secure an order for shells to the amount of $125,000, which they are now manufacturing at some place in Montreal.

The next is the Spartan Machine Company of Montreal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What name?

Mr. CARVELL: The Spartan Machine Company—named no doubt after that wonderful people who never surrendered and never could be conquered. The president is R. G. Gilbride. This concern was incorporated May 21, 1915; authorized capital, $50,000, with $27,000 paid up. Mr. Gilbride was formerly connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific; and Mr. Robb, the vice-president is president of the Cannuck Supply Company of which the Spartan Machine Company is a subsidiary company.

The next is one that will surely interest my hon. friends opposite—Hepburn Brothers of Picton, Ontario, of which the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Hepburn) is a member. The hon. gentleman told us the other day that he had some sort of a woodworking factory——

An hon. MEMBER: A planing mill.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, a planing mill—at Picton, Ontario. I am not going to discuss this matter very much, because it is not pleasant to discuss the conduct of a fellow member. But one or two points I may call to your attention. This gentleman has a planing mill; he never had a machine shop in his life, for he tells us that he was compelled to get this contract worked out in Montreal. He received an order for 200,000 forgings, 4.5 shells at $2; the machining of 50,000, 4.5 shells at $6, or a total of $700,000. This was given to him on May 29 last. This was at a time when people were told there were no orders to give, and that all the machining plants were organized. Can a man believe that there is no politics in a thing like this? Is there a man on the other side of the House who can help hanging his head in shame when figures such as these are given to the people? I wish my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) would lift the veil

for one moment and tell us what he knows about the securing of this contract for $700,000 by a man who had not even a factory or a place in which to put a plant. Will any man say that there is no middleman in this case? I wish the hon. member for Prince Edward were here, for I would like to ask him a question. I am not here to make statements on this subject, but I would put a question to this House: is there a man in this House who believes that the hon. member for Prince Edward, and his company are able to manufacture 4.5 forgings? Why, there were only three or four companies in Canada that could do it when the war broke out. There were the Nova Scotia Steel Company and the Canada Foundry and Forgings Company; later there were the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and the Steel Company of Canada, in Hamilton. I understand that there are one or two other firms in Ontario that are doing this work. I do not know whether Mr. Hepburn is making the forgings or not, but until he stands up and says he is I must reserve to myself the right to have very great doubts about it. It is my judgment that this is absolutely a case of the middleman making a profit out of the country, for, if Mr. Hepburn is not manufacturing the forgings himself, he is buying them from some other concern that is making them; and if he is doing that he is doing it at a profit. And, if he can buy them at less than $2, surely the Shell Committee can do the same. In the machining of these 50,000 shells he is like the other mushroom Conservative companies organized in Canada. I suppose he will worry them out, that he will get out a few shells at a time, and that ultimately he will get his $700,000. If ever there was a case that required close investigating it is this contract to Hepburn Brothers.

The next is another case which I wish the Minister of Militia were present to listen to, another one upon which I wish he would raise the veil for a moment to show what he had to do with the organization and the securing of a contract. This concern, F. W. Wilford & Company, Limited, Lindsay, organized May 31, 1915, and given an order for 50,000 shells at $4, a total of $200,000.

The next is a small one, the Alton Foundry Company, incorporated under Ontario laws, June 22, 1915; capital, $50,000; J. M. Dodds, president. This concern has a contract for $75,000.

The next is the St. Thomas Construction Company, of St. Thomas, Ontario,—we are here getting pretty close to another member of the Government. This is another mushroom company, incorporated in June, 1915. It was able to secure a contract for shells to the amount of at least $100,000. The members of the firm are all Conservatives except R. J. Strough, a German-American. I presume he is a Conservative too,—of course he is.

The next is the Eastern Machine Company, Armand Lalonde, president. This is a mushroom company organized October 26, 1915. This brings me beyond the date of the letters to which I referred, and I cite these cases only to show that even after the time covered by this correspondence the same condition existed as before. The authorized capital of this concern is $45,000, and it got a contract for $50,000.

Then we have the Holden-Morgan Company of Toronto, organized November 8, 1914; capital, $40,000. This concern got a contract for at least $325,000.

Besides these, I have the names of dozens of these mushroom companies. Without going into details, I will give the names of some of them, and hon. members can look them up for themselves. There is the Albion Machine Company of Stellarton, N.S., which was organized for the express purpose of manufacturing shells. I may have something to say about that later on. However, I might as well tell the facts of the case now, for in my judgment this is a most obnoxious case, almost the most disloyal case that has come under my observation in the course of the somewhat extensive investigation I have made of this matter from one end of Canada to the other. Here is a company organized, as I have stated, for the express purpose of securing a contract to manufacture shells. The president is W. McNeill; vice-president, Charles McNeill; secretary, Alexander R. Fraser. In the spring of 1915 they sent a consignment of shells to Quebec to be inspected. That consignment of 1,500 shells was condemned by the inspectors, a mark showing their condemnation was placed upon the shells, and they were afterwards returned to the makers. In the course of a month after that, the same shells, with the marks obliterated, were mixed up with another lot of shells and sent to Quebec. The obliteration was detected; they were rejected and again returned. I want to say here, to his honour, that one of the members of the Shell Committee wrote the committee

informing them that he objected to the Government of Canada or the Shell Committee having anything more to do with a company whose operations in this respect were so unpatriotic and disloyal. They came to Ottawa and investigated the matter; the Prime Minister was consulted, and knows all about it. With this knowledge in their possession, hon. gentlemen opposite allowed these men to continue manufacturing shells, and they are doing it to-day. Is it necessary that I should argue further in order to point out the real object, the real purview, the real business of the Shell Committee?

Then there is the London Manufacturing and Machinery Company, to which a contract amounting to $200,000 was awarded; the Ingersoll Machine Company, $175,000; the Invincible Machine Company of Walkerville, Ontario, $160,000, the Zenith Machine Company, Montreal, $150,000, and so on. Before I leave this branch of the case, there is one contract which, I think, deserves more than a passing reference from any one who attempts to discuss this matter from a comprehensive standpoint. This is a matter which brings right to the door of the Government the question as to whether they want shells, or whether they want political support. I refer to the Transcona Shell Company, which has a large contract for manufacturing shells at the Transcona shops in Winnipeg.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman intend to move a vote of censure upon the Government for the conduct of the war so far? If not, of what avail is all this abuse now?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not wish to be discourteous to my hon. friend—

Mr. MARCIL: Do not hurt his feelings.

Mr. CARVELL—but I may say I am not the leader of the party, and do not move votes of censure unless I am instructed to do so. I have the greatest confidence however, that the people of Canada, when they get the opportunity, will carry into effect a vote of censure much more effectual than anything we can say in this House.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: They do not want it.

Mr. BURNHAM: This is for a general election, then.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. TURRIFF: That is what you wanted last year.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope that my hon. friends on the other side will have a chance to discuss this matter. They have been very reticent of late; in fact, it looked at one time as if this debate would peter out for want of material. I am glad to observe that I am supplying them with something which makes them sit up and take notice, and I hope that there will now be more interest in the debate on the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side than there has been during the past ten days.

A good deal has been said and written in Canada with regard to this Transcona shell contract, and I do not intend to weary the House by repeating things which have already been placed on Hansard. But my hon. friend the Solicitor General in attempting—and very weakly, at that, to defend himself from the mild suggestions made by the hon. member for St. John city— because you could not call them charges at all—was compelled to read a report published in the Montreal Gazette of an address given by Mr. Thomas, representative of Lloyd George, before he left Canada. In doing this he was compelled, of course, to read the whole address. In his speech Mr. Thomas referred with the greatest patriotic feeling to the fact that the Government of Canada, through the Minister of Railways, had patriotically offered to place at the disposal of the Imperial Government the magnificent shops at Transcona, near St. Boniface. I never had the pleasure of going through these shops, but I have been near them and I have some knowledge of what they look like. From what I have seen and from what I have been told by others, I believe that no institution in Canada is so well equipped, so far as the ordinary requirements of a manufacturing establishment are concerned, as are these shops at Transcona. They have splendid power, splendid light, splendid facilities of all kinds, plenty of trackage rights, everything which could possibly be required in the manufacture of anything in the iron and steel line. The people of Canada felt a patriotic thrill when they heard that the Government of the day, getting away from their little grafting propositions, were going to manufacture these shells themselves; to manufacture them at cost, and to give the Empire the benefit of the money which we have expended in the Transcona shops. This would not necessarily interfere with the people who

were manufacturing. There is no doubt in the world that the Government can manufacture shells cheaper than private persons or corporations can. I am told by men who know that the actual cost of machining an ordinary 18-lb. high explosive or shrapnel shell is not more than seventy-five or eighty cents. I do not say that any private individual ought to produce a shell at that figure, but that is the actual cost of machining; in fact, I am told that it comes very much below that. I realize that a private company have to get the interest on their plant and on the special machinery which they say they have to install. They have their overhead charges to meet; they have to take the chances of cessation of business. I do not think, therefore, that it would be reasonable to ask private corporations or persons to manufacture shells for eighty cents. I do know, however—I am not drawing on my imagination now—that when they get $1.75 they are making a handsome profit. And, Mr. Speaker, if they make a handsome profit at $1.75, what in heaven's name can they do with the money which they make at $5.70? Just think of it.

As I have said, we all felt a glow of patriotic enthusiasm when we heard that the Government were going to hand over these splendidly equipped shops to aid in the defence of the Empire, and to supply the weary Titan, who is furnishing the sinews of war on the other side of the water, with the munitions of war which are necessary for the very preservation of the life of this country, and which should be furnished at the lowest possible cost. There are different stories as to who made the offer. From the statement made by the Solicitor General a few days ago, it would look as if the offer had been made by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I am in a position to say that the request came from Mr. Thomas, and was sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals. If my hon. friends will give us a committee of inquiry, we will give them all the facts of the case; we will prove them not only by the statements of those who conversed with Mr. Thomas, but also by written documents emanating from one of the Government offices in this city. That is only a matter of detail; the important point is that we all hoped that the course suggested by this offer would be carried out, and that we are all disappointed that it was not. It meant a good deal, Mr. Speaker, not only to Canada, but to the Empire as well; it meant a good deal to the businessmen of Canada. By adding a reasonable profit to the actual cost of making these shells, and by allowing for overhead charges, interest, depreciation on plant, increase of power at one place as compared with another, and all other incidentals of a manufacturing concern, it would have been possible to show what would be a fair and reasonable price at which these shells could be manufactured by private corporations.

Because, Sir, remember that this war, unhappily, is not over yet; and that there must be shells and more shells and after that still more shells manufactured before it can be brought to the successful issue that must result before the people of Canada or of any portion of the Empire can lay down their arms. And, Sir, you cannot win in this war, in Canada, in Great Britain, or any other part of the Empire, unless you have the very bone and sinew of the nation joined together by indissoluble bonds in order to carry it to a successful conclusion. You never can make a success, you never can have a proper economic organization for the manufacture of shells, so long as everything remains in the hands of the big corporations or the political friends of the Government. You have got to work right down to the very lowest strata of the people of this country, you have got to get the labouring man, who, after all, does things, the man without whom this war cannot be run, I do not care whether it be in Canada or in the United States. In order to present to you the view of organized labour in this country as to whether it was right or wrong to go into the manufacture of shells, I want to read a letter written by Mr. J. C. Watters, president of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, addressed to H. R. Ward, secretary of Canadian District No. 2, International Order of Machinists ,Winnipeg, Manitoba. I shall not read the whole letter, because in it Mr. Watters discusses the minister's view, and the question of whether the shells should be made by private corporations or by the Government. He goes into all of that, but he sums up the situation in two paragraphs which I wish to place on Hansard.

> The Dominion Government is bearing the expense of raising and equipping contingents for active service to aid primarily the Mother Country and incidentally all of her Dominions—Canada included. The Dominion Government could and should have just as materially aided the Mother Country, without cost to Canada, by converting all of its available machine shops into shell-making establishments and turning the shells over to the Im-

perial authorities at cost. Had this been done the stream of money flowing from the nation into the pockets of the profiteering leeches would have been saved; which at this particular time, means the saving of the very life blood of the nation. Had this been done it would have meant too, without any question, the placing in Canada of much larger orders for shells with the consequent employment of greater numbers of men.

Protest justified.

From the foregoing statements you can draw your own conclusions. In my opinion the attitude adopted by Mr. Hichens is entirely correct. The value attaching to the statements of the minister as to the amount required to install machinery in the Transcona shops—if any at all is further needed than that now installed—to provide employment for men by leasing the shops, rather than keeping them idle, to whether the Government had been asked to tender and to make shells and to whether the Government could undertake the work at all, I leave you to estimate. You are in a better position also than I am to judge the value of the information supplied me by the machanical engineer. It seems to me, however, under all the circumstances you are amply justified in registering a vigorous protest against being compelled to make profits by your labour for the private profiteers instead of being given an opportunity to contribute your aid to the nation in its time of stress by turning out the needed shells direct for the Empire at cost. In the one instance you are employed for the purpose of making profits direct to the contractors and only incidentally providing the needed ammunition for the Empire; in the other you would be employd to aid the Empire direct. And which is the most inspiring and calculated to bring out the best efforts of the men, to slave for the private gain of the hard and calloused profiteers or to work for the defence of the Empire? Make your protest and let the people judge.

J. C. Watters, president.

Ottawa, December 1, 1915.

In my judgment the situation could not be more fairly, more clearly and more patriotically placed before Canada than in that letter of Mr. Watters, in those two paragraphs. What is true of the shops at Transcona is true also of the Government shops at Quebec which are almost completed, true of the Government shops at Moncton, true of the Government shops at Sorel, true of the Government shops at Prescott. All of these are owned by the Government of Canada, and why should they not have put men to work in those factories? If they had done so, not only would they have turned out shells for the Mother Country, but they could have established the price to be paid to other people. They would have doubled the production of shells in Canada; and if there is anything in which Canada has been laggard and for which she has reason to hide her head in shame in connection with the conduct of this war, it is the huckstering, incompetent, inefficient manner in which this Government has handled the shell contracts which were entrusted to it by the British Government.

Not content with huckstering in contracts, the next thing we find is profiteering, not in shell contracts but in the shares of the companies which were going to make the shells. That has been going on all over Canada. I shall give a small illustration which will show you how the thing is worked. Down in Truro, N.S., there is a little foundry; I am sorry that the chief Conservative whip (Mr. Stanfield) is not here, because he could tell us a great deal about the foundry, its possibilities and capabilities better than I could; he could tell who were the actual owners, let alone the reputed owners, better than I could. However, the little foundry was there and had been doing nothing for some time past. A company was organized to take over this foundry. I have here the prospectus and shall read it as an illustration to show the House and the country how they have not only profiteered out of the contracts themselves, but profiteered out of the companies that are going to make the shells. The prospectus of this company reads:

Truro Steel Company, Limited, Truro, N.S.
Capital, $200,000, 20,000 shares at $10 each.
Bond issue authorized, $150,000.
2 year 7 per cent first mortgage bonds, due August 1, 1917.

Trustees for the bondholders: Eastern Trust Company, Halifax, N.S.

Legal opinion: Henry, Rogers, Harris & Stewart, Halifax, N.S.

Officers and directors: W. A. Henry, Esq., K.C., Halifax, N.S., president and director; E. F. Williams, Esq., Dartmouth, N.S., vice-president and director; J. McG Stewart, Esq., Halifax, N.S., secretary and director; Eastern Trust Company, Halifax, N.S., treasurer; Louis N. Fuller, Esq., Halifax, N.S., director; J. A. Kirkpatrick, Esq., Shubenacadie, N.S., director; George W. Edens, Esq., Truro, N.S., director and manager; J. C. McLeod, Esq., Truro, N.S., director and superintendent.

Transfer agents: Paul Revere Trust Company, Boston, Mass.

Registrars: International Trust Company, Boston, Mass.

Bankers: Bank of Nova Scotia, Truro, N.S.

There you have an illustration of how this thing is being worked in the Maritime Provinces. We knew down there that this thing had been hanging fire for months; we could not understand why this company did not start. But they would not commence until they made their money out of selling their stock. They have sold their stock, I presume, because they have gone to work. They have gone to work

for the purpose, not of turning out shells for the Empire, but of making money, not only in the manufacture of shells but in hawking all over the United States, the stock of a mushroom company, organized after the war broke out, purely as a political organization, in the home province of the right hon. the Premier of Canada. And what is true in that instance you can find all over the Dominion of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: The foundry is not working yet.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, I beg pardon of the House. I was led to believe that it had actually got to work, but I am informed by my hon. friend that they have not yet commenced doing business.

That brings me to a consideration of the prices which were paid. In the correspondence regarding the operation of the Transcona shops, the principal objection alleged to have been raised by the Minister of Railways was that it would cost $150,000 or a little more to equip these shops for the manufacture of shells, and he said that in view of all the locomotives they had to buy, and of the small amount of money at his disposal—he was not like the Minister of Public Works, who disposes of it whether he has it or not—he could not see his way to spend the enormous sum of $150,000 to equip the Transcona shops. Therefore he was compelled to hand the shops over to a private corporation, with whom dame rumour connects the name of a member of this House. I want to say, Sir, that if these contracts are going to private corporations I have not very much objection to the gentleman to whom you know I refer getting a share; if they are to go to the Government's privateers, I do not see why he should not have a hand in the spoils as well as anybody else. But let us see what an awful thing the expenditure of $150,000 on a plant would have been. I want to specify a few of the contracts that were given out by this economical shell commission, and just here perhaps I should refer generally to the second part of the speech of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, because I desire to do him justice. On page 129 of Hansard he says:

Mr. TURRIFF: Where are the members of the Government now?

Mr. CARVELL: They will come back; I have something else for them. Before I am through some of them anyway will come back.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Do not threaten.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the Minister of Agriculture will be back before I am through.

Mr. BURRELL: The Minister of Agriculture is here.

Mr. CARVELL: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. This is what my hon. friend the Solicitor General said:

> It may be that the prices were higher than the conditions warranted; I am not an expert, and I do not know. But I do think it is worth our while to consider this fact: that when the orders were given, they were given at a price which amounted to compensation—and which was intended to amount to compensation—to the contractors for the machinery which they had specially to install for the purpose of executing the orders. At that time there was a more or less general belief that the war was to be of short duration, and that not a great deal of this shell production could go on, and as a consequence the only method that appeared to be at the disposal of the committee —so, at all events, the chairman has stated— of securing contractors to do the work was to include in the contract price an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the installation of the necessary machinery. Therefore the price was fixed at $5.70.

That means for the 18-pounder high-explosive shell; I think it is 3 inches in diameter, and $5.15 for the 18-pounder shrapnel, and that is just for machining. That is, under these prices the Government furnishes blanks to the contractor, and the contractor machines these blanks; he bores them out in the inside wherever it is necessary, then he lathes them on the outside, turns out the completed shell, and puts in whatever is required in the way of high explosives, or receptacles for the same, and so on. For that he got $5.70 for one lot and $5.15 for the other. They say it was necessary to give this high price in order that the first order should furnish sufficient profits to provide for the plant. The remarkable thing to me is the enormous discrepancy in the orders given to provide profits with which to pay for the plant. The first order on my list was given to a small concern, M. Beatty & Sons, Welland, Ont., who got a 10,000 order at $5.70. Evidently, Mr. Speaker, they did pretty well; they must have paid very quickly for their plant, because they came back in a short time and got another 10,000 order at $4. Then they came back again, and got an order for 20,000 at $3. To-day they are manufacturing shells by the million at $1.75 each. Therefore, out of a little order of 10,000 they could make sufficient profits to pay for their plant.

Then, what have my hon. friends to say about the Dominion Bridge Company of

Montreal? Their first order was for 200,000 shells at $5.70, and, taking $1.75, the present price, as a basis, that one order gave them a profit of $800,000. And yet the Solicitor-General, poor man, comes to this House, and by his specious hair-splitting tries to make out that it was necessary to give the Dominion Bridge Company, the finest organized mechanical institution in Canada, a profit of $800,000 to enable them to install a few lathes and machines for shrapnel shells. This concern came back a short time afterwards and got an order for 300,000 shells at $4; so that out of those two orders they made a profit of $1,400,000. And they tell us it is necessary to give prices like that in order to pay for a few lathes and drills.

Then, take the case of a little shop, the Chapman Engine Works. They managed to get along nicely with an order for 10,000 at $5.70, and then they came back and got another order for 25,000 at $4 each. They were able to provide for the machinery all right.

Then we come to another, the Massey-Harris Company, Toronto. They got an order for 100,000 shells at $5.70, so that they made a nice profit of $400,000 out of one transaction; and they say it is necessary to give them these prices in order to buy machinery.

Then, we have a little fellow, the smallest of them all, I think, the Mechanical Engine Company of Montreal. They got along with an order for 5,000 at $5.70, and repeated with a 10,000 order at $4. They got along all right, and they want more orders.

Then we have the Monufacturing and Contracting Company of Toronto, one of those mushroom companies, of which both the president and the secretary are Americans. They got an order for 125,000 at $5.70, and another order for 100,000 at $4; so that out of those two contracts they have made a profit of $600,000, based on the price of $1.75. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they are even making money with the price at $1.75, so that you can probably add another $100,000 or $200,000 to their profits.

Then, we come to the Metal Drawing Company of St. Catharines, Ontario, owned by a Conservative candidate. They got an order for 100,000 at $5.70, and afterwards an order for 50,000 at $4. I am told it was a small concern at the start, but that it was not very long before it was among the big ones.

I have another one on the list, and I think the Minister of Militia would want to keep the veil drawn over it. I do not think he would want to lift the veil and tell you what he knows about the organization of and the securing of contracts for the company which is called the Universal Tool and Steel Company of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: How do they spell steel?

Mr. CARVELL: On my sheet it is spelt s-t-e-e-l. It may interest my hon. friends to know that the Universal Tool and Steel Company has, I think, for its president, or at least for one of its directors, no less a personage than one Sir Donald Mann. I do not know what the connection may be between building railroads and manufacturing shells; there may be a necessary connection; but really I am somewhat at a loss to know it unless I allow my imagination to run riot, and I do not know where I might land; I am afraid I would land pretty close to the Minister of Militia. However, this company got an order for 100,000 shells at $5.70, and a later order for 20,000 at $4. In other words, they made between them about half a million dollars profit out of the manufacture of those few shells.

I am prepared to state more than that: in the month of May, 1915, a contract was given to a Montreal middleman for a very large quantity of shells, which he sublet to an American, and, mark you, within eight days thereafter, this Imperial Commission gave an order to one of their own members at 75 cents a shell more than the middleman took it at, and he took it for the purpose of handing it over to Americans to manufacture for him.

But we find that it was not necessary to give prices like these. We find lots of the smaller companies taking contracts at prices away down below that without any difficulty at all, begging and falling over each other in their eagerness to get them. The city of Ottawa simply swarmed with would-be manufacturers eager to get contracts, not at $5.70, but at any figure which they could possibly get, even down to $1.75.

Here we have the Alton Foundry Company, a little mushroom company, perfectly satisfied to take 75,000 at $3.25 apiece, buy and install their machinery, and go on with the business. They are doing business and making at least $1.50 a shell, and out of that order they will get $37,500 profit.

The Canadian-Ingersoll Rand Company of Sherbrooke were satisfied to take 10,000

at $3.25 for their first order, and 30,000 for their next order at $3. They were able to install their machinery and make a profit.

Darling Bros. of Montreal were willing to take 25,000 at $4, and in the month of December last they took a little order of 10,000 at $1.75.

Then, there is the Peterborough Machine and Lubricator Company, of Peterborough, Ont.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, Peterborough, Ont.

Mr. BURNHAM: What is the matter with that?

Mr. CARVELL: Nothing at all; it is all right. These fellows are real patriots, because they were satisfied with a little order of 25,000 at $3.25 per shell. They did not want any $5.70. I pay that tribute to my hon. friend's town; they did not have to have $5.70 to enable them to buy their machinery.

Then, we have the National Manufacturing Company, of Brockville. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) comes from there. Here are more of those patriots who took a 20,000 order at $3.25 and yet they were able to buy and install their machinery.

And so you might go on; there is no end to it. You could talk all night upon these inconsistencies. It seems that the only question was as to how much pull a man had, and then you could give the answer to the question how much of a contract he would get and what price he would receive.

Now, let me give some of the later contracts. I do not want to attack anybody. I am only placing facts on record, I will personally vouch for them, and if you will give me a committee I will prove every statement I have made this afternoon.

Mr. BURNHAM: When do you want it?

Mr. CARVELL: Right away, as soon as this debate is closed.

Mr. BURNHAM: Surely you would not consider that an interruption?

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is always gentlemanly; I have no fault to find whatever. We find that a lot of these small fellows are willing to take orders away down as low as $1.75 a shell. Here are Darling Bros., who take an order for 10,000 at $1.75; the Universal Tool and Steel Company, of Toronto, 30,000 at $1.75.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The same shell?

Mr. CARVELL: The same shell exactly. I am talking about the 18-pounder high explosive shell, because the same condition of affairs exists in regard to the 18-pound shrapnel or the 4.5 high explosive, or even a shell of larger calibre. It would be an unending job if one attempted to discuss the merits of the different shells, so I am only taking the 18-pounder high explosive as a standard.

I find that also in the month of November the Northern Electric Company of Montreal got a contract for 16,000 shells at $1.75 and as far as I am able to find out this was their first order. These men could install machinery at $1.75 a shell, and they only got a 16,000 order. Yet the Solicitor General says that it was necessary to give a somewhat higher price in the beginning in order that the manufacturer might make a sufficient profit out of his first order with which to buy his machinery.

I find here something I cannot understand—there may be a good reason for it. In the month of December the Manitoba Shell Company of St. Boniface were given a 10,000 order at $2, and about the same time an order was given to the Saskatchewan Bridge and Iron Works of Moosejaw for 20,000 at $2. There may be some good reason why they paid 25 cents a shell more in Winnipeg and Moosejaw than in Eastern Canada. However, on 25,000 this difference only means $5,000, which is nothing for this concern.

Then, I find another most remarkable thing, which I presume will interest some of my Conservative friends from Quebec. I find that in the month of December there was a small contract for 20,000 high explosive shells—that is, the 60-pound high explosive—given to the E. Long Manufacturing Company of Orillia, Ont., at $4.50. I find that in the month of December, a few days later, another contract was given to the Canada Malleable Iron Company of Owen Sound, Ont., for 70,000, but the price had climbed to the extent of a quarter of a dollar; they got $4.75.

Then, I find that in this present month of January A. B. Morgan and Sons of Montreal, Mr. Morgan being a former Conservative candidate in Richelieu—

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the future candidate.

Mr. CARVELL: And the future Conservative candidate in that constituency—got an order for 25,000 at $5.

Mr. HAZEN: When?

Mr. CARVELL: In January.

Mr. HAZEN: That would be given by the new commission.

Mr. CARVELL: Sure; there is no difference. I am not here to make any attack on anybody but I have not seen very much difference in the general management of the thing. **It is all politics.**

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: If the hon. gentleman says that it is all politics, let me state that the E. Long Manufacturing Company of Orillia are not in any way concerned politically, because Mr. Long was in the last provincial elections a Liberal candidate, he is a strong Liberal, and I am very glad that he got the contract on his merits.

Mr. CARVELL: I thank my hon. friend for the information; but it would have been much more instructive to the House and to the country if he had told the House who was his associate and what he had to do in order to get the contract. There is also a most remarkable incident in this, that of these three contracts—and they are the only three that have been given lately—he got only $4.50, while the Canada Malleable Iron Company got $4.75, and the Conservative candidate got $5.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I will add that I personally wrote a letter to the Minister of Militia recommending the E. Long Manufacturing Company as a most reputable company. I did not accompany them to Ottawa, but they presented their claim and got their contract.

Mr. CARVELL: I wonder how far Mr. Long would have succeeded in getting the contract if the member for the constituency had not written to the Minister of Militia, not to the Shell Committee, another proof of politics in the beginning, politics in the middle, and politics in the end. Here we have the honourable member for East Simcoe standing up in this House and unblushingly confessing that in order to get a contract for a political opponent he went to the Minister of Militia, the man who has nothing at all to do with these contracts, and succeeded through his political influence in getting a contract for 25,000 shells. Is it not a pity that he did not press his claims a little harder and get the same price that other companies wholly Conservative were getting?

Mr. GRAHAM: He was long on shells and short on price.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know the meaning of that term. Perhaps some of my hon. friends opposite do.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: He knows what short and long is.

Mr. BURNHAM: This is not a truce; it is an armistice.

Mr. CARVELL: I have some other evidence here, and it is only another of the straws which show which way the wind blows. In this particular case the Conservative candidate in the county of Pictou in the province of Nova Scotia felt himself somewhat aggrieved. He was unable to get as much as he wanted, and so he came to Ottawa to lodge his petition at the foot of the Throne. When here he made several charges. One was that no person could procure contracts unless they purchased the lathes through the company of which the chairman of the Shell Committee was a member. His second charge was that a sum of money had been paid by Flemings of St. John, in order to secure a contract for shells. I have referred to that already. He also said that certain contracts for the making of boxes had been re-let by the Nova Scotia Steel Company at a profit. He was very dissatisfied and had the matter investigated before the Shell Committee. The matter was also brought before the Premier. He knows all about it, but I do not know whether there have been any results or not. Whichever way you turn, Mr. Speaker, you will find politics mixed up with this business from beginning to end.

But the thing which in my judgment looks the worst, and which I think requires explaining to a greater extent than all the others put together, is the question of fuses. I have not very much inside information about these fuse contracts, except that I know what they are, and I am afraid we shall have some difficulty in getting inside information, because these contracts were placed in the United States and not in Canada. It is a most remarkable thing that with all these manufacturing concerns in Canada tumbling over one another in order to get contracts, we could not get fuses made in Canada. The result was that the Shell Committee gave first an order for 833,333 fuses to the American Ammunition Company of New York at $4.50 each. Later on a second order for just twice that number, 1,666,666, was given to the same company at $4.00 each. The average price on the two con-

tracts was $4.16⅔ per fuse. About the same time the Shell Committee gave another order to the International Arms and Fuse Company of New York for 833,333 shells, and a second order for 1,666,666. But, instead of paying $4.50 on the first order and $4.00 on the second, as they did in the case of the American Ammunition Company, they paid $4.50 on the whole transaction, lock, stock and barrel. These 2,500,000 fuses will therefore cost this country nearly a million dollars more than the 2,500,000 bought from the American Ammunition Company. It does seem to me that if there is anything in Canada which should be investigated, it is this matter of fuses.

5 p.m.

I find that the Shell Committee could have let contracts for fuses in Canada. Some time after these contracts had been made, a contract was let to the Russell Motor Car Company of Toronto. The Shell Committee bought the first quarter of a million fuses from the Russell Company at $4 each, and the next quarter of a million at $3 each; in other words, the half million fuses averaged $3.50 each, whereas the two and a half million fuses that were purchased in the State of New York cost $4.50 each. I am told—and I wish to place every particle of information which I have on this subject on record—that the fuses which are being made in Canada are not filled with the powder, but that the ones made in the United States are complete. I give this statement to the House because I do not want to do any person an injustice. Any of my hon. friends who know what a fuse is know that it consists of a brass knob that goes into the end of a shell. There is a graduating scale on the top of it, which turns around and can be set at the exact second or fraction of a second at which the shell is to explode. A spiral groove goes round inside the fuse, and this is filled with some kind of gunpowder paste, and in order that this shall burn at the same rate per second it must be pressed down at exactly the same pressure. This is merely a matter of hydraulic pressure, and the thing is done in a few minutes. I do not know what the cost of putting in that powder would be, but it cannot be very much. The powder ignites from the flash of the gun, and burning at the required rate per second explodes the charge of cordite, or whatever it may be in the shell. In the one case it would be cordite, and in the other black powder. It does seem to me, Sir, a most remarkable thing that there should be this enormous difference in price in these fuse contracts, all of which were given within a short time of one another. Hardly a fuse has been delivered in Canada, and if our shells are not on the firing line in France and Flanders it is because we have not the fuses for them rather than because we cannot get the shells.

I find, also, evidence of all kinds of political partisanship, and everything else that ought not to exist in Canada at this time, in the contracts for shell boxes. Shell boxes are a very important matter, running not only into millions of dollars, but, I believe, into hundreds of millions. They are something worth investigating in minutest detail. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen)), in trying to take so much credit to himself yesterday afternoon for the manner in which these contracts were being handled in his own province, referred to the fact that the contracts had been given to the Wilson Box Company of St. John, one of the officials of which was a Liberal.

Mr. HAZEN: I gave the hon. gentleman the names of the directors.

Mr. CARVELL: And one of them was a Liberal.

Mr. HAZEN: More than one.

Mr. CARVELL: Well. The hon. gentleman also told us that the contract was given to the Sussex Manufacturing Company of Sussex, N.B. I want to tell him that if there was a contract given by the Shell Committee for which they deserve special credit, it was the contract given to the Sussex Manufacturing Company—and they are practically all Conservatives. This company is made up of men who know their business. They run one of the finest sash and door factories and planing mills in Eastern Canada. They were given a contract for 20,000 boxes, and were allowed three or four months within which to produce them. But they made their plans on business lines; they are men who know how to do things in a big way. The consequence was that they turned out these boxes in four weeks instead of in four months. Then they came back to the Shell Committee and said: Give us a contract for 100,000 boxes; we have demonstrated that we can do this business right. Do you suppose they could get a contract? It was impossible. But a man named W. H. Farnham, of St. Stephen, whom the Minister of

Marine and Fisheries knows nothing about —I do not wonder that he wants to wash his hands of the whole business—who had been in Montreal or Toronto, landed back in New Brunswick with a contract for 25,000 shell boxes, and this at a time when this great, big, efficient Sussex Manufacturing Company could not get a contract at all. Mr. Farnham went down to St. Stephen to get some factory to make these boxes. They wanted to know where the money was coming from. He went to the representative of the Steel Company of Canada in the Maritime Provinces, who told me the story himself, and wanted to buy the screws and the iron straps for his work, a matter involving from $3,000 to $5,000. This representative of the Steel Company of Canada wanted to know where the money was coming from. The answer was: I will pay when I get my money from the Government. Why, this man Farnham had not even $1,000 to put up. He hawked that contract about New Brunswick for at least a month. He went to different institutions in St. Stephen and St. John, and could not get a company to manufacture the boxes or even to buy the screws to hold them together. I have not followed this matter up—I have been very busy of late—but I believe that Mr. Farnham managed to get a combination of politicians together; but whether they are manufacturing or not I do not know. I will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he looks upon this as playing the game in the big way that this Empire should play it, under the conditions in which we live to-day?

I do not wish to multiply instances, but let us go to the constituency of the Minister of Militia himself—to Fenelon Falls. I think that my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) has placed on Hansard a clipping from the Canada Lumberman.

Mr, MURPHY: No.

Mr. CARVELL: Then I will read it, because I think it is of sufficient importance to be placed on Hansard. It refers to the shell box contract of C. W. Burgoyne—5,000 shell boxes at $2.50, and a second contract for 25,000 boxes. The Canada Lumberman says:

> In the first place, the contract was apparently secured through personal or political influence by a party who had no apparent right to it. In the second place, the contract was apparently handed on, or sublet, to Tiers, a proceeding which is understood usually to involve remuneration to the first party, although he actually produces nothing. In the third place, another contract for a much larger quantity of boxes was secured by the same parties. We cannot see how such methods of handling the shell-box business can be justified. Even in ordinary times the letting of contracts in this way could not be defended, and at a time like the present it is quite indefensible. The suspicion that this contract was handed over by Burgoyne to Tiers for a definite monetary consideration is strengthened by the fact that these two parties formed a partnership under the name of C. W. Burgoyne & Company. Evidently they wished to give the transaction a more respectable appearance; but we cannot see how this can be considered as lending the affair any respectability. It amounts to the same thing in the end, namely, that a party quite unable to produce boxes, secured the contracts and turned them over to another party. The fact that he entered into a partnership with Tiers indicates rather clearly that he did so in order to make it appear that he was entitled to a share of the profits which he was securing and towards which he had contributed nothing. When one considers that throughout Canada there are hundreds of planing mill plants which have suffered heavily through business depression and would be greatly benefited by securing shell-box contracts, he is thoroughly justified in criticising a Government which has permitted the letting of contracts in such a manner.

If my hon. friend the Minister of Militia were in his place this afternoon, I would ask him to tell this House the part he played in securing that contract for his friend Burgoyne. As he is not here, I can only express the hope that when he addresses this House, as I understand he intends to do, he will not forget to tell the whole facts—all the things he said and all the things he did, in order to secure this contract for his friend, a grocer, who never owned a planing mill, and knew nothing about this business, handed it over to him to make money out of. Perhaps it would not be fair to be more particular than that.

Well, Sir, I have spent some time discussing the shells and shell boxes. I may have a word or two to add before I am through. But there is another matter to which I wish to refer. I may be charged, perhaps, with being provincial in this matter. It may be said that this is a purely local matter. But it is of such great importance to my constituents and to the people of the province of New Brunswick generally, that I should be recreant to my duty did I not refer to it. I hope the words I speak may not merely be heard in this Chamber, but that they may be read by every farmer in the province of New Brunswick, especially by every farmer in my own constituency. Yes, and I hope they may be read by the Imperial authorities themselves. And if they want evidence that

this Government is playing the game of politics—not honourable politics, but contemptible politics—I think I can furnish that evidence in connection with the hay contracts which this Government has been handling in the province of New Brunswick within the past two years.

Shortly after the war broke out, it became necessary to get fodder for horses, and the Government started out to buy hay. This was a perfectly proper transaction; no man could find fault if every pound of hay and oats in Canada were commandeered if necessary and taken away to be used in helping to win this war. But when we look into the matter—and I did not know all the facts of the case until some time well along in last session—we find that this is the state of facts. A contract was given to a company called the Atlantic Hay Company, among the members of which are B. F. Smith, my opponent in the last two elections, now a member of the local legislature; the A. C. Smith Company, of St. John, very close personal and political friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the Peters firm, the exact name of which I have forgotten, but of which there are two members, also friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and a Mr. McDonald, of Montreal. These men were given a contract for 7,000 tons of hay, afterwards increased to about 10,000 tons, at $24 a ton, delivered in St. John from press, ready to be put on board the vessel —I am not sure; I was under the impression that the contract price was $24.50. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs knows about this, because he and I talked the matter over.

Mr. J. D. REID: When was that?

Mr. CARVELL: That was one night last spring.

Mr. REID: You are referring to something which took place a year ago.

Mr. CARVELL: I am referring to something which took place a year ago.

An hon. MEMBER: That is too deep for him.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is not too deep for him. The Minister of Customs and I will not quarrel over this matter. If he had been allowed to handle this thing there would not have been the terrible condition of affairs that exists in New Brunswick to-day. The Minister of Customs told me that the contract price was $24.50. He may have been wrong, but we will let it go at that; I presume that the Minister of Agriculture will tell us exactly what the facts are. The contract was for 10,000 tons of hay at $24 a ton, delivered at St. John. Then, through the political interference of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, three other contracts were given to three concerns in New Brunswick. One of these was to Messrs. Connelly and Wetmore. One of them pretends to be a Liberal, but he is very closely associated with a prominent Conservative in the city of St. John.

Mr. ROGERS: They are all Tories there now.

Mr. CARVELL: Are they? Bring on the election, and we shall see. Another was a Mr. Stephens, of St. John, a good Conservative; and the other was a man named Charles Cyr. This gentleman lives in the county of Madawaska and runs a barroom opposite the international bridge. Just across the line, in the State of Maine, there is a prohibition town of three or four thousand people; this gentleman, therefore, has the greatest gold mine that I know of in the province of New Brunswick. He was formerly a member of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, and, in all probability, will be the Conservative candidate against my hon. friend the hon. member for Madawaska in the united counties of Restigouche and Madawaska. He was given a contract for 2,000 tons, Stephens a contract for 2,000 tons, Connelly & Wetmore a contract for 5,000 tons. These contracts were given at $21.50 a ton, not $24. These men never pressed a bundle of hay in their lives; they would hardly know the difference between an ordinary bundle of hay and one which had been pressed. They never owned a hay press, and never had anything to do with that business. At a rake-off of a dollar they sub-let their contracts to Liberals in my own town, the Phillips Estey Company and the McCain Produce Company. They got $20.50 for their hay, compressed according to government inspection and delivered in St. John at the same point at which the Atlantic Hay Company was required to deliver. The Atlantic Hay Company—that is, the political company—had an advantage of $3.50 to start on over the men who went out and bought the hay and did the pressing. These two Liberal concerns went out and bought the hay, brought it to Woodstock, pressed it, paid the freight to St. John and got their $20.50

for doing so. In this way they established the price of hay, because it would cost them a certain amount for pressing, a certain amount for freight, and a certain amount would have to be allowed for profit. The result was that the price was driven down to somewhere between $11 and $12. So the farmer of New Brunswick, during last season, through the manipulations and machinations of the Tory politicians, got between $11 and $12 for his hay, loose in the barn. I may explain that in the province of New Brunswick hay is always bought on the basis of its being loose in the farmer's barn. Sometimes the farmer presses it himself; if he does, he adds $1.25 to the price, but in nine cases out of ten the merchant presses it. The farmer boards the pressers, feeds their teams, hauls the hay to the railway station and gets the price, figured on the basis of the hay being loose in his barn. As I have said, the price last year was $11 to $12 a ton. Practically all the export hay which comes from the province of New Brunswick is produced in my own county and in the constituency to the north which will be the constituency of Carleton and Victoria after the next election. Mr. Smith, a leading member of the Atlantic Hay Company, has warehouses in many portions of Victoria and Carleton county. When the price of hay was established at $11 and $12 a ton, Mr. Smith went and bought his 7,000 tons of hay out at that price—$11 to $12. He bought a few small quantities from the merchants, for which he possibly paid fifty cents additional. I have the information; I have the documents; in fact, I have a lawsuit in prospect in connection with this matter, and I know what I am talking about. When they established the price at $11, Mr. Smith bought his hay at the same price as was paid by the others, and he made $2 profit in the compressing, the same as the others did, thus leaving him $3.50 over and above the legitimate profit which the other men obtained. There you have $45,000 taken from the pockets of the farmers of my constiutency, or out of the coffers of the British Government, for the small quantity of 19,000 tons of hay. This was nothing in the world but politics; this was done by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or with his knowledge—manipulated by him and by his followers—with the intention of giving to these people the chance to make that profit. Not one of them has had the hardihood to stand up and attempt to defend this transaction from that day to this.

Mr. Speaker, I was busy during the last three or four weeks of the last session, and I was not in the House very much. I was in another part of the building most of the time.

An. hon. MEMBER: Doing good work.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope so. Earlier in the session I had put a notice of motion on the Order Paper asking for a discussion of this matter. On two occasions, when the motion was reached, the Prime Minister asked me to allow it to stand, taking the ground, I believe, that there was some doubt as to the right to discuss these questions, owing to the fact that the persons in question were said to have been agents of the Imperial Government. I went to the Minister of Customs, then acting Minister of Agriculture, and stated the case to him. He admitted the iniquity of the whole transaction and promised that if I would not say anything about it, this thing would not happen again; that this iniquity would be remedied. I believe that if the Minister of Customs had been continued to act as Minister of Agriculture, he would have carried out his promise, and that a similar iniquity would not have happened again.

In order to make the record clear, I should say that during last year practically all of these smaller contracts were carried out in the town of Woodstock. The Phillips Estey Company, men of good financial standing, big men in every way, entered into an agreement with James Scott & Sons, of Montreal, who are, I presume, the biggest hay merchants in Montreal. They brought a compressing plant down to Woodstock and operated it there on the basis of thirty cents a ton royalty; that is, they got thirty cents a ton for the use of their presser, paid the transportation of the presser and of two men to superintend the transportation from Montreal to Woodstock and back to Montreal.

They worked under rather unfavourable circumstances, but they compressed that hay for less than $3 a ton, including 30 cents a ton royalty for the use of the press, and including transportation charges. I know whereof I speak, because I am the solicitor of the company; and I have not only their consent but their hope that I will go on and discuss this thing, so I am at liberty to tell everything I know about it. They pressed that hay for less than $3 a ton, and the Atlantic Co. of St. John are pressing it for

less than $2.50. I will agree to take a contract and do it for $2.50 a ton and make a lot of money. I know what I am talking of. I have had experience in this matter. During the South African war I was a member of a company that compressed hay, and I speak with knowledge. I was not then a member of the legislature or of the House of Commons. I was a member of the New Brunswick Hay Company. We had a small contract from the Department of Agriculture, about $7,000 altogether. We had to compress our hay down to 70 cubic feet to the ton, whereas under present specifications it is compressed to only 100 cubic feet per ton. That makes a difference of from 50 cents to 75 cents a ton in the cost of pressing. But I am willing, in my argument, to allow $3 a ton for pressing, which is at least 50 cents more than it ever cost them or anybody else.

The other firm compressing hay in Woodstock was the McCain Produce Co., who also had a contract during the South African war. They had a press, but could not get a contract, although they got a sub-contract and pressed the hay at $20.50 a ton. Their plant is all set up in Woodstock; it needs only the turning on of a motor, and they could be pressing hay in twenty-five minutes. Back as far as October 28, 1915, this company wrote to Mr. J. A. Ruddick, the Commissioner of Agriculture, as follows:

> Kindly let us know if you are open to purchase any quantity of compressed hay to be delivered in West St. John, N.B., in the near future. As we have the only press in this province at the present time capable of doing this kind of work, we would be glad to have a chance to put our press to work, and would take an order for any reasonable amount that you would be willing to let us have.
>
> Kindly advise us by return mail, etc.

That was not answered until the 15th day of November, two weeks later, when they got back this answer:

> Messrs. McCain, Produce Company, Ltd.,
> Florenceville, N.B.
>
> Dears Sirs,—I must apologize for the delay in replying to your letter of the 28th ult., with respect to New Brunswick hay. A contract has been entered into with the Atlantic Hay Company to supply 15,000 tons and as there will probably not be much more than that available this year there will be no object in entering into further contracts.

They wrote back on the 20th of November and offered to furnish any amount at one dollar a ton less than any other firm. On the 22nd day of November they wrote this letter. I have it here in my hand, for the inspection of any hon. gentleman, but I will not encumber the record with it. That was followed up on the 11th of December, 1915, by a telegram to the minister himself:

> Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.
>
> Offer two to three thousand tons hay, cofpressed; delivered West St. John $22.50 per ton, subject to government inspection at pressing point. Answer.
>
> The McCain Produce Co.

That was fifty cents a ton less than they are paying the Smith Co. or the Atlantic Co. They followed that by a letter, and they got an answer on the 13th of December, saying:

> I am in receipt of your wire in regard of contract for compressed hay. The question of handling of hay in New Brunswick was given careful consideration, and, on our estimate of the amount of hay available in New Brunswick, and having in view the most convenient methods for ourselves in regard to shipment and inspection, a contract was awarded for an amount that we believed would practically cover the available hay of the standard that was required. We would not at the present time care to undertake any more contracts and have pointed this out to one or two correspondents who have written us along similar lines. There is little doubt, however, that if there should prove to be more hay available in New Brunswick than was anticipated, every ton of it would be required before we get through.
>
> (Signed) Martin Burrell.

That is followed by a letter of the 17th in which they protest very keenly against the course of the Minister of Agriculture in having given the whole contract to one concern, who had not a press, who never owned a compressing plant, but had to bring down a plant from Montreal and operate it there on a royalty basis. They told the minister that they were the only firm with a press in New Brunswick, and said:

> Also we were prepared to offer to you and did submit to you an offer at a price which is much less than the price you have paid the people having the contract for some 15,000 tons; and now, at a time when the honour and independence of the Empire is at stake, politics and religion and all other issues should be laid to one side and everything worked out to the very best interests of the country.

That even did not bring an answer.

Then I come, Sir, to my own sphere of operations in this matter. On the 8th of December I wrote a letter to Sir George Foster, Acting Premier of Canada, because I knew that Sir George was a New Brunswicker, I knew he was acquainted with conditions, I was aware that he knew many of the people, and I had no idea of being disrespectful to the Minister of Agriculture in going to him. I pleaded with him to do justice to my constituents. I wrote him a long letter. It is unneces-

sary to read it. I told him the whole story. I told him the nefarious manner in which the matter was managed the year before. I followed that up by an interview in his office on the 20th day of December. We telephoned for Mr. Burrell, but he was sick in bed. Then Sir George Foster asked to have Mr. Ruddick brought over. Mr. Ruddick came and we discussed the matter for probably an hour in Sir George Foster's office. I told him my complaint, I told him that these men, under this contract, could pay the farmer $15 for hay loose in the barn, and if he would give a contract to McCain or any other man who would agree to pay the farmers $15, I would be satisfied. We discussed the whole question, and I have here the original figures, made upon a sheet of the Weekly Bulletin, in Sir George Foster's office, giving all the figures, everything in connection with the whole transaction. I claimed that a contractor could pay $15 for this hay. I put down the cost of the hay at $15. I put down $1.25 as the cost of pressing in the farmer's barn. I know that is enough. I am a farmer myself. I press my own hay. I have my own press, and I know what it costs me. I press my hay, and hire every dollar of work done, for less than $1.25 a ton. We put in 50 cents for wastage in transferring the hay from the farmers' barns to the presses, but Mr. Ruddick said: "That is too much; put down 30 cents";—and Mr. Ruddick is the man who has charge of pressing hay for the Government all over Canada. He says that their experience is that 30 cents is a sufficient allowance for waste and loss in compressing. I put in $1.75 as the average rate of freight. It might go ten cents above that or ten cents below that, but that was a fair average. Then we put down $3 a ton for the compressing—and that is 50 cents more than it ought to be.

If you figure that up you get $21.30 a ton. Sir George turned to Mr. Ruddick and said, "Are these figures correct?" "Yes," said Mr. Ruddick, "they are right." We are pressing our hay in Montreal, we are paying for all overhead charges, we are paying rent for our buildings and paying for the inspectors, and we are doing all that for around $3; sometimes it might go five cents over, sometimes five cents under. When you go to the province of New Brunswick you find that they do not have to pay for inspectors, and I do not think that the Smith Company even pay for the rent of their building.

Mr. HAZEN: They pay $300 per month.

Mr. CARVELL: Three hundred dollars per month, a mere bagatelle on a contract amounting to over $300,000. I said to Sir George, "What are you going to do about it?" He said, "I am not the Minister of Agriculture," but he turned to Mr. Ruddick and said, "You go to him, and tell him that my advice is either to make this man pay the farmers what that hay is worth, or give the contract to some man who will pay the price." I said, "Thank you," and left the office. But, Sir, just a few days before that, this Government had put an embargo upon the exportation of hay from New Brunswick. They gave these people, the political friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a contract for every ton of hay in the province of New Brunswick, and after giving the contract they put an embargo on the hay, so that the poor farmer in New Brunswick has the grip of this combination around his throat. There is no way of getting that grip removed except by the Minister of Agriculture. It is up to him to remove that death grip, which those politicians have upon the throats of the farmers in my constituency.

Mr. MARCIL: What was the reason for the embargo?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know. They say they need all the hay.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was the British Government.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no fault at all to find; if they want to put an embargo on everything produced in Canada they can do so. But I object to them saying, "You cannot sell your hay where you want to sell it." I have $1,500 worth of hay in my barns, and the Government says, "You cannot sell that hay in Boston," where I can get $16 for it to-day; they say, "You have got to sell it to the political friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for $13." That is what I object to, Mr. Speaker. If the British Government will cut down the price of those people and make it $20 I will sell my hay for $13, and if they cut down the price still more I will sell my hay for $3 less. In this I am speaking for every constituency in the province of New Brunswick. But we do object to the Government taking us by the throat and preventing us from selling

our hay in the best market, and then telling us that we have to give it away at half price to the political favourites of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TURRIFF: They are doing that with every one of our farmers in the West.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, I went home, and I felt I had accomplished something. But I did not know my man; I did not know the Minister of Agriculture. The day after I got home the McCain Company wrote this letter to Mr. Ruddick, the Commissioner of Agriculture:

Dec. 24th, 1915.

J. A. Ruddick, Esq.,
Commissioner of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

The writer has just returned from Woodstock after having had an interview with Mr. F. B. Carvell, M.P., who informs me that he has been discussing the hay situation with the Hon. George E. Foster and yourself and would say that we are willing to take on a contract of three to five thousand tons of hay for $23 (twenty-three dollars) per ton as closely as possible to track West St. John, N.B., and will agree to pay the farmers $15 per ton loose for their hay in the barns. This hay to be pressed under the usual rules and conditions of inspection at pressing point.

I might say that we could start our plant in operation on very short notice as the press is all set up and the only connecting link would be having the motor replaced.

We have a large quantity of hay stored at our different warehouses throughout the county and as we are unable to sell same at a reasonable price we would thank you very much to give this letter your most favourable consideration and hope to receive your reply by wire asking us to make preparations for pressing at once.

Thanking you in advance for a favourable reply and wishing you the Compliments of the Season, we remain,

Yours very truly,
McCain Produce Co., Ltd.

I sent a letter also to Sir George Foster, and I had no doubt in the world that this man would get the contract, or that the other company would be told to pay the farmers a reasonable price for their hay. These letters were handed over to the Minister of Agriculture, and in due course I received a letter from the Minister of Agriculture dated January 5. Perhaps I should read it to the House, because I want to treat the minister fairly:

Ottawa, Jan. 5th, 1916.

F. B. Carvell, Esq., M.P.,
Woodstock, N.B.

Dear Mr. Carvell:

When I was laid up with the grippe I understand that you discussed matters relating to hay contract in New Brunswick with Sir George Foster and he subsequently sent me the letter which he had received from you on the same subject, but in special reference to an offer of Mr. McCain to undertake a contract for pressed hay. I received a somewhat similar letter from Mr. McCain some time previously which I answered and I am not writing him again as there is nothing to add at the present time. Since I have got around again, which was only a short while ago, I have been giving this matter consideration and getting fuller information on the subject.

My department has been acting for the War Office in regard to hay all over the country and while the conditions in various parts of the country naturally vary, and in some cases a very low price would be obtained for the surplus hay if it were not for the War Office purchases, it is our desire to see that the War Office does not have to pay unnecessarily high prices, and that while the farmer gets a fair figure for his product the contractors should not make an unreasonable profit for the work and responsibilities which they undertake.

In so far as the situation in the Maritime Provinces goes, I am getting our officers to look thoroughly into the situation in order that I may have full information on the whole matter.

Yours faithfully,
M. Burrell.

Perhaps I was a little incensed when I got that letter. Any man who knew the situation as well as I did would be incensed to find a minister of the Crown, with all the information he had, and after all the trouble over this thing, writing a put-off letter saying that he had instructed his officers to make an investigation in order to get more information. Here is the answer I sent to him:

January 6th, 1916.

Hon. Martin Burrell,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

I am just in receipt of your letter of yesterday regarding the hay situation in this county, but am sorry that, after reading it over several times, I fail to find anything in it which looks like a solution of the problem.

You state that you are getting your officers to look thoroughly into the situation. Let me assure you that your officers have looked into the situation, and have known all about it for months past.

You signed a contract with the Atlantic Hay Company, which is really B. F. Smith, a twice defeated candidate in this constituency, for 15,000 tons of hay at $23 a ton delivered in West St. John, and you have in your office an offer from the McCain Produce Company, or A. D. McCain, who are thoroughly responsible people in every respect, and well able financially to carry out any promises they make, to deliver you the same quantity of hay at the same place at $22.50 per ton, thus saving the British Government $7,500 in the transaction, and to this letter, so far as I am aware, at the present time, you have never even given an answer.

Then you received a letter within the last fortnight from Mr. McCain, agreeing to deliver you 5,000 tons of hay at West St. John at $23 per ton, and a covenant that he will

pay the farmer at least $15, loose for the product. To this you have made no answer excepting an acknowledgement of its receipt by Mr. Ruddick.

In addition to this your Government has prohibited the exportation of hay, and the farmers are entirely at the mercy of Mr. Smith, and your political friends. They are receiving today about $13.50, which is $1.50 a ton more than he was paying when I started after the business, and under the present prices, he is cleaning up no less than $3 on every ton he is handling, and in some cases much more, or $45,000 to $50,000 profit on the transaction being made out of the farmers of New Brunswick.

You know this is not a fair deal, and the only way to do justice to the farmers is to compel Smith to pay $15 per ton, not only in the future, but for that which he has purchased in the past, or give a contract to McCain, under his offer of a fortnight ago.

I understand you have agreed to give to Mr. Hatfield an order for 2,000 tons and perhaps you are innocent, I am going to assume you are, but I can assure you that an offer of this kind will never raise the price of hay a cent. In fact, this is only part of the game to stifle competition.

Now Mr. Burrell, it is fairly up to you, either make Smith pay the farmers $15 for their hay, or give a contract to the man who covenants that he will pay that amount, and who is financially able to stand by his covenant.

There is no other way of handling it, and I trust before I reach Ottawa next Wednesday, this matter will be worked out along these lines.

While I have not the power to force the Government, I suppose you will agree with me that I have the power of speech, and it is my intention to see that justice is done to my constituents, for I will never be charged with having been negligent in presenting the case.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Speaker, what do you suppose was the answer I got to that? I had been here and had gone home again, and I found this letter on my desk acknowledging receipt of it, but the answer I got was a personal invitation from the Minister of Agriculture begging me, for God's sake, not to refer to this matter in the House of Commons, and telling me that it would look bad if it were published in the newspapers.

Mr. BURRELL: Would the hon. gentleman extend me the courtesy of allowing me to interject one remark? I do not want to do him any injustice, and I trust that he does not want to do me any injustice. I did not beg him, in God's name, to refrain from doing this. I stated my reason to him, as I did also to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. That reason is good, and I shall speak of it later on. It is simply a matter of justice to put this interview in its proper terms.

Mr. CARVELL: I will stand by what I say, and this House and this country will accept my word for it too. Let me tell the hon. Minister of Agriculture that if there was not something crooked and dirty about this, he would not be trying to stifle investigation and discussion in this House. It is true that at that interview he wanted to tell me certain things in confidence, although I told him not to. He told me certain things, and I shall not reveal them. It was up to him to explain to this House and this country about the manner in which he tried to chloroform me and to keep me from discussing this question. When he found that I was going to speak out, he went to the Liberal whip, and then to the leader of the Opposition, and begged them to pull me off and keep me from telling of this dirty, contemptible stealing of these Conservative politicians in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr MACDONALD: When was this?

Mr. CARVELL: Three or four days after this debate commenced. I told him also in that interview—and he will not deny it—that I did not want to discuss matters here that there might be some question about with relation to the public interest, but that this was a matter of so much interest to my constituents that I would never dare to face them again if I did not discuss it. I told him that if he would give to McCain a contract for 5,000 tons of hay at $23 with this covenant, or to some of his Conservative friends with the same covenant, they could have McCain's press; or if he would write a letter to the Atlantic Hay Company telling them that they must pay $15 for hay, I would never open my mouth, and that would end the whole transaction. Why does he not do it? Because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not allow him to do it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Saving the Empire.

Mr. CARVELL: Saving the Empire—yes. It is like Foster saving the Empire; it is like Garland saving the Empire; it is like that bunch of patriots whom we investigated in the Public Accounts Committee last session saving the Empire. Now we have the Minister of Agriculture saving the Empire by bleeding my farmers to the extent of about $50,000 for the benefit of the political organization of his friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The minister told me some of the things that he was going to do in order to have this thing straightened out, and I told him that he did not know his men. The poor, innocent Minister of Agriculture up against a

proposition like my hon. friend's friends down in New Brunswick! He does not know the Tory politicians of New Brunswick. But I took back a letter to him in order to show him something of the standing of my friend, and I gave him this letter, or rather I read it to him. "Now, Mr. Minister," I said, "in face of that, can you still refuse to do justice to my constituents." Here is the letter. It is a letter from a poor man, with a big family, a hard worker on a rocky farm, which, I am sorry to say, he does not own in full. He is a good, hard worker; he is going to come out all right; he has paid, during the last year, more than one-third of the mortgage on his farm; but he is among the smallest of the small farmers. Here is the letter I received from him.

Centreville, Jan. 13, 1916.

Mr. F. B. Carvell,
Woodstock, N.B.

Dear Mr. Carvell,—I have sold my hay to B. F. Smith. I got stuck for money, so his brother gave me only $13 per ton. He said when Frank came home he would give me more. So when he came I wrote to him and asked him to send me the bill, which he did not. Now, how am I to make him? The letter I send you with this and also the bill for hay. Can you make him settle with me? He promised to give me as much as any one and said he was in a position to give a little more. The balance on the hay is $11.42—

Mr. Speaker, the amount is only $11.42, and what is that to a man who has a contract with this Government for $325,000?

—or you can figure it up yourself. The weight of hay is 11,450. He paid me $13 per ton. Will you let me know what can be done, please.

(Signed) Walter W. Pryor,
Centreville, N.B.,
R.M.D. No. 4.

Here is a man who only had an insignificant amount of less than 6 tons of hay to sell. Surely that man is entitled to all the British Government is paying for hay. Surely that man is entitled to protection from the Minister of Agriculture, and he should not be subjected to the scandal of having his hard-earned money filched from him in order to line the pockets of the political grafters in New Brunswick. Let me read the answer which he got:

East Florenceville, N.B., Jan. 8, 1916.

Walter W. Pryor, Esq.,
Centreville, N.B.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of January 3rd duly received. I note all you say with reference to what I was to do when I secured a contract. I fear that you have been listening to bad counsel.

I have usually paid my bills and paid as high a price for hay or anything else as any one else in the business and I do not think that at this time in life, after I have been in business twenty years, that I will allow any one to come forward and tell me what I have to do. I think you know me well enough for that.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) B. F. Smith.

God save the King, one of my hon. friends says, and may I add the poor farmer who is in the hands of this political monopoly and who is not allowed by this Government to sell his hay to any person on earth except this monopoly.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL: When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing a matter which I admitted was perhaps of a somewhat local nature. I was pointing out to the Minister of Agriculture some of his sins of omission and commission respecting the mismanagement of the hay situation in my province. I just want to add a little more in order that there will be no misunderstanding about the whole transaction. I detailed rather fully the handling of this business by the Department of Agriculture in the year 1915, and also what is going on in 1916. I had pointed out that the department had first given a contract to a set of political friends for all the hay which they hoped to buy in that province for the present year. They then applied an export duty, which prohibited our people from sending their hay to the United States and obtaining the price they were entitled to. The Minister of Agriculture has in his hands to-day very serious protests from some of the best farmers in the province of New Brunswick. A very illuminative and businesslike letter on the situation was written me from Sackville, in the county of Westmorland, by a Mr. Fawcett, a man known over the length and breadth of New Brunswick, well known to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and regarded as probably the most up-to-date farmer in the whole province. That letter was forwarded to Sir George Foster, and by him forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture, who has the document in his possession to-day. In the county of Westmorland the situation is even worse than in my constituency. As can be seen from the documents I have read, the farmers in my constituency are receiving about $13 for their hay, and the Government is paying $23. In some cases our farmers receive $13.50. If it is a

poor man who cannot help himself such as I have described this man Pryor to be, they crowd him down, but if it is a bigger man, who can hit back, they give him fifty cents more. In any case they simply put a string around the farmer's throat, and then twist it just as hard as they can and yet leave life in his body. There is no escape. That is the position in which we find ourselves. In the county of Westmorland the hay is hardly of as good a quality as ours. I do not say that offensively, but they grow in that county a certain quality of marsh hay, which the authorities, at the time of the South African war, would not take at all. But they have also what is called upland hay, which is a splendid article, just as good as the Government are buying elsewhere, and which answers the requirements of what is called No. 2 hay. They started in to pay $12 for this hay in the county of Westmorland, but the Company thought that the gentleman from whom they were purchasing down there was paying too much, so they stopped doing business with him and started in with two other men, who are now paying $11 or $11.50, and to-day the farmers in the county of Westmorland, who have no market at all for their hay except this gang of politicians, have been compelled to sell their hay to these two men for $11 or $12. These agents then pay $1.75 freight on the hay to St. John, compress it there and get $23 from the British Government.

Mr. BOYCE: Does my hon. friend say that that is what the farmers are getting now?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and I say it on the authority of the farmers themselves, the men whom I have seen personally and discussed the situation with. I also have the written authority of Mr. Fawcett, of Sackville, a man known to the Minister of Marine, and, I believe, to the chief Government Whip, a man who is so big and well-known in the farming world in New Brunswick that every man who knows anything about farming knows him. These farmers are compelled to accept $11 or $12 for their hay which these men then sell to the British Government for $23. Worse than that, they are even bringing hay by the schooner load from the Annapolis valley in Nova Scotia. The whole intention is to show the farmers of New Brunswick that they can get the 15,000 tons of hay without them, and make them accept the price they are willing to pay. Our hands are tied; we cannot help ourselves; we have no other outlet except a little local market.

I should just like to read three telegrams I have received recently from men who have been handling hay in my constituency, some of them for twenty-five years. The first is from the McCain Produce Company, who I am safe in saying are the biggest hay merchants in the Maritime provinces and among the biggest in Canada, handling between ten and fifteen thousand tons of hay per year. Here is what they say:

> Hundreds of tons of hay here available, farmers at distance very anxious to move stock. Embargo on St. John shipment. Can't you do something secure contract and thus relieve situation.
>
> McCain Produce Co.

The next one is from Bohan Brothers, an old established firm who have been in business over twenty years:

> Hundreds of tons of hay available. Farmers anxious to haul. An embargo to St. John and United States. Can you not do something to secure contract and relieve the situation.
>
> Bohan Bros.

The last one is from the Phillips-Estey Company:

> Is there any possibility of arranging for compressing hay at Woodstock. Several thousand tons available here. Embargo on St. John. Cannot ship to the States. Everything tied up. Can't something be done to relieve the situation.
>
> Phillips Estey Co.

I have already discussed the embargo on hay going to the United States. The term " embargo " in St. John means this. These people have been bringing hay over from Nova Scotia by schooner loads and landing it on the Government wharf. They have also brought it from Westmorland County, where they paid $11 or $12 a ton for it. They will not receive any more hay than they can handle nicely, the yards are piled up, and the Canadian Pacific railway will not allow any more cars to be loaded for St John points. The result is that many of the merchants in my county have thousands of tons of hay stored up in their warehouses, and even if they wanted to sell to the Smith crowd they could not get the cars, and they will not get them till the place is cleared in St. John. I do not blame the Canadian Pacific railway for that. They cannot allow the farmers to use the Canadian Pacific railway cars as storehouses for hay. Accordingly, they put on an embargo and

said: "You cannot ship any more hay until they have pressed out what is in the yards already." There is no escape for us; we are tied hand and foot, and are compelled to take the treatment which these people are giving us.

If this were not bad enough—and I think it is—let me tell you that last year, after these people had made $35,000 to $45,000 out of the manipulation of these contracts, after they had filled their order of 7,000 tons, they started out to get more. I find no fault with the Government for giving all the contracts they could, because they want the hay. But these people bought up every ton of the rotten, black, condemned clover hay there was in the county of Carleton. There were 300 tons of hay condemned at the plant of the Phillips-Estey Co. at Woodstock; there must have been more than 300 tons at the plant of the McCain Company at Woodstock, and 300 tons more at different points along the line. And, mind, at the two plants to which I have referred, this hay was condemned by Government inspectors. But every ton of that black, rotten hay was loaded on the cars, sent to St. John, put through the Atlantic Hay Company's presses, and they got $24 a ton for it from the British Government. No, I want to qualify that. There may have been a carload or two that did not go through their presses. I was in the shed at St. John in the summer, and there was a little lot of hay piled up in one corner. Now, what kind of inspectors must they have in St. John? What kind of supervision does the department give to the purchase of this hay? What kind of cursed influence must the Minister of Marine and Fisheries exercise upon the minister of this department, and upon all the rest of them, to allow these things to go on unchallenged —to allow this profiteering to continue at the expense of the British Government and of the Canadian farmer?

Mr. LEMIEUX: All Smith?

Mr. CARVELL: All Smith—the Atlantic Hay Company. These are facts that I charge publicly, facts that I got from the men who know—from the Phillips Estey Co., clients of mine; from the McCain Produce Company, clients of mine; men who have their books to show, men who know what they are talking about.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How much do they get for it?

Mr. CARVELL: Twenty-four dollars a ton. Why, they bought some of that hay for $12, landed in St. John. This hay, condemned by Government inspectors in Woodstock, was loaded on the cars and sent to St. John. And they were only willing to pay $12 for it. But the matter is not yet settled; it is quite likely there may be a lawsuit about it, because the McCain Company say that the price was $12 a ton f.o.b. Woodstock, and the Atlantic people say it was $12 a ton f.o.b. St. John. I think some of it was consigned to Messrs. Connelly & Wetmore, and they made some kind of arrangement with Smith and put it through their presses. I hope the Minister of Marine is taking note of this. I think there is enough to make him take note, and I hope he will get the Minister of Agriculture to give the matter consideration and do what is fair and right.

Mr. CROTHERS: With the hon. gentleman's permission, I desire to ask a question for information, as I am not sure that I understood him. Did he say this hay was pressed at Woodstock and then sent to St. John, opened up there and re-pressed?

Mr. CARVELL: This hay was pressed in the farmers' barns. It was drawn into Woodstock for compression—that means to be opened up and re-pressed. It was unfit for compression and would not stand the test. It was condemned by the Government inspectors and piled out. Then it was sent to St. John and compressed. I hope I have made that plain. I am only too happy to give information on the subject, so serious is its significance, so gross and so criminal, in view of existing conditions, that I think the fullest information should be given upon this ignominious subject.

I am sorry the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) is not here. I presume an attempt will be made to answer me, and I should like to be absolved from my promise of confidence in the interview I had with him three or four days ago. Of course, as he is not here, I cannot be given that right, and without that right I cannot go into the matter. But I can say this: I know how the Minister of Agriculture hopes to straighten out this horrible mess in which he finds himself. But if he knew the character of the men he is up against he would laugh himself to ridicule; he would not know what to say to himself about his plan to protect the British Government and the Canadian farmers. As he is not here, I cannot disclose the matter. But if he does attempt to discuss this question, I give you notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will take the earliest opportunity to show exactly what his little scheme means.

I know what defence the Minister is going to put up. He is going to say that in 1902, when I had an interest in a hay contract, the company in which I was interested got a greater price for hay than did the McCain Company and Peters, who had a contract at that time. Well, there was no politics at that time, for the Peters, now partners in the Atlantic Company, and Conservatives, under the name of the Imperial Hay Company, pressed hay in St. John for two years, while the company that I was in pressed hay for only a few months. As I have said, the Minister will say that I got a bigger price than the others. I do not know what the Imperial Company got. I may have known at the time, but I do not know now. We got $17 a ton for our hay landed in St. John, pressed down to seventy cubic feet to the ton. The McCain Company got $14 a ton f.o.b. at their place of business at Florenceville. The freight to St. John would be $1.70 or $1.80—the rate was 8½ or 9 cents, I have forgotten which. Our freight would be the same from different points along the line. In addition to that, we put our hay off at McAdam Junction, re-pressed it, and sent it forward on the same bill of lading, and paid 20c. a ton more for freight than did the McCain Company. They would add to the $14 they received $1.75 to St. John, making the cost to the Government $15.75 in St. John. Ours cost them $17 in St. John, but it cost us 25c. more for freight. It worked out that our hay cost the Government $1 a ton more than the McCain hay. And here is the reason. We bought no hay from the farmers, but bought all our hay from the merchants; McCain bought no hay from the merchants, but bought altogether from the farmers. We bought hay from every merchant in the county. We got them all together. They knew what we were getting from the Government; they knew it cost $3 a ton to press it; they knew the freight rates, and the cost in the farmers' barns. We made a trade with every hay merchant for $10.25 f.o.b point of shipment; and they made an agreement among themselves to pay the farmer $8 a ton.

Among the men in that arrangement were Mr. Smith, Mr. McCain, and a dozen other hay merchants in the county and in the three or four adjoining counties. Prior to that time hay had never been worth more than $6 a ton, loose in the farmers' barns.

Mr. J. D. REID: It must have been worth more than that in some years.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. REID: Never before?

Mr. CARVELL: It has never been worth more than $6 or $6.50.

Mr. REID: That seems to be a very low price.

Mr. CARVELL: I know it is, but that is the fact just the same. I have here a return brought down to Parliament on June 13, 1900, showing that the Government bought from this same Mr. McCain 1,450 tons of hay at $9 a ton f.o.b. Florenceville. Taking $6.50 and adding $1.25 for pressing, you have $7.75—and Mr. McCain had $1.25 for his labour and trouble. That shows what was the price of hay in New Brunswick at that time; I will send the return over to my hon. friend so that he may see it. That price of $8 was $1.50 in advance of anything ever got before. We allowed the merchants $1.25 for pressing the hay and $1 for his profit and trouble, and paid him $10.25 f.o.b. at the point of shipment. We bought over 2,000 tons of hay from this Mr. Smith at that price, so that the farmers got practically the same price whether he sold his hay to Mr. McCain or whether he sold it to any other merchant. The hay which the Government bought from us cost them a dollar more than that which was bought from Mr. McCain, but that dollar went not to our company, but to the middleman or the hay merchant. Our profits and Mr. McCain's profits were exactly the same. I have always justified my conduct in that regard and I will do it again. I never thought that, because we stepped into an unexpected or unusual condition of affairs, we had the right absolutely to drive out of business these men who had been doing a legitimate business for a quarter of a century, and to take from them all the profits to which they were entitled, and put them in our pockets. But that is the kind of thing that is going on to-day in the province of New Brunswick. Moreover, this same firm, the Phillips-Estey Company, a week ago yesterday went to Mr. Smith and begged him to take some hay from them at any price. The best price they could get was $17 in St. John. You can figure that out for yourself; you have $1.75 freight to pay; you have $1.25 for pressing in the farmer's barn. That brings the price to $14, and you give them a dollar for doing the business, which brings it back to $13. This is the very best price a man can get in New Brunswick to-day.

I see that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) is in his seat. I think I have a right to ask the minister if he intends to discuss this matter in reply to what I have said to-day, and, if so, whether he will allow me to relate the conversation which he and I had in Room 16, which he asked me to treat as confidential. I do not want to do this unless the hon. gentleman himself is going to refer to it. If he is going to refer to it, I think I should have a right to give it to the House.

Mr. BURRELL: If my hon. friend's relation of that conversation is not more accurate than his relation of the conversation that he has already given to the House, I should prefer that he would not say anything at all about it.

Mr. CARVELL: All right; I accept that. I assume from that that the minister will not refer to it either.

Mr. BURRELL: Since my hon. friend puts that question, I think he will grant me the same privilege to state what took place and to put before the House a version as against the version that he gave this afternoon.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as I have gone, certainly.

Mr. BURRELL: So far as you have gone.

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly, but no further. Of course, if my hon. friend chooses to go further, I think I know enough about the rules of the House to find an opportunity to have the matter straightened out.

I have discussed this matter at considerable length, but I feel that I have done no more than I ought to do under the circumstances. I here publicly accuse the Department of Agriculture of having during the year 1915 deliberately, and with the knowledge of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, so manipulated the contracts for hay in the province of New Brunswick that his political friends were placed in a position to filch $45,000 either out of the money which this Government is handling as a sacred trust on behalf of the British Government, or from the pockets of the farmers of the province of New Brunswick. I go further: I here publicly accuse the Minister of Agriculture of so allowing the contracts to be manipulated for the present year with the knowledge and consent of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the Atlantic Hay Company will filch about $35,000 either from the funds held in trust for the British Government or from the pockets of the farmers of my constituency and the rest of New Brunswick. I am sorry to have to make these statements; I am sorry on account of the Minister of Agriculture. I want to say here, Sir, that no man in Canada feels as badly over this matter as does the Minister of Agriculture. I sympathize with him from the bottom of my heart. He is an Englishman by birth, a gentleman by instinct and training; a man who, I believe, is absolutely loyal to the core; a man who, if left to himself, would never have caused the nefarious conditions that have existed. I am sorry that he has allowed himself to be jockeyed into the position in which he finds himself to-night, by his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But, Sir, he is the responsible head of the department, and he is the man whom I must blame for the condition, and to whom I must look for redress. I have presented the situation to the House, and my hon. friend can take whichever horn of the dilemma suits him best.

Mr. Speaker, the question now naturally arises, what are you going to do about it? That is the question that every elector in Canada is asking to-night: what are you going to do about it? What is Parliament going to do about it? What is the Government going to do about it? What is the Prime Minister going to do about it? To-day I have pointed out facts which, if I can substantiate them, ought to drive this Government into oblivion; ought to drive the Conservative party of Canada into oblivion for the next twenty-five years. I ask you again, what are you going to do about it? Are you going to get behind the contemptible quibble of the Solicitor General, or are you going to investigate the matter? Are you going to give the electors of Canada the right to get to the bottom of these things and to know whether or not I am right in the charges I am making? Or are you going to chloroform them, muzzle Parliament and refuse a chance to investigate these matters? And if you are going to investigate them, how are you going to do it? Before what sort of tribunal will these charges be inquired into? Will they be entrusted to a royal commission such as was fooling around the country during the last summer, or will the investigation be held in the broad, open light of Parliament? Will it be done by hole and corner means, where counsel for the public shall be absolutely refused the right to prosecute, or

will it be done in Parliament, so that every member on this side as well as on the other side of the House shall have an opportunity to examine into the matter, in the presence of the representatives of the people, so that it will receive such investigation as the condition of affairs in this country demands? That is the question. I hope my friends, the members of this Government, will address themselves to that question very seriously. They think, in face of what has been said here during the last week, that they can simply close the door and say: Go hang yourself. If they want to take that responsibility, of course they have the right to do so; but I very much doubt if they will do it. I could pick out three or four members of that Administration who, I think, would be heartily ashamed to do that, and I am looking to them to see that justice and right and honesty is done to the people of Canada. You may say: what objections have you to a royal commission such as we had last summer? I have many objections to it. I am not going into the submarine business, and I am not going to read these two immense volumes of evidence which I hold in my hand. The submarine business has been pretty well discussed by speakers on both sides of this House. I am only going to call the attention of the House to the fact that one of the most serious charges that could be made against a public man in Canada was made against Sir Richard McBride, practically alleging that there had been a rake off of $350,000 in the purchase of these submarines, taking advantage of the nation in its hour of need, when these things were a real necessity, considering the fact that they were obsolete, that they had been refused by the government of a South American republic, not because they would not shoot torpedoes, but because the things would not come to the surface when they wanted them to.

Taking these considerations, taking the enormity of the charges, think of a royal commission that would not allow counsel for the people to appear before them, that closed the door to the people, that closed the door to any man who would have any real ambition to show the exact condition of affairs. The Minister of Marine spent half an hour yesterday afternoon trying to tell us how absolutely honest and upright Sir Charles Davidson had been. I am not charging him with dishonesty; I am simply charging him with not doing his duty—side-stepping, as my hon. friend behind me says. Let me bring it down to our own experience. Suppose we had an investigation in the Public Accounts Committee of this House of some charge against a prominent member of the Government, a serious matter involving almost his political life, and there was nobody in the Public Accounts Committee except his political supporters. Supposing that no opposition members were allowed there—and I do not care whether the ruling power be Liberal or Conservative—what kind of an investigation do you suppose you would get? How near would you get to the facts? I am sorry that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) is not here to-night. Take our investigation of that poor deluded young man, Powell, in the Public Accounts Committee last spring. He was a young man whom I pitied as I do not think I ever before pitied a witness on the stand in my quarter of a century of professional activity, a young man who was brought there by Garland and made to perjure himself in the most horrible manner I have ever seen in any court. And the only contribution offered by my hon. friend from Ottawa to that investigation was to say: "Oh, well, that money would be very handy to put him through college." That is an illustration of what these one-sided, jug-handled investigations are. If there was nothing wrong with this transaction, if everything was perfectly straight and honest, why has Sir Richard McBride thrown up the premiership of British Columbia and gone to London? Why has he accepted a twopenny-halfpenny job, with a great big salary attached to it, putting another man out on a pension of $10,000 to make room for himself? Men act on certain business principles usually; they do not do these things if everything is all right.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Did not the Davidson Commission discover very many more facts in connection with the Garland case than the Public Accounts Committee under the guidance of my hon. friend?

Mr. CARVELL: No. He owned up to the Davidson Commission and he would not to us. Garland brought that poor young man there and made him perjure himself in the most blackhearted manner I ever saw.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend was unsuccessful in getting the truth.

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly; how could I help it if a man perjured himself? When

they got before the Davidson Commission a change came over the spirit of their dreams—they owned up and coughed up.

Mr. J. D. REID: That must have been a better commission than the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it was not. The Public Accounts Committee cannot help men perjuring themselves if they want to. But they had a chance to think it over; they repented, and I say I was sorry, and I am sorry to-night, for that young man. He had as fine a countenance as any man I ever met. I should like to have a young man like that for my own son, which unfortunately I have not. He appeared to me to have every instinct of a gentleman, and I am glad that he had the moral courage, or that his father had the moral courage, to make him go before the Davidson Commission and tell the whole story. I believe that he will be able to go through life with a clean record, because, according to my religion, if a man is willing to confess his sins I believe that there is a power to forgive him his sins both here and hereafter.

I come now to the horse investigation. I am going to show the doings of this wonderful commission. The investigation of these Nova Scotia horses came up in the Public Accounts Committee. We certainly had a lively time of it for three or four days. We proved many things, and in substance here is what we proved. We proved that the Government gave about $73,000 over to one of its supporters, the member for Kings, N.S., with which to go out and buy horses. He was given carte blanche to draw cheques or drafts against this money, which was placed to his credit in the Bank of Montreal. He went to Nova Scotia with a gentleman named McKay, who had been the secretary to the chief Conservative whip.

Mr. STANFIELD: Acting secretary.

Mr. CARVELL: Acting? He was in the office and had access to all books and papers. He was on the job, that is all I know. He took also two men whom he picked up in Ottawa, Keever and Woodworth. I think he went so far as to say that one of these men, Keever, had a desk in the same room as he had, in a building in Ottawa.

Mr. STANFIELD: That was not my office.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not blaming the chief Conservative whip a particle. I do not think the hon gentleman had the faintest connection with the purchase of these horses. I should be very sorry, indeed, if anything I might say would lead to such a suspicion. He took these three men down to Nova Scotia, and they started buying horses, and it was the most perfect whirlwind campaign I ever heard of in my life. Billy Sunday was not in it for a moment. They would lead their halt and maimed and blind horses up there and go through a process of investigation, which was all sworn to in the Public Accounts Committee. They would tie on a tag and send the horse on and bring on the next one. Some of them would not even be untied. They would look sometimes at their mouths, sometimes at their tails, and sometimes even at their sides. When a man went there with a good horse to sell, they said: "Nothing doing, we do not want that kind of horse." They bought a few good horses but as a rule the good ones were all turned down. They bought a few, but as a rule the horses were all turned down.

Mr. REID: Not all.

Mr. CARVELL: Harvey brought a good horse, and they would not buy it.

Mr. REID: The same witness swore that there were good horses.

Mr. CARVELL: The Government did not want good horses; the Government turned down good horses, and these men telephoned to their friends to bring in the lame, the halt, the blind, the spavined, the ring-boned, and every other kind of horse with all the ailments to which horse flesh is heir to; and they brought them in, and got enormous prices for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where was the trouble? According to the evidence, the limit price to be paid was from $172 to $175; they must not exceed that. If they had bought horses up to the standard they would have paid $172 or $175 for them. But if they had bought those good horses at $172 or $175 there would have been no rakeoff; therefore they refused to have the good horses, and paid the limit price for the halt, the blind, the spavined, the ring-boned, and the aged and infirm horses, horses that had been too old to pass muster during the South African war 14 years before. The farmers got $125, $130 and $135 for the horses, and when the horses fell down they were just allowed to lie until they had sufficient force to enable them to get up again. According to the evidence, the price averaged about $130 each, and on that basis there was a total profit of $15,000 on the transaction.

You will remember, Sir, that when I cross-examined Mr. Foster I asked him what he had been doing in Washington on Easter Sunday. He was very much surprised, and wanted to know how I knew he had been in Washington. I said, "I know." "Yes," he said, "you have been trailing me with detectives for the last three years." I rather admitted the accusation, although I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it was not so.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend just took a flier.

Mr. CARVELL: I just took a flier. I happened to be at the Chateau Laurier the night before, when I met a gentleman who told me he had seen Foster's name registered in the New Willard Hotel, Washington. He had been telling his Government for days before this that he could not get in touch with these men—that they were engaged in some mining propositions in Arizona. When he admitted that he had been in Washington, I asked him if he had seen Keever and Woodworth, and he said no. I said, "You met them in Boston." and then he said that he had met them there, but that he had never asked them to come to Canada and produce the receipts. I do not know what the Minister of Customs thought about it, because he has a habit of keeping his tongue to himself, but I thought from his countenance that I could form a pretty good idea. That was the state of affairs when we left Ottawa last session. I think I have narrated the facts exactly.

Now, Sir Charles Davidson went to Nova Scotia—I do not know what for. The Lord knows what took him down there, because we proved enough here and settled it all; the Prime Minister himself read the fellow out of his party, and told him to get out. I do not know what more Sir Charles Davidson had to investigate, but he went down and spent a month in Nova Scotia. Of course, the climate of Nova Scotia is all right in summer time; he had a pleasant time, and all his entourage had a pleasant time at the expense of the country. I am sorry I have not the evidence before me. I have tried for three or four days to get it. The statement was made by the Solicitor General that a copy of the evidence had been sent to the Opposition. We have volumes 1, 2 and 5, and part of volume 6, but we have not volumes 3 and 4, and, as I understand, volume 3 contains the evidence taken in Nova Scotia in regard to the horse deals. Why we have not that evidence before us I do not know. I tried to get it on Friday, I tried again on Saturday, and again on Monday, and I could not get it. I am told it will not be ready for perhaps two or three weeks yet. Therefore I am not able to discuss this matter from the evidence taken by the Davidson Commission, and I am lawyer enough, or farmer enough—whichever you like—not to discuss a matter without having the evidence before me. I have, however, a very distinct recollection that not a day was allowed to pass on which Sir Charles Davidson did not publicly, from his place on the bench, chastise the farmers for selling horses of that kind to the Government. He even went so far as to ask men whether they realized the position in which they had placed themselves in making the sales they had made. The whole investigation was a deliberate attempt to throw the blame of those decrepit horses on the farmers of Nova Scotia, and to take it off the shoulders of the Tory party of Canada. Any man who read the evidence in the newspapers would come to the same conclusion. As I have said, I have not had an opportunity of reading the official evidence, and I reserve the right to make further criticisms upon the matter later. At any rate, that was the thing that impressed itself upon my mind, and that would probably impress itself upon everybody's mind.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, more than that: Sir Charles Davidson made a statement to a gentleman not more than six or seven days ago that there was nothing wrong with Foster. No, there was nothing wrong with Foster; it was those two scoundrels who left for the United States. He blamed those two scoundrels for getting the money. But what on earth was Foster, a member of the Conservative party in this House doing, handling the money for those two scoundrels?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who gave him the money?

Mr. CARVELL: The Government gave it to Foster, and Foster never looked after his receipts. There was one little bit of evidence in the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee which I did not see reported in the newspapers. Foster admitted that on several evenings he and the secretary of the Conservative Association, Mr. Oates, went over the receipts and checked them up. They had them in their possession, and I would like to know, if they had them in their possession after the horses were bought, how they

got into the possession of Keever and Woodworth. I have very grave doubts about it.

I come next to the investigation of the horse deals in Ontario, and here again, while I have not the evidence before me, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the same slipshod methods and the same conditions prevailed in Ontario as prevailed in Nova Scotia. When the Davidson inquiries were started there was a good deal of blowing of trumpets, nice letters, and that sort of thing, and at the opening of the commission a statement was made by Mr. Thompson. You will find it on page 7 of the evidence:

I wish to say at the very opening of this Royal Commission, that if any representations are made to me by reputable persons, which I consider will lead to the disclosure of any irregularities in the purchase of military supplies, or wrong-doing, or deceit, I place myself unreservedly at the disposal of persons who will give such information, and I am prepared to bring before you, my lord, any valuable information and evidence that appears to be of a reliable nature.

Acting on that invitation, men who were absolutely reliable, absolutely responsible, and absolutely respectable, went to Mr. Thompson and gave him not only information but sheaves and sheaves of evidence. They had men meet him at different points all over Canada to arrange matters beforehand. These men would meet Mr. Thompson, and tell him who was to be subpœnaed, and who was not. More than that, Mr. Thompson was furnished with typewritten statements about every case. I hold in my hand copies of the documents which were placed in Mr. Thompson's hands, and he was told in these documents who to subpœna and where to find evidence; he was told who were the guilty parties. I have not the time nor the disposition to read them all, but if the Prime Minister wishes to see them I will send them over to him. I will just read one of them in order to show the kind of information which those respectable persons gave Sir Charles Davidson. I am going to read one which deals with the purchase of horses in Ontario. A Mr. Cox—I do not know his Christian name—a son of the late Senator Cox, from purely patriotic motives, decided to present to the Government fifty horses from his stable at Oakville.

These horses were taken away, they were inspected by the Government veterinary, every one of them was passed and every one of them accepted. Their manes were shaved off, their tails were trimmed, they were put in military shape, and became the property of the Government. When Sir Adam Beck was put in charge, for some unaccountable reason, I do not know why, he refused this gift; he sent around other veterinary inspectors, and they refused to accept every one of these fifty horses. Then the man who had charge of these horses—I think that perhaps Mr. Cox may have had a little finger in the pie as well—decided to test the sincerity of those who were acting for the Government in this matter. Mr. Cox said: "We will see how serious these men are in their rejection of these horses; they will not take my fifty horses that I want to give to the Empire, but they are going around and paying fancy prices for old, broken-down horses, and I want to see how sincere they are in what they are doing." Mr. Wilson, the man who was in charge of Mr. Cox's stable at Oakville, took at least twelve of these horses of which we know to a public sale at Brampton, he got different people to lead the horses up at the sale and every one of them was bought by Sir Adam Beck's men at a big price, they were all accepted without a murmur, and Mr. Wilson got his pay for them. What happened in the case of these twelve horses I believe we can prove happened in the case of the other thirty-eight horses. Here is the memorandum that was placed in Mr. Thompson's hands regarding this transaction:

Hugh Wilson is the farm manager of Mr. Cox, son of the late Senator Cox, who owns a very large stock farm at Oakville. It would appear that at the beginning or some time after the war started Mr. Cox presented to the militia authorities in Toronto 50 horses which he took from his stables at Oakville. They were accepted by some of the officers connected with the militia in Toronto. Later on when Sir Adam Beck ascertained that these horses had been presented to the Government he made an inspection of them and rejected every one of the horses and sent them back to Oakville, notwithstanding that they had been previously accepted by some officer of the Government, and their manes had been cut off and they had been trimmed up for military purposes. No one seems to know what eventually became of all the horses, but it is known that Mr. Hugh Wilson brought twelve of them to Brampton and through Jones presented them for inspection—

This man Jones was the accomplice in this whole transaction of Fallis, a member of the local legislature.

—and they were passed by the veterinary and accepted by Fallis and the money paid for them. It is expected that some consideration was given for passing these horses and either Jones or Fallis, more likely the former, would tell what this consideration was.

Jones went to Oakville before the horses were bought. When they reached Brampton Jones distributed them about, or in other words, had different people lead them up to be sold, and when the cheques were made out Jones had these different people endorse the cheques and he put the cheques in his pocket and had them cashed himself.

This information was placed in the hands of the commissioner, and more damaging information regarding other transactions in Brampton and vicinity. When the investigation came on, and when they had Jones on the stand, the only question I am told—and this comes from Mr. Thompson himself—asked him was: "Did you buy any horses from J. Wilson?"—and the answer was: "Yes." Not a word about what horses they were, not a word about what was paid for them, not a word as to whether they were the horses that had been received and rejected! Can any man believe that this is an honest investigation? Do we want that kind of investigation into the pilfering of millions, such as I described this afternoon? No, Sir. I know the Prime Minister down in his heart does not want it. It may be that his followers behind him may drive him to it, but I hope that will not happen. I refrain from further comment on that branch of the case, because, as I said before, I have not the evidence, but I am in a position to make that statement because Mr. Thompson told the gentleman who told me that that is the only question he asked, and he said that he was afraid that he forgot to ask the rest of them.

9 p.m.

Now I come to another matter to show the searching investigation which this Commission gave to these grave public affairs—the most searching investigation, as detailed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the Solicitor General. I am afraid that I shall have to take a little more time, and I apologize to the House, but it seems necessary to get this before the people. I refer now to the sham investigation into the purchase of a thousand automatic pistols by Major John Wesley—

Mr. GRAHAM: Colonel.

Mr. CARVELL: Colonel John Wesley Allison—in the early stages of the war. You will remember, Mr. Speaker—I know you will, because at that time you were attending the committees with us occasionally—that we had a witness here for two or three days. I have forgotten his name; there was a man here from Morrisburg.

An hon. MEMBER: Nash.

Mr. CARVELL: We had a witness called Nash here for two or three days to give evidence about some suspicious circumstances that took place at Morrisburg regarding the purchase of military clothing, but the Government were in such a hurry to get away last spring—

Mr. REID: That is not right. The hon. gentleman knows that we offered in that committee to wait as long as the hon. member was willing to have any matter investigated.

Mr. CARVELL: I know you did, but I also know that when I had to go home on the Thursday before Good Friday, and when I was compelled to hold a nomination convention in my riding on Easter Monday, and could not get back here until Wednesday, I asked that the committee adjourn over until I got back, and they would not do it. They sat, not on Good Friday, but on Saturday and on Easter Monday, something which had never happened before.

Mr. REID: But we went on with some other cases.

Mr. CARVELL: I know you did, but they had nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. REID: But there were other members who wanted to take up other cases, and we were willing to take up your case when you returned.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and we went into them pretty fully, too.

Mr. REID: I admit that.

Mr. CARVELL: However, there was not time to investigate Mr. Nash, and he went away. In the present month of January a so-called investigation into this transaction of the purchase of automatic pistols took place in the city of Ottawa. Col. Allison was called, and here is the evidence which he gave. I am sorry that it will take me some time to make this case complete, because I must read the evidence:

Q. Did you sell any revolvers to the Canadian Government?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or pistols?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were you the agent of any person who sold revolvers or pistols to the Canadian Government?—A. No.

Q. Or are you the agent of any company who sold any revolvers or pistols to the Canadian Government?—A. No.

Q. Did you profit by way of commission on any revolvers or pistols that were sold to the Canadian Government or to the Department of Militia and Defence?—A. No, sir.

Q. Not in any way?—A. No.

Q. Neither directly nor indirectly?—A. No.

Q. While I am on this I might clean up another point—did you sell any clothing to the Militia Department for Canada?—A. No.

Q. Are you interested, as partner, with any person who sold any clothing to the Canadian Government?—A. No, sir, I never had anything to do with the sale of clothing.

Q. To the Canadian Government?—A. No, sir.

Q. Not at any time?—A. Not at any time.

Q. Neither directly nor indirectly?—A. Neither directly nor indirectly.

Q. Did you receive any commission on any clothing sold to the Militia Department of the Canadian Government?—A. None whatever.

Sir Charles Davidson: Was there a memorandum with respect to this?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, sir, that is the information; I have asked the witness with reference to the information coming to me.

General Sir Sam Hughes: I want to see that memorandum, your lordship.

Mr. Thompson: I have not got it here.

Sir Charles Davidson: I have a vague recollection of having seen one. (To Mr. Allison.) Will you be in town for a day or two, Mr. Allison?

Mr. Allison: I do not know, I have been very unwell and came out of a sick-bed to be present here.

Sir Charles Davidson: Perhaps you could wait a little while until Mr. Auditor General is present, so that we may see if he desires to ask anything further. It is evident that you are in quite a weak condition, Mr. Allison.

Mr. Allison: Yes, sir, I have been quite ill.

Mr. Thompson: I may say, Mr. Commissioner, that there is no evidence that Mr. Allison actually sold any clothing or equipment to the Militia Department. My information was that he had some clothing and equipment in his possession at Morrisburg, and the suggestion was that this had been sold to the Canadian Government, but he tells us that neither he nor any partner of his is associated in any way with the sale of clothing to the Canadian Government.

Sir Charles Davidson: That should dispose of the matter in the meantime.

It is all over with: the show is finished so far as Sir Charles Davidson is concerned. But there was another gentleman who was not quite so willing that the show should be over, and that was the Auditor General; and this country should thank God that we have an Auditor General who brings some of these things to the attention of the public. We cannot have a counsel to represent the public on these commissions; we have no way of investigating them ourselves; and therefore it is a blessing that there is one man whom this Government cannot turn out of office, and who will see that something like justice is done in so far as it is possible for him to do it. But he is only an official; he cannot act as counsel; and he has to do the very best he can. I turn to page 7, and take the evidence of Sir Sam Hughes. Before this the minister had been giving some evidence about clothing, and I may say that he had made a most grandiloquent speech. Why, it was the chance of a lifetime to make a speech and have it published to the country. The minister seemed much more anxious to make speeches at that time than he has been during the course of this debate:

Q. Do you know if that would apply to revolvers or pistols?

Sir Sam Hughes: We have nothing to do with pistols. The deal was made through American officers, or friends—perhaps I should not use the term "friends"—but at all events he had nothing to do with the pistols in any sense whatever. Mr. Cochrane, who is a wholesale dealer complimented me on the prices we obtained the pistols at and he told me it was lower than the ordinary price.

That settled it so far as Sir Charles Davidson was concerned, but this ubiquitous little man Fraser was called the next day, and you will find his evidence on page 8. He says:

My information as to the wholesale price was that it was $18.50 with trade discount—ten and five, and two and a half, for cash. We paid $18.50 net. I know they were selling them to the New York State Government for about $14.00.

Mr. Thompson: Was it the same pistol?

Mr. Fraser: The same pistol.

Mr. Thompson: The same make of pistol?

Mr. Fraser: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: That is the Colt Automatic?

Mr. Fraser: The Colt Automatic.

Mr. Thompson: Do you know if that was a new model?

Mr. Fraser: I cannot give you the description now, but the description in the vouchers, and the description of those sold to the New York State Government is the same.

That settled it. On page 9 Sir Charles Davidson asks the Auditor General:

Q. Have you the vouchers for the Canadian purchases?

Mr. Fraser: Yes.

Then, instead of having them produced and finding out what they were, Sir Charles Davidson said:

You might produce them to-morrow, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Fraser says, "I shall," and then they went on to another part of the evidence. Mr. Fraser came back. This little man was determined that he would get his evidence on the records anyhow, if he had to fight the whole crowd. You will find his evidence on page 17. He gives a lot of correspondence, which I will not read, as it is hardly necessary. However, he says on page 13:

In examining the accounts for the purchase of revolvers and automatic pistols I found

that the Government had paid $18.50 for each pistol. I subsequently ascertained that the same pistol was sold to the New York State Government for $14.50.

I think that should be "Canadian" Government. Coming down to page 17, Mr. Thompson asks:

That is the whole of the correspondence on the subject?

Mr. Thompson wants to shut it off, but this persistent Scotchman says:

Yes, there are the vouchers.

Mr. Thompson: You might quote one of them.

Mr. Fraser reads:

"Colt Patent Fire Arms Mfg. Co., sold to Canadian Government, Department of Militia and Defence, September 11, 1914, 1,000 .45 calibre, automatic pistols, Government model, $18.50—$18,500."

Sir Charles Davidson: There appears to be a deduction for two pistols?

Mr. Fraser: Yes, there appears to have been two pistols short, and there is a deduction for these two pistols.

Sir Charles Davidson evidently did not want this to go in, for he tries to shut the Auditor General out by asking him about two pistols that were not there. But the Scotchman says:

The voucher continues: Shipped to J. Wesley Allison, Waddington, N.Y., duplicate copy sent to Valcartier to-day.

That is the man who had nothing to do with it. On page 21 Mr. Fraser states positively—I will not read his evidence—that the price of these automatic pistols was $18.50 with ten, five and two per cent off, which would bring the net price down to about $15.42. He got that evidence in for the third time, and they shut him off again. On page 23 there was a long discussion about these prices and as to whether Fraser would be able to substantiate the information he had got in New York. Sir Charles Davidson spent a couple of pages of the evidence quibbling over this, and then they were through again. Sir Charles Davidson asks:

Is there anything further?

Mr. Fraser: I think you suggested that Mr. Thompson should ask me who made the purchases.

Sir Charles Davidson: Yes.

Mr. Fraser: I was under the impression judging by the vouchers, that the purchases were made by Colonel Allison, but I read the evidence taken yesterday in which the Minister of Militia stated that Mr. Allison had nothing to do with the purchase of the pistols. The Minister of Militia stated that Mr. Allison had absolutely no connection with that, but he must have had some connection with it as the pistols were consigned to him.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Sir Charles Davidson: He may have been the consignee without having bought them?

Mr. Fraser: Certainly.

Sir Charles Davidson: Your impression grew out of the fact that they had been consigned to him?

Mr. Fraser: The voucher states so.

Sir Charles Davidson: Your impression was that he had been the purchaser because the voucher said he was the consignee?

Mr. Fraser: Yes.

What a severe cross-examination that was! How anxious this gentleman was to get the facts of the case! How his soul must have gone out in mortal combat almost, in the effort to find out who bought these pistols, whether Allison had anything to do with it or not. Such was the man who investigated these charges for the Government. Further on Mr. Fraser said that the prices were all wrong, that he could buy pistols himself by ones and twos for $18.50, and that the trade in Ottawa could buy them for that price with the trade discount off. And yet the Minister of Militia said that Mr. Cochrane complimented him on having saved the country so much money by paying only $18.50 for these pistols.

They called one T. M. Birkett, a gentleman well-known to my hon. friends opposite—certainly not a very bad Grit, anyhow. Mr. Birkett was put on the stand, and here is his examination, at page 28 of the evidence:

Q. Are you an importer of firearms? A. Yes.

Q. Have you imported, within the last two years any Colt's revolvers or Colt's automatic pistols? A. Yes.

Q. What was the price paid by your company for Colt's automatic pistols?

Sir Charles Davidson: Give the dates.

He did not want the prices before the war; he wanted them as high as possible.

A. We imported Colt automatics on September 25th, 1914, and on March 4th, 1915.

Q. How many did you import on the 25th of September, 1914? A. We only imported two, we are small dealers in those.

Q. What did you pay for them? A. We paid $18.50, less twelve and a half, less five, and less two.

Q. Making the net price per pistol how much? A. $15.06 f.o.b., Hartford, Conn.

Sir Charles Davidson: I would like to know the kind and quality, if there is any distinctive mark.

The witness: .45 calibre Government model, automatic pistol.

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. How many of those did you import on March 4th, 1915? A. Two.

Q. What were they? A. Two .45 calibre automatic pistols, Government model.

Q. What was the price? A. $18.50 each, less twelve and a half, less five, less two.

Sir Charles Davidson: You purchased them at the same price as you purchased the others?

The witness: Precisely.

Then they called another witness, George Easdale, Manager of the Ketchum Sporting Goods Company, of Ottawa. Mr. Easdale's examination was as follows:

Q. Have you imported Colt's revolvers ·455 calibre? A. Yes.

Q. Have you any invoices for them? A. I have not imported any Colt's ·455 service since before the fire, and the invoices were destroyed by fire in our establishment, but I have here a list of the wholesale prices. Our invoices up to last December were all destroyed in the fire.

Q. How many automatic pistols did you import on March 6th, 1915? A. One.

Q. That was a .45 calibre, Government model, Colt pistol? A. Yes.

Q. What did you pay for it? A. I paid $18.50, less twelve and a half per cent, and two per cent.

There is something left out there, as the next question makes plain:

Q. That is the same as Birkett's price? A. Yes, I think so.

So evidently the five per cent. discount was left out.

Q. Let us take another one, November 8th, 1915, how many did you import then? A. We imported two ·45 automatic pistols, Government model, price $18.50, less twelve and a half per cent and two per cent.

Q. Is that a Colt pistol? A. Yes.

Q. That was the same price as the other you imported? A. Yes.

Q. Were your other importations at the same price and with the same discount? A. Yes, I might mention, of course, that although we only import one or two at the time, we are on the wholesale list, and I get the same price as the wholesalers do.

How many did you import—same price as wholesalers do?

They next called Mr. H. W. Brown, a gentleman well-known to members of the Public Accounts Committee, purchasing agent of the Department of Militia and Defence. He was put under quite a cross-examination, and here is the report of part of it:

Let me ask you, initially, are you aware of the correspondence between the Auditor General and the Militia Department?

The witness: I know there has been correspondence, but I have not seen it lately, and I do not remember it, I have seen it but I do not remember what it was.

Sir Charles Davidson: Then you had better look at the correspondence.

The witness looked at the correspondence filed by the Auditor General.

The Witness. Yes, Sir, I have seen these letters.

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. Would you produce from your file the document showing how this contract for Colt's automatic pistols and revolvers was given?—A. So far as I know, there were no orders given for revolvers. The only orders I know of, I am speaking from memory, were orders for automatic pistols.

Sir Charles Davidson: The revolvers were only a small matter compared with the other. I think there were just twenty of them purchased, and you will recollect, Mr. Thompson, that it was said that these were handed over to the Sifton battery.

By Mr. Thompson, K.C.:

Q. What orders were given for automatic pistols?—A. The first order is one for 1,000 automatic pistols given on the 5th September to Colonel J. W. Allison, by authority of an Order in Council of that date. I have the Order in Council here before me.

Sir Charles Davidson: You might read that.

Mr. MURPHY: That is the man who had nothing to do with it?

Mr. CARVELL: Not a thing.

"The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 5th September, 1914, from the Minister of Militia and Defence, recommending that he be given authority to purchase for the Canadian military forces 1,000 automatic pistols, 45 calibre, at a price not exceeding $18.50 each; and 10,000 rounds of ammunition therefor, at a price not exceeding $40.00 per 1,000 rounds.

"The Committee advise that the requisite authority be granted accordingly.

"Rodolphe Boudreau,
"Clerk of the Privy Council.

"The Honourable the Minister of Militia and Defence."

In accordance with that Order in Council, and in accordance with verbal instructions which I got from the Deputy Minister of Militia, I wrote Colonel J. Wesley Allison, Morrisburg, Ontario, the same day, namely, the 5th of September, as follows:

"Ottawa, Sept. 5th, 1914.

"Sir,—

"I am directed to request you to be good enough to procure and supply to this department, at as early a date as possible, 1,000 automatic pistols, 45 calibre, at a price not exceeding $18.50 each; and 10,000 rounds of ammunition therefor, at a price not exceeding $40.00 per 1,000 rounds; subject to any instructions, verbal or others, which you may have already received. Shipping instructions will be furnished later on. The invoice, in triplicate, should be sent to the undersigned.

"I have the honour to be,
"Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"H. W. Brown,
"Director of Contracts.

"Colonel J. Wesley Allison,
"Morrisburg, Ont."

Mr. Speaker, can any man imagine, in the first place, that evidence like that could be given before a public investigation in Canada? But, such evidence having been given, can you imagine this high commissioner, clothed with his great powers, never having brought to the witness stand Sir Sam Hughes, never having brought back Mr. J. Wesley Allison, doing nothing whatever to investigate this matter further, but closing the books so far as it was concerned? And I suppose he will come back and report to

this House that everything is lovely, and that there is no trouble in the country over the purchase of automatic pistols. It is true, they brought Mr. Brown back and hectored him for a day. He read order in council after order in council, and letter after letter, the only effect of which was to prove the case more completely and make it worse. They proved at least two orders in council to buy these from the Colt people themselves, and one order in council absolutely wide open.

Now, is there any man on the other side of this House so absolutely innocent that he believes that order in council having been put through by this Government directing the Director of Contracts to purchase these pistols from Mr. J. Wesley Allison at a price not exceeding $18.50——

Mr. REID: There was no order in council of that kind.

Mr. CARVELL: No, but the order in council was to purchase them, and a letter followed, authorized by the deputy minister, on the strength of that order in council—

Mr. REID: That is the way to put it.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to put it quite fairly. Is there a man in this House or out of it, so innocent that he believes that the minister was innocent in that transaction? When Mr. J. Wesley Allison was told to buy these automatic pistols at a price not exceeding $18.50, do you suppose he was going to buy them at less? And is there any man so innocent as to believe that when the Colt Arms Company will sell two pistols to Birkett and two to Ketchum for $18.50, less discounts amounting to three or four dollars—their ordinary trade discount—that these men are going to get the whole $18.50 from the Government? I put it to the Minister of Customs.

Mr. REID: Birketts are wholesale dealers, and get the trade discounts.

Mr. CARVELL: Then, why on earth did not they get some wholesale dealer to buy them? Why did not they get the Minister of Railways to buy them? He is a wholesale dealer. He could have bought them for $18.50, less the trade discount. middleman, middleman, middleman—everywhere you go it is the middleman. Why could he not go to some one here in Ottawa? Why could he not go to Birkett's? If there was any commission to be made, why not give it to them? They are in the business. Why not go to Ketchum's; why n t to hundreds and thousands of people in Canada who are in the business and get the trade discounts? The hon. Minister of Customs tries to explain these things away, but there they are; I put them before him and before the Government. Do my hon. friends opposite want this country to go through another farce? Do they want to hand over the inquiry into a matter involving hundreds of millions of dollars, under the conditions that I have described this afternoon, to such an organization as that to which I have referred? Are they sincere in that? I cannot believe it. These things must be investigated in the broad light of day; they must be investigated by this Parliament, and I tell my hon. friends right here and now that the people will stand for nothing less than that. Hon. gentlemen might as well face the situation now as at any other time.

I realize the extreme gravity of the charges that I have made this afternoon and evening. I make them with full realization of my responsibility as a member of Parliament. I have been a member of the House now since 1904; I have been a barrister in the province of New Brunswick for nearly a quarter of a century; I have made my living during that time by practising my profession in the courts, and I think I know something about the rights, duties and privileges of a barrister. I think I know, too, what is required by the ordinary common decency of this country when a man stands up in his place in Parliament or in any public place and makes statements of the kind which I have placed before you this afternoon and evening. Sir, I do not believe that the Government —I do not want to believe that the Government—are going to allow this session of Parliament to pass without giving us a chance to investigate these matters to the very bottom. If there is anything in which I am wrong, set me right; if there is anything which have not made strong enough give me an opportunity and I will supplement it with the real facts of the case. I have pointed out the condition of affairs in Canada; I have pointed out the manner in which the shell contracts have been let and the manner in which the hay transactions have been bungled in my province. I want my people to know that, by the manner in which this thing has been, not bungled, but botched in the interests of Tory friends in New Brunswick—my constituents are compelled to take $13 a ton for their hay, whereas the people in the province of Quebec, where the Govern-

ment are buying the hay and pressing it themselves, are getting $17. In the daily papers to-day you will find No. 2 hay quoted at $20.50 in Montreal. Take away $1.25 for pressing and $1.75 for freight, and you get back to $17. In Quebec the farmer is getting $17, whereas my constituents are getting $13, or $13.50 at the very outside. In Nova Scotia—I am not going into that, but I am told that the Government are pressing there, and the contractors are not making the horrible rake-offs that they are making in my province. Perhaps I am taking a more serious view of the condition of affairs in Canada than I should. I confessed to you this afternoon that I took a somewhat pessimistic view of it; I repeat that now. The Government say that they are going to increase our army to half a million men. We have now little over 200,000; I tell you that they have a gigantic task on their hands to raise the other 300,000 men. I have no doubt they will find enough Conservatives to fill up the offices, but I am afraid they will have some difficulty in getting enough Liberals between the ages of eighteen and forty-five to fill the ranks.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: The Liberals are allowed to fill up the ranks, but that is as far as they are allowed to go in the defence of the Empire.

Mr. SMYTH: That is not correct.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it not? I will discuss that with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia; I am not going to discuss it with any back-bencher. I will have an opportunity of coming face to face with the Minister of Militia to discuss this matter, and I will prove my statements.

Mr. SYMTH: That is absolutely false.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You are paid to tell that.

Mr. SMYTH: That is absolutely false, too.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my duty to say that the expression which the hon. gentleman has just made use of, that " it is absolutely false," is unparliamentary and offensive, and I should like the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. SMYTH: Of course, I bow to your ruling, but I say it is absolutely false, because the colonel of my regiment is a Liberal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. CARVELL: Let it go, Mr. Speaker; it is another case of a man who forgets to be a gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, immediately after you called him to order, repeated the very offensive words which he had used. The other day, of your own motion, you required me—and very properly so—to withdraw an expression which I had made use of with regard to the Solicitor General. There should be one rule in this House, for members on one side as well as for members on the other.

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly always do my best to have but one rule in this House for members on both sides of the House. As soon as I heard the hon. member say that the statement was false, I rose and called him to order, and asked him to withdraw it. The hon. gentleman said that he was ready to submit to my ruling; the hon. member for St. John says that he repeated the expression.

Mr. CARVELL: Immediately repeated it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood that the hon. gentleman had withdrawn the remark; I did not catch the other words. If the hon. gentleman repeated it, I must fulfil my duty and ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. SMYTH: Of course, I bow to your ruling, but will you allow me to explain? The hon. gentleman just said—

Mr. CARVELL: I object, Mr. Speaker, to any explanations; the hon. gentleman withdraws it, and that is the end of it.

Mr. SMYTH: He made a mis-statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: I object to any explanations on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the incident is closed; I understand that the hon. member has withdrawn the remark.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker, after this little breeze, I shall spend a few moments in trying to collect my scattered thoughts. I have tried to draw the attention of the country to the very serious conditions which have prevailed. I have tried to point out that the Government will have some difficulty in getting 300,000 men. But, Sir, it is the duty of this Government to get them, if that number of men is necessary in order to assist

in bringing this war to a successful conclusion. I am not advocating conscription—I do not like that term; I am not going to advocate force of any kind; but there are hundreds of means by which this Government can get men, if they would adopt different methods from those to which they are adhering at the present time. What do you think must be the view of the ordinary man of this country when he reads of the horrible pilfering of public trust funds which has been the subject of newspaper articles during the last two or three months? What will be the opinion of the man who has a family to support and who feels that if he goes away his wife and family may become a public charge? What will be the thoughts of the man who, perhaps, has scarcely enough money to keep body and soul together, when he looks around him and sees the political henchmen of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government profiting, not by the thousands of dollars, but by the tens and hundreds of thousands? I tell you, Sir, they must adopt a new principle, and turn over a new leaf, if they are going to get men. I tell them that if they will go at this thing honestly, uprightly, decently, patriotically, they can get the men; but they cannot do it by conducting affairs as they have been conducting them in the past. I asked the Government this afternoon if it was true that Mr. Lloyd George had sent a message over here that he did not want to have these matters investigated. I was not able to get an answer and I do not believe it is true. But if it be true, if Mr. Lloyd George does not want us to investigate his end of the transaction, I want our end of it investigated. If this Government has been misappropriating millions of our money—and the Minister of Finance says we are paying our proportionate share of these expenditures—we want our end of it investigated. I quite understand the position in which the British Government finds itself to-day. It is up against the most horrible proposition any government has had to face in the last one hundred years. The British Government wants every man, and every dollar, and every round of ammunition, and every ounce of influence of any kind that it can command, in order to bring the war to a successful conclusion. It is compelled by force of circumstances to deal with the men who occupy the Treasury benches in Canada to-day. It cannot come over here and quarrel with these men and tell them publicly the things that I am telling them to-night. It would not be politic. The British Government is bound to look to these men so long as they remain in office, in order to have them help them out of its troubles. But, if everything was all right, why did the British Government find it necessary to send a representative over here in the person of Mr. D. A. Thomas? And if things were all right after Mr. Thomas came here and investigated, why was it necessary to dismiss in ignominy the old Shell Commission, reorganize it, and form a new one? These are the questions I want the Government to answer. If things are all right why do these things happen? Why does Toronto Saturday Night announce: No new orders for Canada, while Russia tries to place $150,000,000 contract in the United States? Why do manufacturers all around the city the last day or two tell you that there are to be no more war orders for Canada? Why is it published in the public press? I think it is the duty of the Government to tell us at once whether it is true that no more orders for munitions are coming to Canada. If it be true it is a misfortune for Canada because it is, no doubt, of enormous advantage to us that our labourers be kept busy, that our factories be kept humming and our industrial life be kept in as high a state of efficiency as possible. It is of infinitely greater importance to this country to know whether the Government of Canada has so mismanaged, yes, so grossly mismanaged the affairs that the British Government has entrusted to its sacred charge, that the British Government absolutely refuses to come over here and do any more business with our Government? That is the lamentable part of it, the part of it to which I wish to direct the attention of members of the Government and their supporters. I repeat that it is the duty of the Government, and I hope they will not allow the sun to go down again, before they state to the House what the facts are in connection with this lamentable condition of affairs which exists in Canada to-day. How can these men expect recruits to pour in when they see this horrible condition of affairs existing? How can they expect recruits when they know that this petty political patronage is going on in every hamlet in Canada? A Liberal cannot get a chance to sell a pound of tea to the soldiers.

Mr. WILCOX: Rot.

Mr. CARVELL: It is not rot; it is a fact. It is known to every one of you. There is not a man sitting over there who is not guilty clear to the ground.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman knows himself, I think, that the expression which he has just directed to the members of this House of knowing that they are guilty, is offensive and unparliamentary.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps I might be allowed to qualify the word "guilty" by saying "guilty of looking after party patronage."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: What do I understand the hon. member to say?

Mr. CARVELL: I say: guilty of looking after party patronage. That is the sense in which I used the word. I try to measure my words and to use proper language. When you consider this state of affairs, when you consider that people all over the country are making sacrifices in order to work out this great problem which we have staring us in the face; when you consider the fact that public bodies, municipal corporations, have been granting money by the thousands and tens of thousands to supplement our patriotic fund; when you consider the great campaign going on in Montreal and Toronto to-day to raise millions for the patriotic fund; when you consider that in every hamlet in this country the women are organized in Red Cross societies and patriotic societies; when they are saving their quarters and sometimes their dimes in order to add to the amount of money available for these objects of mercy; when you realize that even the school children are holding concerts and saving the pennies and dimes for the same purpose; when you consider that the women of this country, the mothers, sisters and wives, are knitting and praying and praying and knitting, from end to end of Canada, for the safety and comfort of their dear ones at the front; when you realize the terrible sacrifices that the poor people of this country are making; when you realize the awful responsibility resting on every public man, yes, on every private citizen in Canada, to do his bit, and to do it in the most manly and upright manner, in order to bring the war to a successful conclusion; and then place against that the condition of affairs I have been describing here this evening; how can you go out and ask people to recruit, to take the chance of giving up their lives, to put their loved ones in the charge of charitable institutions in order that they may go to fight for their country?

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the very patient attention which you have given to me. It has not been a pleasant duty, I can assure you, to lay before you these facts which I have been compelled to state this afternoon. But I have performed the duty to the very best of my ability. I have placed before this country the facts as I see them, as I know them; and I can only say, in conclusion, that if the Government will give us a committee of this House, I will guarantee to prove every word I have stated, and I will supplement it by very much which I have not stated.

Mr. S. FRANCIS GLASS (Middlesex East): Mr. Speaker, the congratulations that have been extended to you by eminent leaders and other members of this House of high standing in public life and in the country but emphasize the honour conferred upon you. In my humble sphere as one of the rank and file among those who have the honour of representation here, I desire to join in the congratulations and endorse the kindly sentiments that have been extended to you. The position of Speaker is not only an honourable one, but an historic one. I understand that in England it dates back to the year 1382. While it carries with it the highest honour within the gift of Parliament, it likewise symbolizes confidence and trust in the occupant. But great as are the responsibilities involved and onerous the duties, I venture to say they will be discharged by you efficiently, and with that fairness, dignity, and impartiality which for nearly the last half century have characterized those eminent men who have been elected to fill that honourable post. I will go further and congratulate the House on the choice it has made.

The unusual conditions which we are called upon to meet remind us of the weighty problems with which this country is confronted at the present time. It seems, therefore, peculiarly fitting that in the sentiments expressed by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and by the right hon. the Prime Minister and by other members who have already addressed this House, there should be a preponderance of opinion and sentiment favourable to a unity of purpose and co-operation in the task that lies before us which on ordinary occasions might not be expected. Let me read the words used

by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in his address a few days ago. He said:

> When the war broke out, both parties in this House agreed that it was the duty of the Canadian people to participate in the war to the fulness of our resources.

Further on in his address the right hon. gentleman said:

> We on this side of the House, His Majesty's loyal Opposition, feel that we should declare that we are perhaps more than ever before imbued with the responsibility which appertains to an opposition, and especially in time of war. It will be our duty to criticise: to criticise fairly under all circumstances, and to criticise forcibly perhaps, but always to criticise wherever there is cause for criticism. It will also be our duty, and a far more pleasant duty it is, to support whatever there is just cause to support. We come to this House with this one aim only: to contribute as far as may be in our power to the final and complete victory of the Allies over Germany.

If the right hon. gentleman speaks, as he should, for those whom he leads, it seems to me that some of his followers have not hewn closely to the high and lofty spirit of patriotism which was so much in evidence throughout the address of their right hon. leader.

I have listened patiently, and with a great deal of interest, to my hon. friend who has just preceded me (Mr. Carvell). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I had hoped to have four or five hours of this sitting within which to address the few observations I might have to make to this House, but from the very extended remarks he has made, and at this late hour, I am afraid I will have to considerably curtail them. It is said that one in public life must be over-praised by his friends to compensate for the harsh criticism that he sometimes receives from his enemies. If the tone of this debate continues on the lines which have been followed by some members of the Opposition, I am afraid, Sir, that we will have to extend to our friends on this side of the House who have been so harshly criticised a degree of praise that will overtax the thermometer to which my friend the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wilcox) referred. The people of this country are awakened to a sense of the mighty problems involved in the prosecution of this war. I say that no matter by what standard we measure it, this war is without precedent or parallel. If we measure it by the destructiveness of the weapons employed, nothing so horrible has ever been known. Inventive genius has been exhausted to find new ways by which man can kill his fellow man. The trade of the whole world has been deranged. Transportation has been crippled, especially so by the withdrawal of shipping from the customary channels to provide for the more urgent needs of war. Not only the lack of ships, but the increased risks of the sea have resulted in higher carrying charges. As a result, it is said that it costs three times as much to transport a bushel of wheat at the present time as it did in times of peace.

And why all this struggle; why this destruction of life and of property? There is a cause to be found in that false philosophy, that false doctrine, that might makes right. McCutcheon has, in a recent cartoon, illustrated two characters, one representing War, and the other Anarchy, curious, hideous looking monsters, and across the breast of War was written the words, "Might is right," while across that of Anarchy was written, "dynamite is right." It seems to me to be difficult to draw a distinction between these two doctrines. If we support the doctrine that might is right, we must be prepared to repudiate all the moral code upon which we relied for the protection of individual right, and for the guarantee of private property. There is one lesson, and that is, that nations which aspire to mere physical supremacy can have no hope of immortality. The fact that they put their faith in force is proof positive that they have only the seeds of death. The pathway of human progress, from ancient times down, has been strewn with the wrecks of empires which at the zenith of their power thought themselves invincible. We realize that Germany is the most resolute, the most cunning, implacable, unscrupulous foe ever arrayed against our country. We are fighting against a military organization which for forty years has been preparing for this struggle. Last May they were making shells at the rate of over 250,000 a day, while the Motherland was producing 2.500 high explosive shells and 13,000 shrapnel. The result of these superhuman efforts of Germany were seen in the tremendous turnover in Russia. Through a tornado of shells Galicia was won back, and the Austrian morale was restored, Poland came under the invader's foot, and a large part of the Balkan provinces have been overrun. The whole explanation of the astonishing success of the enemy, except in the case of Serbia, was that the Germans had enor-

mous supplies of ammunition, whilst, compared with them, we had none; we were short of guns, especially of machine guns. However, this preponderating advantage has to a very large extent been overcome.

That brings me to the point in the discussion which has taken up a large part of the time of my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), the munition question, which I think, has taken up the greater part of the debate since its commencement. I do not know that I can add anything new, but I do not think that the remarks of my hon. friend from Carleton will tend to stimulate and influence and increase production amongst the manufacturers of this country. From a patriotic point of view, from a sense of giving stimulus to industry in this country, I am afraid that the remarks he has made this afternoon, if they are spread throughout the country, as no doubt they will be, will rather tend to discourage the development of our industries along these lines. I noted that my hon. friend said, with a great deal of force and vigour, that he was prepared to prove every statement that he had made.

My hon. friend throughout his remarks gave a great deal of attention to that species of industries which he called mushroom industries, and in connection with these mushroom industries, he presumed to refer to an industry in the city of London. I would like to ask my hon. friend what is the definition of a mushroom industry. I do not know what his remark means as applied to those institutions which have carried out their contracts and have delivered the goods to the War Department. My hon. friend referred to an institution in St. Catharines, which, he said, had received a large order for shrapnel shells. Could my hon. friend tell me just how many shells were given to this company in St. Catharines to which he refers?

Mr. CARVELL: My notes have gone to Hansard, but when I get them back I will be only too glad to.

Mr. GLASS: My hon. friend has no doubt that there was an order for shrapnel shells given to this firm to which he refers?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot carry all these things in my head. But if I made the statement this afternoon I stand behind it.

Mr. GLASS: My information is that the Metal Drawing Company of St. Catharines, incorporated with a capital of $50,000, took over the plant of the Reo Motor Company to which he referred.

Mr. CARVELL: I made that statement.

Mr. GLASS: We are then referring to the same company?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. GLASS: An order was given for brass cartridge cases, not shells, and not shrapnel—brass cartridge cases were never before made in Canada, and, as far as I know, not made by any other plant now. I will not say that they are not made now, because I do not know.

An hon. MEMBER: Not made at that time.

Mr. GLASS: Not at that time, anyway. This company use presses, not lathes, for their work, and they added to their plant presses costing $200,000 to carry on the manufacture of these cartridge cases. Some one had to go into this business if Canada was to make fixed ammunition. Even if an order for shrapnel had been given to them I would be unable to appreciate the force of the argument that my hon. friend put up this afternoon. I would be rather pleased to know that these orders had been so widely distributed all over the country because the fundamental need of
10 p.m. the industries of this country was to distribute these orders so that labour might be employed as far as practicable. That was the object of the Government.

My hon. friend has taken a good deal of time to discuss the question of prices, which has been discussed amply and fully by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me.

I note that the hon. gentleman this afternoon read out of the Liberal party the Free Press of Ottawa. I fancy that the Free Press will survive. I do not even know now whether the hon. gentleman altogether represents the views of the Liberals in this House, or of the members of the Liberal party, but I do know that this paper has been recognized as a Liberal organ in this city, and my hon. friend knows that during the time the Liberal party controlled the Government that paper received its share of the Government patronage. Therefore it was rightly considered as a Liberal paper.

Just here I want to refer to the fact that my hon. friend was very much incensed because he was interrupted on one or two occasions this afternoon. My attention has

been drawn to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) was interrupted no less than sixty-three times during his address to the House yesterday and several times by the hon. gentleman who objected to-day.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I should call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he is very much in error. I have no recollection of raising any objection. I tried to answer questions put to me, and I thought that I did so with some degree of success. I did not know that I had objected seriously at all.

Mr. GLASS: I forget the incidents in connection with these interruptions, but if I have wrongfully interpreted the hon. gentleman's attitude I regret it and take it back.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is no misinterpretation at all. I asked the hon. gentleman to explain in regard to the St. Catharines business, and he could not answer the question and consequently objected.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker, I make no comment.

Mr. GLASS: In the House yesterday the hon. member for Carleton asked for some information in regard to the shell question, and the Free Press had some observations concerning it. It says:

> In the House of Commons yesterday Mr. Carvell asked the Minister of Marine why he did not read a complete list of the companies who had received contracts from the Bertram Shell Committee.
>
> "Go to the Shell Committee and get them," was Mr. Hazen's suggestion.
>
> "Nice chance we would have of getting them," commented Mr. E. M. Macdonald.
>
> "While the minister is in the giving mood," observed Mr. Carvell, "I would ask him to get the dates of the contracts, the quality of the munitions to be supplied, and the price to be paid as well."
>
> Would it be believed that all this information, in just as complete and detailed a form as Mr. Carvell suggests, was actually supplied to the Liberal Opposition last July? Messrs. Carvell, Macdonald and Pugsley seem to be slashing around in the dark when men sitting alongside of them are in possession of documents which, though confidential, would at least enlighten them if they seek only for facts. These gentlemen pretend to laugh when The Free Press opinion of this shell business is quoted; but their laughter is as nothing to the amusement The Free Press derives from such dialogue as the one quoted above.
>
> To sane men it is unnecessary to argue that the Bertram Shell Committee could not reveal all its operations in the newspapers. But knowing as we do that the Bertram Shell Committee did take the Liberal Opposition into its confidence privately, in regard to all the contracts placed in the period under criticism, how can we interpret otherwise than as petty partisanship the efforts in some quarters to create the impression in the public mind that there has been a refusal to "lift the veil"?
>
> And The Free Press months ago set its face against petty partisanship for the duration of the war.

The Free Press has referred to these charges and to the Shell Committee scandals, as they may be called, and, in the edition of the 21st January, it published again the statement made by General Bertram. I think it is regrettable that Sir Alexander Bertram, who has sacrificed so much, who has so worthily discharged his duties, and who has been honoured by his King only recently in recognition of his services, should be made the subject of reflections of this kind, and that these criticisms should be spread broadcast throughout the country. General Bertram is a gentleman who is held in the highest esteem by all who know him, and his honour cannot be questioned. General Bertram, in a statement issued on December 27 last, said:

> At the outset, I wish it to be understood that I am not a politician seeking honours or graft. I have been trying to do a job faithfully and honestly, and to do something which will be a credit to the country. Evidently what little I have done has not pleased some—the Daily Mail, of Montreal, and others.
>
> There is absolutely no truth in the report of my resignation, said Gen. Bertram. I have not resigned and don't intend to. I have been working night and day for fourteen months, and it has undermined my health. Mr. Flavelle urged me to take a holiday. I expect to be away a month or six weeks.
>
> Now I suppose it is proper, since I am going away, to make some answer to my critics. I want to clear the air. I have seldom sought to be interviewed, but feel now that it is necessary.
>
> I was asked to undertake a contract by the British War Office, and I have here the contracts showing that these were allotted through myself to manufacturers at prices fixed in all but one instance by the British War Office. That single instance I refer to was a contract for 100,000 shells at a price fixed by myself. I had nothing to go by, or any records to assist me. In comparison, I can show that the prices for similar work on a contract let through J. P. Morgan & Co., New York, were $1.45 per shell higher. I was guided by American prices, and it was due to the ability of our manufacturers and mechanics that Canada was able to produce these shells much cheaper and quicker than elsewhere.

My hon. friend knows very well that in the early days of the war it was difficult to get manufacturers to take the responsibility of putting in equipment for manufacturing shells. In my own city of London the firm of E. Leonard Sons & Company, of which Mr. Frank Leonard is the head—he has two sons rendering distinguished

service at the front to-day—were offered orders for manufacturing shells, but at the start they did not feel that they had the machinery and equipment adapted for it, and at the prices offered and under the conditions at that time they did not feel disposed to accept the order. It was not until shells had been manufactured in this country for some time that Mr. Leonard, stirred no doubt by the splendid valour of his sons at the front and imbued with their loyalty and patriotism, made up his mind to go into the shell business. When the earnest appeal for shells came he accepted orders under the regular terms and conditions. My hon. friend seems to make a great deal of the fact that repeat orders were given for a lesser price than the original orders, that the price kept getting lower with successive orders until it has got down possibly to rock bottom. I do not think there is anything mysterious about that. I do not think my hon. friend is dull of comprehension at all. He told us this afternoon that he was both a lawyer and a farmer. Well, even a lawyer or a farmer can readily appreciate that experience and increased orders must regulate to some extent the cost of production. Speaking of lawyers reminds me of a little skit I saw in the Globe recently. A young fellow from the country went to town to study law, but after three days he came back home again. His father said: "Well, son, didn't you like it?" "No," said the boy, "I am sorry I ever learned it." My hon. friend has objected that shell orders have been given to certain firms, and he asks what connection railway companies have with making shells. I believe that one of the criticisms my hon. friend made later on in his speech was that the Government had not used the Transcona shops for manufacturing shells. In this crisis, so long as the goods are delivered, it makes no difference who makes the shells. The shells are what the people want and that is what the Government try to obtain.

I am not in a position to make any reply to my hon. friend's remarks about the hay scandal in his province, but I have no doubt the Minister of Agriculture will reply to him to the full satisfaction of this House. If I had any observation to make on that head, I would say that the farmers in his part of the country seem to be a good deal easier and softer than the farmers in my part would be. I submit that we should take a great deal of what my hon. friend has said this afternoon with a degree of reserve, for I remember former occasions on which his judgment did not seem mature and reasonable. I wish to refer for a moment or two to some of the criticisms made by my hon. friend of the Militia Department's Estimates when they were up in the House in the year 1914. At that time my hon. friend said:

> The principal cause of the trouble with the minister (referring to the Minister of Militia) and his top-heavy Militia is the report of a General named French, who came to this country some years ago, and in my judgment his visit was one of the greatest misfortunes that has befallen Canada.

Further on he says:

> I told the late Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) publicly and privately, that in adopting the ridiculous and unreasonable report of this gentleman he had committed a great mistake. It might be all right if General French were reporting on the conditions in Bulgaria, or Russia, or Germany, or even Italy, but when it comes to a country like Canada where there is no possibility of trouble his ideas are ridiculous. There is no more possibility of war breaking out between Canada and any country in the world than there is of the Minister of Militia and myself committing suicide between now and to-morrow morning. There might of course be a possibility of the Empire being at war and we might find it our duty to volunteer.

Further on he says:

> We do not want this top-heavy militia force.

Mr. CARVELL: I would ask whether my hon. friend knows that the Conservative party have canned and discarded within the last three weeks some tons of literature which they had had prepared on the French incident?

Mr. GLASS: My hon. friend knows more about the Tory literature than I do.

Mr. ROGERS: I should know something about this. If any such thing had happened I should certainly have some knowledge of it, but I can assure my hon. friend that his statement is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. CARVELL: In view of what is taking place in Europe.

Mr. GLASS (reading):

> The difficulty in arguing with my hon. friend is that he seems to believe in it. When a man really believes in such a policy as that, it is arguing with a crazy man, because there is no good in arguing with him. Does the minister believe that the Canadian Militia works for the benefit of any man in Canada, morally, religiously or in any other way in the world? He does not have enough of it to improve him physically. When I was in Germany, I admit, I could see the result of military training there. You could see it as the men walked along the street. In Canada you do not get enough military training to be any benefit physically.

All you get in the militia of Canada is that you teach about twenty-five per cent of the men in Canada how to get drunk. That is the size of it.

Further on the hon. gentleman said:

The trouble is my hon. friend is living in a fool's paradise over this. I believe he is sincere about it, and as I said before that is the difficulty. I am sincere when I say that I believe my hon. friend is sincere about it. He lives in this thing, he is dreaming over it, and he believes all of these fairy tales he is telling. I want to tell him they are only fairy tales and they do not exist.

This was six weeks before the declaration of war.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. gentleman tell me how many of the first contingent had performed their annual drill during the three or four months prior to their going?

Mr. GLASS: I am not in a position to give my hon. friend that information, nor do I see what material bearing it has on the question. I am quoting these remarks of his to show that we have to take his words with reserve, because in the past we have not found them consistent nor altogether right. Referring to the engineering corps, the hon. gentleman said:

What is the good of an engineering corps unless you have highly trained technical officers? If you would take farmers or lumberjacks they would be some good because they know how to do a good many things.

If you can find two other sentences in Hansard, side by side, that are so inconsistent as these two, I should like to know where they are to be found. First, the hon. gentleman calls for trained technical officers, and then suggests that farmers or lumberjacks should be taken. I agree that the farmer is an intelligent man and understands a good many things, but I think the average man would question his adaptability as a technically-trained officer. The hon. gentleman proceeds:

The men there are dudes, lying around and drinking booze. They are good enough, decent fellows out of camp, but when they get into camp it is simply drink booze from the day they come until they leave.

On the same day, the hon. gentleman made these observations, as recorded at page 4620 of Hansard. He was showing the minister how to be economical, how to spend money so that it would be good for the country.

If the minister would spend this money in something that was of real value to the people, I would not mind so much, although I would not consent to spending $15,000,000 a year. On rifle associations and bands—something of real value—he is only spending $80,000. If he would take half a million dollars of this money he is squandering and get some decent bands in the country he would be doing some good.

That is the hon. gentleman's idea of what was most essential at that time, before the war. He objected to the expenditure on clothing, munitions and arms, and all the accoutrements of the army. If the minister would discontinue his extravagance in building armouries, and training militia, and would buy half a million dollars' worth of bands—that is what the hon. gentleman thought the country most needed. He referred on this occasion to the fact that he had been in Germany, and had seen the result of military training there. He should have observed the meticulous preparations of the Germans, and, having had the benefit of such observations, one would naturally have looked for a broader vision and a keener perception of the future than that which he displays.

But he is not alone in the views he expressed on that memorable day. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) spoke on the same day and on the same question. I refer to his speech at page 4591 of Hansard:

Canada is simply going military-mad under my hon. friend.

Referring, of course, to the Minister of Militia. He goes on:

This huge expenditure on militia is simply monstrous, and the people of this country will revolt at such useless extravagance.

Referring to the cadet movement in Quebec, he said:

The cadet movement is not a new institution.... My hon. friend has invented nothing and he will deceive no one. In our day the Minister of Militia did not try to impress upon the minds of the youth the foolish idea that war was imminent and that our country was to be a camp of warriors and of barbarians, as in the days of old.

And my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) at that time quoted a line from the pen of Eliza Cook, which, in view of subsequent events, seems to have been most appropriate:

Never trust the soft breathing that preaches of peace
With a pledge giving lip and a smile-lighted eye;
Hear it all with good will, but be provident still,
With men that are earnest and powder that's dry.

On the same occasion the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) gave expression to his sentiments in connection with the Address, at page 4580:

There is no danger in sight; why, then, raise the militia of this country to the enormous figure of between 75,000 and 80,000 men? There is no reason for it; there is no emergency in sight, and there will be none in our day and generation.

This was six weeks before the war. Further, the hon. gentleman said that on one occasion the Minister of Militia had said that he could turn out 750,000 men if the necessity arose, and then proceeded:

Well, he does not believe, I do not believe, and nobody believes, that the occasion for turning out such a large number of men will ever arise in our lifetime, or in the lifetime of the children who are to come after us.

That was the foresight that this hon. gentleman possessed at that time, in reference to the urgency of preparation.

I wish now to refer to some remarks that my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) made the other day. The hon. member wished to make some capital—or I do not know what he was trying to get at—about the circumstances of the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country being called to the council of the Imperial Cabinet. And he went ahead to give statements made by Sir George Paish. I do not know that what Sir George Paish thinks or says has any more significance than what the press of England says. I believe that to a greater degree than any personal influence the press of the country directs public opinion. We remember that on the 1st of January the right hon. Prime Minister announced an increase of the forces of this country to half a million, and this is what the Post of January 4 said on that subject:

Canada had already authorized the raising of 250,000 men, so at the outbreak of war, Canada determined to contribute an army about the size of the existing British Army—and she has now doubled it. Together with Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, we are contributing men and treasure to the common cause of the Allies. Each and all of the self-governing Dominions have won imperishable honour in the field. It is not too soon to understand what these things mean, for their significance is for the present, as well as for the future. What do the people of the Dominion mean by the word "Empire"? Even the most perfervid among those who opposed the Imperial idea before the war would hardly have affirmed that the Dominions considered it to mean a military autocracy. The Dominions are self-governing communities exercising in practice a perfect autonomy of government. Their local patriotism is intense, yet they somehow succeed in disproving the theory that local patriotism and a sentiment for something wider cannot exist together. Before the war there were many excellent people who were quite unable to perceive why the existing condition of affairs was not in itself sufficient.

The war has at least demonstrated the fact that the body of civilization and tradition and the material possessions of the Empire are liable to the most furious and determined attack, and it follows that as security can only be gained by unity, some closer form of unity is required. It also follows that as every state or assembly of states is exposed to the war of commerce in which the war of arms is often implicit, a security in this respect is also required, and it can only be attained by the same method of a common organization. In so far as this country is concerned, it has long been clear that, in default of some such coherent scheme of association with the overseas Dominions, she must decline from her place among the nations. The true conception of Imperial development has been defined by Lord Milner as "the permanent organic union of free commonwealths and states to maintain the greatest ideals common to them all." War was declared by this country without, so far as is known, consultation with the Dominions. Their entrance into the war was an act of free will; therefore the organic union has for the moment been actually achieved. That momentous fact does in itself alter at a stroke the whole situation. It is not England alone who is fighting on the side of the Allies, but the British Empire—a very different thing. Nor is it conceivable that in the war the Empire should be acting as an organic whole, and that in peace it should resolve itself into separate parts, only connected each to the other by casual and indeterminate relations, subject to the whim of the colonial office. The old conditions cannot be resumed, because the people will not have them. That the present Government should have steadily declined to invite the premiers of the Dominions to their councils is greatly to be deplored. It is no longer a question of courtesy or of expediency; it is a question of right. The people are indifferent no longer. Men who have fought together side by side cease to regard one another as strangers. The nation will insist that no matter whatever else is done in the interval, the Dominions should have an equal voice in the framing of the terms of peace.

This is the view of the Post as to what effect the co-operation of the Dominion in the affairs of the Empire would have upon its future destinies and politics. It may be that considerable significance and honour was attached to the visit of the Prime Minister of this country to the councils of the Empire, and it is strange that there should be any objection to his not being prepared to make any complete statement as to what occurred at that time.

In the earlier part of my remarks, I referred to the loyal words of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition: "It will be our pleasant duty to support whatever it is just to support." As I listened to the remarks of my hon. friend this afternoon, I wondered, having in regard the statement of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, if the hon. gentleman really saw anything to support. It looks very much as if the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite as to their duties in this House is

that they should oppose and criticise everything. It looks as if they have made up their minds in advance that there is nothing good in the Government of this country. My hon. friend devoted a good deal of time to the subject of partisanship and patronage, and particularly to the partisanship exercised in the province which he represents, as well as in Nova Scotia. He was good enough, in the rambling remarks which he made, to take up the politics of even the distant province of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman says that he has been a member of this House since 1904. I should like to ask him if, during the time that he occupied a seat on the government side of the House, when the Government of which he was a member had the patronage, he on any single occasion, in connection with the Civil Service in his constituency, recommended a Conservative to office.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, many of them. And I may tell my hon. friend that when the Government went out of office, I had not a solitary constituent in the Civil Service at Ottawa, and I had but one on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. GLASS: I am very glad that there is some good in my hon. friend after all. However, aside from that, I do not think my hon. friend expects that his personal Liberal friends in his constituency have the primary right to consideration in the matter of vacancies that may occur within his district. That is contrary to the accepted rule of party government, anyway, and contrary to the practice of his party when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

The address of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. G. W. Kyte) the other evening, until he reached the small and picayune politics to which I am going to refer, was full of interest and fair criticism. But I wonder if my hon. friend, when the pages of history are written, will recall with pride the fact that in this Parliament, at a time when his leader pledged his support to this Government, he discussed the matter as to whether a Conservative or a Liberal barber should have the right to shave a soldier in Ottawa, or as to whether a Liberal or a Conservative should do the laundry work in the militia. In this time of mighty conflict, when all the physical, moral, and material forces at our command should be co-ordinated and concentrated to the purpose of prosecuting this war, remarks of this kind are scarcely in place, and I hardly think that my hon. friend will have cause for congratulation when he comes to review the words of the speech which he made the other evening.

Very frequently the attitude assumed by an opposition is that of pessimism. I have been looking for a definition of pessimism, and I find that the dictionary defines it as the doctrine that everything in nature is ordered for or tends to the worst, or that the whole world is essentially evil.

Another definition is: The worst possible state or condition. At a time like this I do not feel that that should be the feeling permeating our people, even in the air of politics that surrounds this House. Robert Burns, away back over a hundred years ago, at a time when the Mother Country was at war and somewhat the same conditions seemed to prevail, made use of these words:

> O let us not, like snarling curs,
> In wrangling be divided,
> Be Britons true, be Britons still,
> Amang oursels united.

I think and I hope that that is the attitude that the members of the House, on whichever side they may be, should adopt, that we should get away from this whining, captious criticism, and discuss the broader issues. I want to say right here, and I am now speaking for myself as a member of this House, so far as the criticism of the Shell Committee is concerned, that I know no reason why the fullest information should not be given to this House. I do not believe it is necessary to take up the time of this House in investigating a thing of this kind, which might be given over to a Commission. But I do not see why a Commission could not be appointed that would give every possible chance to the Opposition to satisfy their interest in the matter. I give my own opinion of it, but I do say that public opinion has got to be respected; and if there is any matter of doubt, if there has been created even by the suggestions and criticisms of the Opposition, a doubt in the minds of the people of this country, I feel it is the duty of the Government and of this Parliament to satisfy the minds of the people. I take that attitude, so far as I am concerned, and express that view for myself. I have not discussed it with members on this side of the House and I do not know how they feel; but I believe that the great majority of the members of the House feel this way. But let me qualify that also. I do believe that our hon. friends do not criticise in that

kindly spirit and in that manner that can command the consideration that possibly they otherwise should be entitled to, and at the present time, when so much is at stake, I would ask my hon. friends: Can we not get this information, can we not criticise, without that apparent undercurrent of petty, picayune politics, which is so distasteful and which stirs up that feeling of resentment and enmity. I do not think that my hon. friend in his criticisms this afternoon has shown exactly that spirit of desire for information. I believe that questions are put on the records of this House, asking for returns and asking for information that could be obtained by any individual member, whether he be of the Government or of the Opposition, from the department concerned, without any hesitation, and without the necessity of occupying and wasting the time of this House. It looks to me as though a great deal of this information was attempted to be obtained in that way for the mere purpose of shall I say grand stand play? but certainly for some ulterior purpose.

I would naturally expect that under the extraordinary conditions and in view of the splendid condition of this country financially, with the prosperity that seems to abound on all sides, that, so far as the Government can guide and direct these things, if our hon. friends were fair and wanted to follow out the lead set by their right hon. leader in the effort to carry out those ideals, they would have had some word of kindness and commendation to offer with reference to these conditions. Surely the Minister of Finance is deserving of praise for the way he has handled and guided the affairs of his department which has brought the highest encomiums from bankers and from the biggest business men in the country. Hon. gentlemen have no adverse criticism of the policies pursued, except that old question of the tariff which will naturally come up from time to time. But, broadly speaking, the difficulties that they predicted a year ago and the pessimism that was so prevalent then, have not been justified by the result. Can they not see in the existing state of things something for which we should be thankful and not be altogether despondent in spirit and so be tempted to adversely criticise?

Naturally, at a time like this, there are considerations outside of the war which should and do demand the interest of this country, and for that reason I believe it is all the more necessary that the members of this House should be united. When the wages earned, owing to the activity of industrial life, are almost unprecedented, as they are in this country to-day, some encouragement should be given to the labouring classes to save their surplus earnings. In England this matter is engaging the attention of the Government, and they have appointed a National War Savings Committee to look into it. The committee, I understand, have had many meetings and have considered some suggestions. Their inquiries are not yet completed. Arrangements are being made to take evidence from various represenative bodies, one of the first being the parliamentary committee of the Trades Union Congress. One of the suggestions there is to extend the facilities of the Post Office Savings Department, and to increase the rate of interest paid on deposits from two and a half per cent to four per cent. I do not know that, as a member of the House and supporting the Government, it is right for me to make an observation that I feel impelled to do, but I do think that at this time there are some changes that the Government might consider in view of the changed conditions in the country. I believe that the insurance companies of this country are collecting entirely more money in premiums than is necessary for the reserve they have to maintain. A three per cent reserve would appear to be no longer necessary, in view of the present high earning power of money, and I think that, at this particular time, every effort should be put forward to encourage the labouring classes to conserve their resources and invest in life insurance.

The matter of vocational training is also of great importance, more so, possibly, than at any other time in our history.

The question whether Great Britain will adopt a protective tariff after the war is being discussed in England, and the idea finds favour among many newspapers which were formerly free traders. The Morning Post, for instance, strongly supports the protective idea as a means of carrying on the fight against Germany by economic pressure, and it urges certain steps to form a union with the colonies on this basis, and later to approach France, Russia, and Italy with a proposition for a zollverein. In view of this I believe that we should secure the most competent, the most able men of science available to advise and assist in developing the infinitely varied potential resources of our country.

I think, also, that after this war, with the increased number of immigrants who will come to Canada, the matter of rural credits, which has occupied so much attention in the United States Congress during the last year, and which will no doubt result in legislation during the present session of Congress, should receive some attention in this country. I am sure that the people of this country, and, I think, even the Opposition in this House, can find something in the conduct or management of the affairs of the country which commends itself to them. I read in an English paper also a report of the statement issued by Sir Robert Borden to the Canadian people on the first day of the year. I believe the sentiments he expressed in that announcement were full of patriotism, and would be endorsed by the people throughout the whole of this country. I desire to repeat these words announcing the authorization of an increase of the Canadian forces to 500,000.

> In the dawn of another year our hearts are more resolute than ever to accomplish that task, however formidable it may prove. By the greatness of the need our future efforts must be measured. Nowhere is the Canadian spirit more firm and unwavering than among the men who hold the trenches, and those who will shortly stand by their side. Nowhere is it more undaunted than in the hospitals and convalescent homes. Already we have learned the full measure of sacrifice. To all Canadian homes that have been saddened, to all Canadian hearts that have been stricken by the tragedy of this war, we pray Divine blessing may bring consolation and healing. Much has had to be learned during the past fifteen months, because we were not prepared for this war. The strongest assurance of ultimate victory lies in the fact that we have not been crushed in learning that hard lesson. Those who forced this war upon us may be assured by the tradition of our past that the lesson will be thoroughly learned, to the end that there shall be an enduring peace. The very character and greatness of the ideals for which we are fighting forbid us to pause until their triumph is fully assured. The Canadian forces at the front have fought a good fight, and have crowned the name of Canada with undying laurels. To them and all of our overseas forces now under arms awaiting to do their part, we bid God-speed, in the sure faith they will never fail in duty.
>
> The Morning Post of London, England, speaking of this action, says: Canada has now announced, has decided to raise its armies to half a million men. Do not let us lag behind our own children in duty to the Empire, but rather let us lead them by example—and we ought also to consult them both as to the conduct of the war and the terms of settlement. It becomes more and more evident as the great struggle proceeds, that if we are to hold our own in the world we must take our children into partnership. Alone, events may prove too much for us, but if a united Empire acts together upon a common policy, it may face anything the future has in store.

[Mr. Glass.]

Now, Sir, in face of all that has happened, in view of the conditions that exist, is it not our duty to look forward with cheer and hope to the prospects of another year? Canada's outlook, to some extent, must be based on the experience of the last eighteen months; no idea based on the experience of peace years can be of moment in discussing the possible results of the year 1916. We assume that the war will continue throughout this year, and though the position of the Allies at the present time lends much encouragement, it seems evident that we are yet a long way from the end of the struggle. On that assumption, we may reasonably look forward to a continuance of the good prices for grain and farm produce, and it seems to me, Sir, that the programme, or propaganda, whatever we may call it, of production that was inaugurated last year may well be continued to the advantage of the country this year. The large increase in our wealth, the large increase in our exports, the large increase in the revenues all lend hope and encouragement, and yet behind them all there is the sacrifice which our people are making with good hearts to assist the Motherland. Those of us who have been around in the country and have witnessed the eagerness and the zeal with which the mothers of our land are devoting themselves to the things that may be of assistance in this war, must have been impressed by the loyalty and patriotism which prompts our people in all parts of the country. When I read of the campaign inaugurated in this city for the collection of $400,000 in three days for the Patriotic Fund, it seemed to me paradoxical that those who represent the people, those who are in this House of Commons should find so much to quarrel and wrangle over. I am satisfied in my own mind that, after all, there is behind these differences that spirit of loyalty and devotion to the country which will prompt our hon. friends opposite to lend assistance to the Government. If we get fair criticism, honest criticism, not that captious picayune party criticism which is offered for the purpose of politics and not for the purpose of obtaining honest information, I think we will get rid of a good deal of those differences between us.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I should detain the House any longer with the remarks I have to make. My hon. friend who spoke this afternoon (Mr. Carvell) referred to some matters which, as I have said, do not come within my province or power to discuss, or answer, but

I am satisfied that, notwithstanding what he has said, when the Minister of Agriculture replies to him, there will be, as there always is, the other side of the story. In connection with his remarks as to how he could get the co-operation and aid of the labouring man, without which we cannot continue this war with conditions as they exist, and as he represented them, my hon. friend seemed to think that there will be considerable difficulty in getting the 500,000 men we have set out to get. That is only characteristic of the pessimism which has been exhibited before on the opposite side of the House, and I do not believe that tactics of that kind will aid the recruiting. I like the optimism and good spirit of the Minister of Militia, and when he is called upon to defend his department I have no doubt that he will be able to give an ample answer to the interrogations that have been put to him. My hon. friend the member for Richmond, the other night, referring to the conditions in Nova Scotia, and to the partisanship which he claimed had been shown there in almost every instance connected with the Militia Department, said that at the moment he could not recall the name of more than one Liberal captain in that province. In the district from which I come the colonels of the three leading battalions that have recently been organized, one of which is at the front now, the 34th, were all Liberals. I have never, in my experience, since the war commenced, found the minister acting in the partisan manner described by my hon. friend. I have found that the minister has on every occasion given consideration to the qualifications of a man seeking appointment.

Let me close my remarks this evening with a sentiment which I have thought appropriate at this time. We have been referring to the loss of the lives of our young men on the battlefields of France and Flanders, and the following lines seem particularly fitting:

Not in vain have these young lives been lost
Amidst the carnage of embattled hosts:
The bravest of our sons have shown the world
That in the hour supreme they were the mates
Of those whose names are on the golden roll
Of Britain's truest heroes.
They wrought that freedom might prevail
throughout the world;
They fought the fight and counted not the cost.
We sorrow for our honoured dead, but not in
sorrow
Shall we prize their names, for all the future
Shall we hold with pride the record of the
deeds they did
When on the fateful day they met the foe
And, grimly fighting,
Fell, victors in death, immortal in their deeds.

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

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Wednesday, January 26, 1916.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (No. 11), respecting British America Nickel Corporation, Limited.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill (No. 12), respecting The Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 13), respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill (No. 14), respecting The Central Western Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill (No. 15), respecting The Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill (No. 16), respecting The Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copies of general orders promulgated to the Militia for the period between November 25, 1914, and December 24, 1915.—Sir Sam Hughes.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, January 25.

Hon. Sir SAM HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): Permit me, Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the few remarks which I purpose making, to offer you my hearty congratulations upon your being called to fill the high position which you now occupy. I know that you will pursue the line of your predecessors, and reflect nothing but credit, honour, and dignity upon the position.

I scarcely know, Mr. Speaker, how to begin my remarks. Thus far, nothing of an adverse nature of any importance has been said concerning the department over

which I have the honour to preside. There has been more or less talk concerning the organization called the Shell Committee, but, as was the case with like expenditures at the time of the South African war, the expenditures in connection with the Shell Committee and the conduct of its business do not appertain to this Parliament. In 1899 and 1902 large sums of money were placed by the British Government to the credit of ministers of the Crown in Canada and they were checked out by the ministers or by their attorneys, and when inquiries were made by members of the House as to the disposition of these moneys, they were met with a prompt refusal. On that occasion I myself had a thirst for knowledge. In my locality in the central part of the province of Ontario, rumor had it that a large number of horses had cost the British Government the sum of $157 or $160 each on an average, were, within three or four weeks of the closing of the war, sold for the sum of $38 each. It was in vain that I made inquiries in regard to this matter, so I promptly dropped it, and I have never been enlightened as to the real facts of the case, from that hour until the present. At the outbreak of the present war I declined to follow the line set by my predecessors in that regard, and accordingly, the funds for all these shell contracts were placed to the credit of a special account under the control of the Shell Committee. For a double reason, therefore, I do not see that it is the function of this House specially to inquire into any of the transactions in connection with that committee; although I should be more than pleased, so far as I am able, to give all the elucidation of the facts, and all the enlightenment as to them which it is possible for me to give. I attended two meetings of the Shell Committee, the first and the last—but I shall take that up later.

I wish to deal, as briefly as possible and yet as fully as possible, with some of the statements that have been made by gentlemen on the other side—possibly by gentlemen on both sides—as to the impatience of the troops to get across the water. We all realize that the troops are impatient to get away, but I am sure that every one who understands the situation knows that upon the British Government and the British Government alone depends the calling of the troops across the water. Canada today stands prepared to send twenty regiments as soon as transports can come for them, but the British Government have not the transports available, nor have they huts available for winter quarters. In general, without going into the details of the matter, it is impossible for us to send the troops over until they are asked for on the other side. We feel that it would be good for these splendid fellows to get over and to obtain a stepping-stone training in England before they cross to the front to do their duty for King and country. However, it does not necessarily follow that because the troops are kept in Canada their training is not good. We feel that the troops that were trained in Canada for the first division were second to no troops in the world; I know that the troops that have recently gone over are favourably reported upon. Our boys who have gone across the water are better trained in shooting and manoeuvring than are any troops on the other side that have been under training for a similar length of time. This speaks well for the training of our troops in Canada. This impatience to go to the front is a matter, affecting not only those who are now training for overseas service. Personally, my own heart's ambition was to go to the front, but my duties at home prevented me from doing so. Possibly I am filling a better job here than I could at the front. It is true that I had my own ideas of how this war should have been conducted at the beginning. It is true, as everyone knows, that your humble servant, before the war began, predicted that this war would be a trench war, and endeavoured to lay plans to have it thus carried out from the beginning. However, I feel that my position here is much larger than it could possibly be in command of a mere division or corps at the front.

I do wish to say a word for a great many of my officers who cannot go to the front. Surgeon-General Fiset served in the South African war with great distinction, under fire and not under fire. He was always a friend of the soldier and was always ready to do his duty fearlessly and well. It would have been the joy of his life had he been able to go to the front; but it was impossible to spare him. The same thing is true of General Macdonald, Quartermaster General, was anxious to go overseas to look after his department, but he could not be spared. So with many more, General Gwatkin, General Hodgins, Colonel Winter, every officer on the staff has been anxious to go to the front, but we could not spare them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: General Lessard—do his duties prevent him going?

Sir SAM HUGHES: And there is General Lessard also. No doubt he is anxious to go to the front, although I have not seen an application from him. We know that his health is not good. There are also General John Hughes, General Logie, Colonel Mewburn, soldiers second to none, some of whom have distinguished themselves in war before, who have had more experience than others, but who have not been sent to the front, because they cannot possibly be spared. Therefore no one has been invidiously selected to remain at home. I think that if any one has a right to go to the front General Fiset or I would have that right; but we realize the situation and are content to stay at home and do our duty in Canada, be that duty well performed or ill performed.

Reference has been made to machine guns. That subject, in fact, has been discussed very fully in the House, and I am sure every one here will agree with me that this is one topic that ought not to be openly discussed in Parliament. I will gladly furnish to the Prime Minister, and I am sure he will be only too glad to give to the leader of the Opposition, a full statement in connection with the disposition of machine guns, under our own purchases and under the purchases made with the sums that have been contributed from time to time. I may say that the guns are coming in now with considerable rapidity, and I am satisfied that the statement, when it is furnished to those who have a right to see it and who are concerned in it, will more than satisfy them that everything is being done that could be done, that the wishes of those who contributed money to this cause are being carried out to the letter, and that the wishes of the Canadian people and the Canadian Government in the same regard are also being observed to the letter. If that will satisfy the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, or any member of Parliament who chooses, we will show the details in connection with the matter and I am sure when they see them they will be more than satisfied.

Reference has been made to the discharge of soldiers, and to returned soldiers, and to pensions. I believe that these matters have been satisfactorily explained to the House and disposed of. However, if there is any question put to me at any time I will be only too glad to give any data in connection with these subjects.

I might point out in connection with the training of officers, that when the war broke out we had a large number of very finely trained officers. A great many of the best of these naturally were selected to go with the first contingent. But we had to keep a lot of them home in order to supervise the training of the new regiments. However, as contingent after contingent went over, we were obliged—and we were glad in one way and sorry in another to do so—to send these good officers to the front, until we must now train up in their place a large number of officers to fill the gaps in the new regiments which are being raised all over Canada. In order to get the best men for these positions we are about to open military schools in every military district in the Dominion of Canada, and these will be opened at a very early date. Admission to them is practically open to every man who has any sort of a decent education and shows any fitness whatever for soldiering. Certificates will be issued to men who attend these schools, showing the qualification which they have attained, whether it be sergeant, lieutenant, captain, major or so on. In order to make it as democratic as possible, we are taking men in from week to week and giving them as thorough a training as possible, graduating them from class to class and stage to stage, until they are finally able to get the certificate of whatever grade they aspire to and are able to attain. It is partly on the lines of the old military schools which we had in the old military days in Canada, and partly on more democratic lines. The plan is meeting the approval of all those who have had an opportunity to look into it, and I am satisfied that the success of these schools will be such that every one will have the same good opinion of them that we have already formed.

In connection with every overseas battalion organized, we immediately organized schools for the training of non-commissioned officers, and also for the training of officers in the district. At the present moment we have hundreds of officers in the schools. But under this system, if an officer has not been able to attend on the date set for the opening of a school, he has had to wait for three months in order to take his course. Under the new policy they will be able to enter every week, and thus we will prevent useless delay in the case of many excellent men. A splendid lot of men are coming forward and offering themselves as privates, non-commissioned officers and

officers. In this regard I wish to point out that a large number of men of the class of engineers, business men, men of strong character and superior education are tearing themselves away from their occupations in life and are coming forward. They are put into training at once and from these the most efficient will be chosen to fill up the new corps.

I might say, in passing, that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) last session brought up the question of the purchase of the Valcartier camp site. I am pleased to inform him that the claims of the proprietors have been before the Exchequer Court, and, I think, have now practically all been settled.

I have also observed that some question was raised in this debate about Colt pistols and Colt machine guns. As this is a Canadian matter, I wish to give the fullest information at once. At the beginning of the war, as every one knows, the United States manufacturers doubted whether they could legally contract during war time with a foreign government engaged in war for the delivery or sale of munitions of war. The United States Government, after a month or two, settled that matter in the affirmative, deciding that the manufacturers could sell. In the meantime the British Government was purchasing a very large supply from the United States. The problem was how to get these supplies out without possibly involving the manufacturers in trouble, because they would not assume the responsibility of shipping direct to a belligerent power. I took the matter up. I se ured the services of a life-long friend of mine Col. J. W. Allison, a man in whom I have had life-long confidence, a man who is the soul of honour and kindness. Thousands and tens of thousands, yes, millions of dollars' worth of war materials were brought in from the United States to Canada by arrangement with our Customs Department, and were then shipped by way of Canadian routes to the old land. Finally, Col. Allison followed the matter up, and it was arranged with Washington that a declaration should be made that these commodities could be shipped by these people direct from New York, or any other United States port, or directly to Canada, without violating any United States law. That accounts for the letter read by the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell), yesterday as being sent by the director of contracts of the Dominion of Canada to Col. Allison in regard to these shipments. He was the officer I had employed, he was kind enough to oblige me in this regard. It is true that the matter of the Colt pistols has been before the Davidson Commission. Inasmuch as this matter has also been referred to, I may be permitted to read to the House a letter which I received from the Colt firm. At the time the question of Colt pistols was brought before Judge Davidson. a wire was sent to the Colt Company asking how they happened to be selling these pistols in Canada to commercial dealers at a lower price than the Government had paid for them. I had had the assurance of the Company—I did not observe at the time that the words " sold to any Government " had been introduced—that the lowest price at which they sold to any Government was $18.50. I naturally concluded that the Government would get a better price than the wholesale merchants, but I was very much surprised to learn that great as our business with the Company had been, it was small compared with their business with some single wholesale merchants. I may say that an officer of the Company and another officer came promptly to Ottawa, and knowing that Judge Davidson was going to hold an inquiry, promptly offered to appear before him and give a full explanation concerning the prices. This company has an arrangement with the United States Government providing that the United States Government in their own factories can make one of those pistols to two made by the company, and they control to a certain degree the price of the article. The United States Government takes hundreds of thousands of pistols, and, as probably the House is aware, the different states in the Union have for war purposes an agreement with the Federal Government that the equipment and material and weapons of the Federal Government should also be adopted by the various states of the Union. This is the letter received from the Colt Company:

Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.,
13th January, 1916.

Major-General Sir Samuel Hughes,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Sir,—In reference to the price at which this Company has sold and is selling automatic pistols, Cal. .45, to the Government of Canada and to wholesale hardware or sporting goods concerns throughout the Dominion, we desired to place you in possession of facts which we believe fully justify our position and account for the difference in price to the wholesale distributers.

Policy.—For many years this Company has marketed its product very largely through the

medium of the wholesale distributers who in turn sell the arms to the small retail dealers, by whom the arms are again sold to the individual consumer.

The established wholesale list price of the automatic pistol, Cal. ·45, in the United States of America is $18.50. From this price the distributer is allowed a discount of 12½ per cent and 2 per cent for cash, also an additional commission of 5 per cent, provided he agrees to co-operate in the upholding of the resale price and to assist to the best of his ability in creating a demand for the Colt's arms.

These concessions in price we believe he is entitled to for the advertising done through the valuable space given in his catalogue for illustration and description of the pistol, to compensate him for investment represented by stock of pistols carried in his store, some of which he often keeps on hand for many months before selling, and to help share in other selling expenses involved in the conduct of his business.

Our customers in Canada are requested to use as their selling price the United States price of $18.50, plus duty into Canada, which at present is 37½ per cent, plus an amount sufficient to cover carriage charges and incidental expenses.

Government business.—This company has in its selling arrangements with the dealers, reserved government business to be handled direct. Such business is of a spasmodic nature, not coming with any regularity as commercial business does, and usually when it comes in any volume, is due to abnormal conditions requiring special attention.

Since the outbreak of the present war, we have had very large orders from several governments involved and each one, like your own, has requested us to do everything possible to effect speedy deliveries. This we have done at very great inconvenience and largely increased expense of manufacture. We have had to provide a large amount of additional space, procure a great many new machines, pay a much higher rate of wage to workmen, and in addition, have given each and every workman a bonus of 12½ per cent of his regular wage in order to get the fullest measure of co-operation and loyalty. All pistols made for governments are subjected to unusual tests and most rigid inspection which involves extra expense.

These very unusual expenditures have added materially to the cost of the automatic pistol, Cal. ·45 and in consequence this company has not since the beginning of the war, sold any of those pistols to any government other than the United States of America at a price lower than $18.50, neither is it prepared to consider doing so. We have supplied and are at present supplying a great many of these same pistols to other governments involved in the war, at same price you paid. This price has been uniform, regardless of quantity purchased.

The fact is, we consider the price most reasonable in view of the service desired during a period of great stress, and we are proud to be able to serve so well as we have succeeded in doing, our friends who have wanted help. Had we selfishly considered only our own interests, we could have placed much of our product at premium prices, but have not done this, preferring to be loyal to our friends.

These pistols are made under a license for which we pay a considerable royalty to the inventor who also has licensed a European manufacturer to make pistols of his invention, giving to them the exclusive right to sell in certain countries where we are not at liberty to offer our pistols. This fact makes it incumbent upon us to render strict account of the ultimate destination of each pistol we produce under the license, necessitating our exercising very rigid control of the sales. We would not consent to the resale of the pistols at a price less than $18.50 by any dealer who buys from us.

Your orders to us for automatic pistols, Cal. .45, aggregated 5,000. We have regular wholesale dealers who each year purchase a greater number of pistols and revolvers than that from us. Business coming to us regularly from month to month, year by year, is much more profitable than irregular orders which demand unusual facilities to supply.

This Company has its regular corps of travelling representatives throughout the world, who each year devote considerable time to the negotiation of government business, although in many countries, as in your own, many years pass without any business being secured. In consequence, a portion of the selling expense involved during each of these several years must be taken into consideration when the selling price to governments is arranged. Commercial business each year bears its own apportionment of the selling expense but in government business, the sales for some one particular year or season, such as the present, must bear the allotment of several years selling expense.

We are not unappreciative of the orders with which you have honoured us, but we want you to fully understand the conditions under which we have to operate.

I may say further concerning Col. Allison—I shall refer to the matter of fuses in a very short time—that in all his dealings with business firms in the United States he has in each instance, so I am informed and believe, given those with whom he dealt the following letter, or one similar:

May 14, 1914.

Confirming my verbal statements to you of yesterday and in order that there can not be any room for misunderstanding, I now reaffirm in writing my position in connection with the fuse question.

I have been and am doing my very best to secure the lowest prices possible for the Government, and above all things wish to do whatever I can to aid them in procuring the best workmanship, lowest prices, and largest deliveries possible; and if you are bidding for the manufacture of this fuse for the Shell Committee or the Canadian Government, I want it distinctly understood that I do not want any profit added to the price under any conditions, with the intention of providing a commission for me, as I would not under any circumstances accept a commission of any kind from anybody, in connection with this matter.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison.

At this point I may be permitted to state briefly where our soldiers are stationed. At the present time we have about 60,000

soldiers in France, nearly 60,000 in England, and the balance of 250,000 odd training in Canada. We have three divisions at the front, and a fourth is in course of preparation. Other troops are ready in Canada to cross to England, and the troops in England are getting ready to cross to France. We trust that in a very short time we shall have the different units, the artillery, infantry, army medical corps and army service corps complete for the four divisions at the front.

I observed a remark concerning complaints as to recruiting. For the first contingent, our recruiting plans were, I think, different from anything that had ever occured before. There was really a call to arms, like the fiery cross passing through the Highlands of Scotland or the mountains of Ireland in former days. In place of being forwarded to the district officers commanding, the word was wired to every officer commanding a unit in any part of Canada to buckle on his harness and get busy. The consequence was that in a short time we had the boys on the way for the first contingent, whereas it would have taken several weeks to have got the word around through the ordinary channels. Under that plan the contingent was practically on the way to Europe before it could have been mobilized under the ordinary plan. For the second mobilization, during last winter and summer, there was no immediate hurry, and we followed the ordinary routine of going through the divisions. It was found that recruiting still kept up well. For the contingent which is being recruited this winter, realizing that we would have a large number of troops for which the British Government would not likely have use for another month or two; at all events, we followed the plan of billeting them in their own localities. For example, in my own county, there are twenty or thirty places where troops are being billeted during the winter. A great many people say that you cannot control men if you keep them isolated. I believe that nearly all of those gentlemen who are wearing the uniform are just as capable of governing themselves as are the people who take so much interest in looking after them. These men are good, law-abiding citizens of Canada, decent, respectable fellows, the best in the land. In the county I have the honour to represent we have turned out upwards of 3,000 men, and we have about 700 there still, and not one solitary case of misconduct has occurred since the beginning of the war amongst those troops, except in the case of a couple of fellows who got boozy one evening, and I do not know that that is limited to soldiers. The same record holds good throughout the country. The consequences are that, where the system which has been inaugurated has been properly carried out, we have these men billeted in villages here and there and all over the country, many living at their own homes at night, going to drill every morning, surrounded by the best associations and, little by little, acquiring that discipline, self-control, and knowledge of military drill that are essential to the upbuilding of the soldier. Morover, we find that in all these localities, they can engage in military sports. We furnish them with miniature rifles and dummy targets, and these fellows put in a very entertaining, instructive and upbuilding time. This system also saves us the trouble and expense of furnishing large buildings in the principal centres, renting buildings at enormous expense wherein to house these men. It must also be remembered that when you bring men to the larger centres you bring them, not to the comfort and convenience of these localities, but to temptations which do not certainly contribute to the upbuilding. I do not know that I need add anything to what I have already said with regard to the plan of recruiting.

I wish to take up for a few moments that very-much-discussed question in days gone by, the Ross rifle. The proof charge calibre of the Ross rifle, following the former Lee-Enfield rifle, was .459 at the base. I have given all the figures to the leaders on both sides of the House, and I would be glad to supply them to any hon. member who may wish to see them. This was the exact size practically of the cartridge of the .303 British rifle. It was found soon after the war broke out and before a Canadian rifle was fired at all, that the brass of the cartridge case was too soft. The many troubles and disasters that from time to time befel the British rifle and the soldiers between Mons and the Marne, and in subsequent engagements, were found to be traceable to bad ammunition. The Princess Pats, who used the Lee-Enfield rifle, met with disaster and trouble owing to the bad ammunition supplied them—it was not due to the rifle but to bad ammunition. When the Canadian division fought at St. Julien —that magnificent and memorable fight— they largely used our own Canadian ammunition, which was absolutely perfect, as were some other brands of ammunition. Some of the American ammunition was good, a great deal of the British ammunition was good, but there were

three lots of British ammunition that were bad, and they were not recognized at the time by our boys or by the British regiments as being bad. The consequence was that both at St. Julien and Festubert, where the Canadians used our own Canadian rifle and our own Canadian ammunition, there was no trouble. At Festubert there were a number of rifles that jammed, but it was found to be due to the fact that the ammunition was defective and not the rifle. I may say that as soon as the cry went up about jamming rifles, I immediately took steps to have the Ross rifle chamber enlarged to .464, which is two-thousandths of an inch larger than the Lee-Enfield, which is .462. A good deal of fault was found at the time about this, but the House, I am sure will be glad to learn that now the British Lee-Enfield is being enlarged to exactly the same size, one more instance in which they are following in the steps of the Canadian people, they realizing that it is better to have the ammunition slightly smaller than the chamber of the rifle rather than that it should be too tight a fit. The reason is that dirt will get on the cartridge; the brass of the cartridge case will sometimes be soft in consequence of too much annealing, and if it is too soft there is going to be jamming. Therefore, at the present time, I am in a position to state that reports from the front say that both rifles, with the enlarged chamber, are giving the best satisfaction. On January 18 General Carson sent the following report:

> Full report from General MacDougall states that no cases of jamming of either rifles have occurred in England for months and the confidence of the men in both weapons and ammunition has been fully established. Bad ammunition which formerly jammed in both rifles has been withdrawn.

Another report received by Col. Helmer with reference to the cause of jamming, said that it was due to defective ammunition. He says:

> A large amount of "B," "G" and "N" ammunition in some mysterious way again found its way to the Canadian trenches. This ammunition was condemned a year ago nearly. Result: when rifles were used for rapid fire, after about 60 rounds, bolts began to hang—an entirely expected result. What the men do not know—and what no one appears to have had courage to demonstrate to them is that with the same ammunition the Enfield rifle cannot be relied upon to fire 15 rounds.

The House will be glad to know that both rifles are now in perfect condition, and that the supply of ammunition is very carefully watched to see that nothing goes wrong.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has the Lee-Enfield rifle been enlarged?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The new British Lee-Enfield rifle has been enlarged to exactly the same size as the Canadian rifle—.464 and corresponding sizes right down through. There has been a reference made to the last Lee-Enfield rifle, and it was only about three weeks ago that I learned that the new British rifle had been enlarged to the same size as ours, namely, .464.

When the war broke out, hon. gentlemen will remember that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister stated in the House that in so far as he was concerned, the conduct of this war would be non-partisan and non-political. As far as my observation goes, and I have observed very carefully, he has religiously carried out his promise. On that same occasion, or a couple of days afterwards, I also made a similar statement in so far as I was concerned, following the lead set by the Prime Minister. I said that in the conduct of the militia of this country, where Liberals and Conservatives were facing the music alike, there would be no party politics.

My good friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), in the course of his address yesterday, trusted that I would raise the veil with regard to shells, and explain some party politics in that connection in my own county. I will do so with the very greatest pleasure. In my county there are twenty-seven to thirty organizations where shell boxes could readily be manufactured. I think only two or three of those organizations, in my county, have obtained orders for shell boxes. I was amazed and very angry when I saw that so few contracts had been given. I certainly thought that the Shell Committee, knowing that my time was occupied elsewhere, should have looked after the county I have the honour to represent a little better than it did. Let us see who these three firms were.

The first is a firm in Fenelon Falls, a most charming town. Mr. Tiers, a very estimable gentleman, who runs a little planing mill there, had not the necessary facilities, and so he obtained the assistance of Mr. Burgoyne, who put up considerable money. Mr. Tiers is one of the most intelligent and decent Liberals you can find in the whole community, and I was only too glad that he and Charley Burgoyne

were in a position to get the contract. The veil has been lifted as regards Fenelon Falls.

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid the veil will have to be rent again before all will be plain.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The next firm is F. W. Wilford—a good name, whether as surname or Christian. Mr. Wilford is from a staunch old Liberal family in the Eastern Townships of the province of Quebec. He saw fit to marry a charming Lindsay girl some years ago. I have never asked him for a vote, or offered him any advice on the subject, so I am not in a position to say how he votes, but all the evidence I have on the subject points him out as a staunch Liberal, well acquainted, I believe, with the leader of the Opposition. I hope, however, that he has become intelligent by this time.

The next firm is the Digby Lumber Company. I do not know who the members of that firm are, but the gentleman at the head of it is a good Liberal.

The next is a firm by the name of the Stinson Company. Stinson's father was a good honest old Tory, and young Stinson is a partner of Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, a bosom friend of the leader of the Opposition. He, McLaughlin, is a gentleman whom it has been my privilege to trim on two or three occasions at election time, a very estimable gentleman in civil life, but in politics, Oh dear! The veil has now been lifted so far as my county is concerned. I think the Shell Committee has neglected my county shamefully, and the next time I meet Sir Alexander Bertram I shall tell him so. My time was so occupied that I could not join the horde of promoters and others who were hanging around the doors of the Shell Committee.

Let us take up next the Militia appointments. Two divisional commanders out of three are good staunch Liberals. I refer to General Currie, of Victoria, and to General Turner, of Quebec, two of the finest fellows who ever stood inside jackets, and two of the best men to be found in the Dominion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not a solitary Conservative in the whole Dominion objected when I nominated these men for brigadiers long ago. The other one is General Mercer. As regards the politics of the brigadiers, I understand they are about half and half. I do not know what my own son's politics may be, but I know he will vote straight anyway. As regards the lower commanders, I am told by those who have looked up the matter—I have not looked it up myself, it would make no difference anyway—that three-fourths of them are Liberal and one-fourth Tory. That is only what we should expect to find, and I say this seriously. The Liberal party was in power sixteen years, and naturally under the system that was first used a number of young gentlemen of the Liberal persuasion would come to the front, just as a number of young Tories are coming to the front to-day because the Conservative party is in power. That is only human nature. When I took office a great many of the gentlemen occupying senior positions in the service were Liberal. I might point out that a gentleman has written me—I do not know whether it is true or not—that in one regiment in Nova Scotia twenty-four of the twenty-eight officers are Liberals and the other four Tories, that three of those Tories are at the front, but the Liberals are all occupying soft jobs at home. Whether that is true or not I can not say. I would not recognize such twaddle anyway.

Mr. CARROLL: What regiment is that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I shall be glad to tell my hon. friend privately, but I can assure him it is not the regiment to which he belongs. As regards the medical men, I am told that of the forty-eight senior officers only four or five are Conservatives. General Jones is a good staunch Liberal. General Roberts, one of the loveliest boys and best soldiers and best medical men that was ever in a hospital, is also a staunch Liberal. Fotheringham is also a Liberal, and so is Scott, who is my own nephew; he is a black Liberal. Dr. McEwen, of Toronto, is a most magnificent man. I took him on account of his long medical service. I also picked out Dr. Bruce of Toronto. I found that Dr. Bruce, Prof. Anderson, Dr. Orr, and others had been in the service years ago as regimental surgeons. I have in my possession a notification, sent to one of these gentlemen who had applied to join the new Army Medical Corps. The writer of this note, a Liberal doctor, regretted that he could not accept him for the medical corps, as he was a Tory. I had, therefore, no hesitation in granting Dr. Bruce, who is a famous surgeon in Toronto, the same status he would have had he remained in the corps. He has been over on the other side.

As regards shell contracts, I am informed by those who have looked into the matter that four-fifths of the contractors are Liberals and that seven-tenths of the shell-box contractors are Liberals.

I now come to a very interesting part of the discussion, namely, the Shell Committee. And here let me frankly admit to the House that it is my baby; I am the father of the concern, be it for good or be it for bad, and I purpose sticking to it as long as it has a button left on its jacket. Let me point out the facts of the case, and when I get through I purpose giving some evidence—not hearsay, but evidence. In July, 1914, owing to the fact that the Kaiser had been rattling his sabre up and down the streets of Berlin for a year or two, and that the clang of the Krupp forges had been keeping the financial and commercial world a little uneasy for some considerable time, business in this country was at a stand-still. Factories were closed, dinner pails were empty and commercial and financial disaster faced Canada, Great Britain and almost every country on the face of the earth. That was the general condition prevailing when war broke out, and the breaking out of war did not make the capitalists of the country any more ready to invest their money, or bankers any more ready to back up commercial men in any enterprises they might undertake. When war was declared Canada fearlessly did her duty. The right hon. the Prime Minister immediately cabled to the British Government an offer of a division comprising from 17,000 to 20,000 soldiers. On the night of the 7th of August, 1914, this offer was accepted. Accordingly, the soldiers were summoned to Valcartier—but of that I will speak later.

On the 24th August, 1914, the War Office sent us a letter, asking if we could procure for them a small order for shells in the United States. On reflection, it struck me that the highly equipped industries of Canada, which were standing idle at the time, could readily manufacture shells. I I had seen shrapnel shells being made in the arsenal at Quebec, and it is merely a blacksmith's shop. Accordingly, we called a meeting of the Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. CARVELL: Do I understand the minister to say that shells had been manufactured in Canada before the outbreak of the war?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, at the arsenal at Quebec. About 75 shells per day was our output, and 75 per cent were bad. The hon. member will understand that an inquiry was made some time ago, and it was found that out of 75 shells that we picked out to test, fifteen would not go into the guns. I know whereof I speak.

At that meeting of manufacturers, which was a very large one, they were so nervous over their capital that only a very small number—I forget the exact number—could be induced to enter into the business at all, and they could not be induced to do so until we took them down to Quebec and showed them during a period of several days how the manufacturing of shells was done, comparing our not up-to-date equipment with the splendid machinery in their big factories. In some cases we had to get them financially encouraged by the banking institutions before we could induce that small number at the beginning to enter into the shell business. We lent them our military experts, officers of the department; and, in passing, let me say that we lent these experts also to the big firms in the United States which had been making shells and which had asked the privilege of consulting our experts and seeing our factories turning out shells. We also sent our experts from factory to factory in the United States to give instruction in the making of shells for the British Government, because the urgency was so great. The Shell Committee was then formed. This is a sample of a shrapnel shell (exhibiting shell.) I do not purpose to cause an explosion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is it full?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, it is empty. I take the liberty of bringing this shell down in order that the House may understand the matter. This is what we term an empty shell (showing the whole shell). This is the steel shell case (showing), with the copper driving band on it fitting into the grooves of the barrel. The brass part which fits on the top of the shell case is called the fuse-plug, and in the shell at the present time is a powder cup empty.

3 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a shrapnel shell?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. There is a tube connecting the upper part with the powder cup at the base, and the shrapnel charge lies around this tube above the powder cup, and is filled in with resin so as to keep it as tight as possible. The fuse screws on, connecting with the tube, and when the fuse is put on the time is set for the number of seconds it takes for this shell

to reach its destination, and when it does so it is supposed to explode.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a time fuse?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. The time fuse explodes the powder cup at the base and the bullets are driven out through the resin, the end of the shell is blown out, and the bullets scatter broadcast. This is called the cartridge case (showing), which is made of copper, and a primer which fits in at the end is fired by a spring. The powder propelling the shell, the cordite or gun cotton, is confined in this cartridge case. In the high explosive shell akin to this we use the high explosive bursting charge to smash the shell case all to pieces and scatter it broadcast. The two parts together make a complete filled cartridge. The fuse is made either empty or filled, either with the gain or without the gain, and it is filled with the gain subject to inspection. Number 80 is the time fuse and number 100 is the detonator or concussion fuse.

This is a cablegram from the British War Office to the Militia Department under date of August 24:

Can you provide or obtain from American trade shell empty shrapnel, Q.F. guns, 18-pr., without cases or fuses. If so, what rate delivery could you promise?

The Militia Department cabled the War Office in reply:

Re yours August 24, concerning 18-pr. shrapnel. Can get large quantities from neighbours speedy delivery. Please advise.

On the 26th of August, the War Office cabled the Militia Department:

Your telegram August 26. Please cable quotation 100,000 segment shells, Q.F. guns, 18-pr. shells only. Presume you have detailed drawings and specifications. Can you arrange inspection. Am sending specifications of 15-pr. shrapnel shells, quotation required 100,000 of these.

The Militia Department cabled the War Office on the 2nd of September in reply:

Am arranging Canadian manufacturers turning hydraulic presses to work on shells. Had meeting to-day with number. Arranging for many more. Already can contract for 4,000 shrapnel weekly, delivery to begin in about four weeks time. This could be increased to more than double that quantity. Believe could produce 75,000 before November 1st. Do you want shell Q.F. empty shrapnel 18-pr., without fuse, as per vocabulary stores 1912, part 2, page 480. Have all details, plans and specifications for 18-pr., but have none for 15-pr. Please send latter immediately. Price not determined yet. Please advise.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

On the same day, September 2, we sent the following cablegram to the British War Office:

Have organized committee of manufacturers on shells. They guarantee 20,000 by first November and 30,000 monthly thereafter. May be able to largely increase this amount.

The following telegram was sent on September 11:

Regarding shells. Have discovered one firm, Canadian General Electric, which guarantees alone to manufacture by the first of January 100,000, either 18-pr. or 15-pr., and 100,000 monthly thereafter. Important to know will you want more than the 200,000 already placed.

The following was received by the Militia Department from the War Office on September 12:

Your telegram No. 121. We still await your quotation for 100,000 18-pr. shrapnel shells with plugs. 100,000 shrapnel shells, 15-pr. with plugs, 100,000 cases for 18-pr., and boxes with in my telegram 954 9th inst.

The following cablegram was sent by the Militia Department to the War Office on September 18:

Reference your cipher September 17. Committee reports price of 100,000 shrapnel 18-pr. as per your cablegrams and specifications will be $8.55 each delivered at Montreal, 20,000 by November 1, and at least 30,000 monthly thereafter. Usual inspection charges. Shall we proceed? If so, please arrange line of credit through Canadian High Commissioner and in favour of Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, Canada. Specifications 15-pr. just to hand. Price later. Please answer. Committee wait.

I may say that later we arranged to have the credit note placed to the credit of the Shell Committee in Canada, and not as is suggested in this message. The price of $8.55 was arrived at by the experts of the Militia Department, who made their calculations with the assistance of machinists and large steel workers throughout the country. Another cablegram follows, from the Militia Department to the War Office, dated September 18:

Committee reports 100,000 shrapnel 15-pr. shells, price $8.30 each, delivered at Montreal. Assuming proceeds with 18-pr. first, can make delivery of 18-pr. already cabled, and follow with 20,000 15-pr. November, and 30,000 per month thereafter.

I should like the House to note that we made the offer of $8.30 for the 15-pounders and $8.55 for the 18-pounders. On September 19 the War Office cabled as follows:

With reference to your telegrams numbered 132 and 133, we accept the prices as offered for 100,000 each 15-pr. and 18-pr. shells. Please proceed. We trust you will ensure punctual delivery.

At that time the Shell Committee was formed, and, until they were dissolved some time ago, took over entire control of the whole business. Neither directly nor indirectly did the Militia Department or I as Minister of Militia ever interfere in any shape, form or manner with the contracts, or with the price. In each instance the price was fixed by the British Government.

At this same time, I obtained many offers from American firms. I will take one as an example, to show what credit is due the Canadian manufacturer for standing by his guns to help the Empire, as compared with the concessions given to United States and other manufacturers, which were really freely conceded to them by the British War Office. Our manufacturers never got one cent of bonus, never got one cent of cash payment, never got anything. They took their own risks, put in the machinery, turned out the shells with their own capital and under their own arrangements, and delivered the goods; I will show before I have finished that they delivered the goods at a lower price than any other country, not even excepting Great Britain. The course which the Canadian manufacturers pursued in this connection will stand to their credit for all time, the little handful of them that we could induce to take hold of the business at this time; later they were more numerous.

The Crucible Steel Company, one of the largest concerns on the continent of North America, on September 10, wrote me as follows:

> We are prepared to make the following proposition: three weeks after the receipt of order for 200,000 shrapnel shells complete, without explosives, and absolutely in accordance with blue-print already submitted. We can ship 1,000 per day for three weeks; after six weeks we can ship 2,000 per day until the order is completed.

You will remember that our price was $8.55 for the 18-pounders and $8.30 for the 15-pounders. Their price was as follows:

> Price, $12 each.

Mark you, our manufacturers undertook the work at their own risk, put in their own machinery, financed their own business, did everything. I will read on:

> In view of the fact that very speedy delivery is required, it means we will have to put an extension to our plant, and also purchase additional machinery. While we do not feel that there is any likelihood of the passing of legislation by the United States Government which would interfere with the shipments of these shells, we are willing to agree that in such event we would be willing to absorb the cost of all the small tools and the extension to our plant, but the Canadian Government would pay us the actual cost of the extra machinery, in which event it will become the property of the Canadian Government and subject to their disposal. The contract not being subject to cancellation,—

The contracts of the Canadian manufacturers were all subject to cancellation.

> —suspension, or reduction, for any other cause than above referred to.

That is, the passing of legislation by the United States.

> All of the above quotations f.o.b., Harrison, New Jersey. Cash in gold on surrender of bill of lading.

It will be seen, therefore, that the famous Crucible Steel Company, one of the best institutions of the kind on the continent of North America, made a price of $12, while our manufacturers did the work for $8.55 and $8.30. Not only that, but the proposal of the Crucible Steel Company was such as to give rise to the possibility that at the close of the war the Canadian Government would have some thousands of tons of scrap iron on its hands—and that is what the British Government is doing in the United States to-day. To one United States firm with a branch in Canada $12,000,000 in cash was advanced by the British Government to carry on the work; the Canadian industry has not been advanced one dollar to carry on the work. It will be seen, therefore, that the Canadian Shell Committee is not subject to condemnation, and that the Canadian manufacturers are worthy of every support, encouragement and blessing that can be heaped upon them.

On April 25 I had the honour to receive the following communication from His Royal Highness the Governor General. I did myself the honour of asking the permission of His Royal Highness to lay this before the House and the country, and he cheerfully acceded to my request:

> Government House, Ottawa,
> 25th April, 1915.
>
> Dear General Hughes:
> I have received the enclosed telegram from Lord Kitchener, which speaks for itself.
> Believe me,
> Yours sincerely,
> (Sgd.) Arthur.

This is the telegram, dated April 24, which was the third day of the fighting at St. Julien:

> London, April, 24th, 1915.
>
> His Royal Highness Duke of Connaught,
> Ottawa.
>
> Will your Royal Highness be good enough to thank General Hughes, the Canadian Shell

Committee, and Canadian manufacturing firms, for their satisfactory delivery of shells. I hope that the future deliveries will come up to anticipation.

(Signed) Kitchener.

Let me point out that on that occasion at St. Julien, our boys were armed with Canadian rifles, shooting Canadian ammunition, and firing Canadian shells. Having no shells to fire on Thursday, General Morrison found on Friday afternoon that a shipment had come to one of the stations eight or nine miles back. He sent his wagons back and commandeered 8,000 shells, and found that they were Canadian. Then, on Friday evening and Saturday, Canadian riflemen, armed with Canadian rifles, firing Canadian ammunition, and Canadian artillery, firing Canadian shrapnel shells, held back upwards of one hundred thousand of the best soldiers the world has ever produced. More than that, the records show that 12,000 Germans dead and 22,000 German wounded fell before our boys in those four days fighting, a record of which we are proud.

The history of the shell industry in Canada divides itself naturally into three periods. There is first what I should call the initiatory stage. Let me point out—I do not know whether the First Minister will remember this—but after we had met at Valcartier for upwards of a week studying this matter, working at it from every viewpoint, and when we had finally arrived at the figure of $8.55, the manufacturers of this country were so nervous, and capital was so sensitive, that they came to me and demanded that I give them a guarantee that they would be recouped for any loss they might sustain at this figure. I told them that my guarantee would not probably be worth the paper it was written on, but I said that if the Prime Minister of Canada would give a guarantee, he, as Prime Minister, would see that it was carried out. The Prime Minister will remember that they waited on him the next day when he came down, and he assured them that in case they found, after making this experiment, that they were losing money at $8.55, he would use his best endeavours with the British Government to see that they were recouped whatever their loss might be. So these manufacturers entered into this enterprise with a great deal of trepidation and, to their credit, they succeeded. The orders were spasmodic, each might be the last.

Then came the second period, when the British Government no longer required empty shells, but wanted filled shells, with the cartridge case and component parts, all except the fuse. It took some time to get that started, but we tackled it, and our manufacturers again succeeded.

Then, later on, the bankers became more confident; and towards the close of what I term the second period we found the bankers and financiers, every one who had money tied up in a stocking, wanting to bring some blacksmith shop or some shoeing forge back in the woods into the game of making shells. The trains to Ottawa were packed with promoters. Young barristers, their hair parted in the middle, armed with a sheet of paper and a pencil, came down here and all wanted to make shells. They were going around the country saying: If you will put up machinery I will guarantee to get you an order for 100,000 shells, 200,000 shells, any number you like. These young fellows would go around looking for orders for 300,000 or 400,000 shells as though they were selling eggs.

This was all done on a pretty definite business basis; all they asked was 50 cents a shell. That was the commission regularly asked for and I heard a great deal of it. Dear old General Bertram and David Carnegie got so that they could size them up, and the first question they asked was: "Where is your machine shop," and before the machine shop could get orders it had to be inspected,—and of course in fully ninety cases out of a hundred it was knocked out. I heard a great deal of talk then, and as the one who had induced the British Government to trust the Shell Committee of Canada, I felt my personal responsibility, not the Government responsibility in all this matter. Whenever I heard any of these yarns—and my dear friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has not commenced to touch the fringe of the yarns yet, he has only given about what we would get in an ordinary afternoon—we investigated them, and I challenge the Dominion of Canada to show one solitary instance yet that has come before my notice that had a tittle of foundation for it. Not one. I felt that, having got the British Government into the scrape, it was my personal business to see that the thing was run right, and I have yet to learn that it was not run right; and therefore I am at General Bertram's back morning, noon, and night in this business. In the early part of the game we were told: Oh, but your steel will not do, you must get your steel from certain companies in the United States or elsewhere. I found that about four or

five hundred tons of steel was all we could get. I consulted the Prime Minister in nearly everything I did, as I had great faith in his wisdom and judgment. Some then might think I might be a little erratic and all that sort of thing, but I felt that the balance wheel would be found in the Prime Minister. So I consulted him in this matter. Now, I am not a scientist; and I know nothing about steel. I know powder, I know lead, I know a rifle as well as any man; I know what is wrong with a rifle cartridge, but I do not know the first definite thing about steel, and I never could understand why, when our Canadians could make stoves and railway rails and all that sort of thing out of our steel, they could not make shells. But we were told: Oh, no, acid steel must be used. I was as wise as ever; I did not know what acid steel meant. So I said to the Prime Minister: "Who in — Canada could teach me this?"

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I may have used the other, too. I said: "Who can teach me something about steel?" "Well," he said, "Cantley, of New Glasgow, was here just a few minutes ago; he is an expert steel man." So I hunted up Colonel Cantley and got him to explain to me the difference between acid steel and basic steel. I said: "Why will not basic steel do?" "I do not know," he said. I said: "Will you undertake experiments with basic steel and see if it will stand up under the heat test and the annealing, and if it is short of carbon cannot you chuck a little more into it and get it up to the standard, so that it will stand the test?" He started on his experiments and expended on the work for the Shell Committee $500,000 before he received one cent in return. He tested the steel, we tested the shells on our own ranges in Canada and we found that the contraction was nil; that they lived up to the standard. We sent a shipment over to Woolwich arsenal and they more than stood up to the test. So to-day the Canadian industries have been benefited to the extent of eight hundred millions of pounds of steel made in Canada by Canadian workmen, turned out of Canadian shops, and turned into shells by Canadian enterprise.

I might say that as regards the first contract I handed it over promptly to the Canadian Shell Committee and that committee carried on all the business. The Shell Committee took the first contract and they delivered the shells, allowing for the delay in producing plans, gauges, etc., on the part of the British Government, practically on time; whereas a contract let in the United States a short time afterwards to one of the established firms, a regular shell manufacturing concern, has only recently been completed. The Shell Committee was made up of Col. A. Bertram, who I believe is a Tory; Brig.-Gen. T. Benson, who, I believe, is a Tory; Lt.-Col. T. Cantley, who, I know, is a great friend of my good friend Col. Macdonald, the hon. member from Pictou—I do not know whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, I think he has voted both ways.

Mr. ROGERS: The member for Pictou voted both ways?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, no, but he is going to. Col. Greville Harston is, I understand, a Tory, and Col. Lafferty is a Liberal, a splendid fellow, and one of the best experts in Canada, but he has the misfortune to be a Liberal. Yet I appointed him to the Dominion Arsenal. Mr. George Watts is, I am informed, a Liberal. Mr. E. Carnegie is a member of the Shell Committee, but had nothing to do with the letting of contracts; his brother David is an expert, and two finer men, two more skilled men, cannot be found in the Dominion, and they are both Liberals. Then there is J. W. Borden; he was appointed Paymaster General, and he has the misfortune to belong to the Liberal brand of the Borden family. Incidentally, I may say there is another of the fraternity who at the last election stood at the poll and—I will not say intimidated—but at all events urged the soldiers as they went to the poll to cast their ballots against the present Prime Minister of Canada. The young gentleman was brought before me and, seeing he was a manly straightforward fellow who openly admitted the corn, I sent him over to England—

An hon. MEMBER: And would do so again.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Certainly I would do so again. He is a splendid, manly fellow, one of the best fellows in Canada; he bears the name of Borden and is a Grit. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will endorse all I say about him. I want it to be understood that I did not allow politics in any sense whatever to enter into these matters, and if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition knows of any Liberal in his following who is anxious to go to the front, let him send him

to me and I will put a uniform on him, give him his training, and let him do his best.

I may point out that although Britain gave a bounty in advance to every industry in the United States which made shells for her, we got nothing. Canada furnished the parts so that we could distribute them throughout the different factories. We got them to work, we got one factory to produce the steel, another to produce the billets, another to do the turning, another to do the fuses, and so on; the Shell Committee distributed the work up and down the country, to the great advantage of the people of Canada, and to the great advantage of the British Government. It gave the small dealers an equal chance with the large factories, and the prices were uniform, thus avoiding any unhealthy competition. There was no object in scamping the work. The inspecting company examined the work of the different firms, and I may here say that they had considerable difficulty in getting gauging machinery.

I shall not discuss the question of basic steel; I have a prepared statement here on the subject, which I shall be glad to show any of the members privately if they care to see it.

Now I come to the question of shells. The price for the first order, for 18-pounders, was $8.55; machinery and assembling, $5.15. The second order was for 400,000 shells, and the price was reduced to $6. The third order was for the completed shell filled, and for machining and assembling the price was reduced to $3.80. Our manufacturers had to pay the cost of the machines out of the first order. I may say that once in a piano factory the first polisher could only earn $2 and something over a day; at the end of two months he had become an expert and was able to earn $20. They reduced his pay, but after a few months more he was able to earn $25, and he was again reduced. I mention this to show that these men soon became experts at the work. At the beginning, we did not have the facilities that we have now, and we did not have the men so well trained as we have now to do this class of work. Some of the dealers spoilt 40 per cent of the shells they made at first. I understand that Colonel Cantley's people and many other firms spoiled a good many at first and lost on them, and are trying to recoup themselves now selling the shells for fancy lamps, etc. But they took risks on those first orders, and they lost money in many instances. Because they have now the men skilled and expert at the work the orders recently given have come down in price to as low as $1.85, and, of course, the quantities are much larger. In the United States the cost of machining the Russian orders was $2.20, and that despite the fact that they got an advance in cash.

With regard to Australia, I may say that what Australia knows about shell-making she owes to our Shell Committee. Australian officers came here and spent considerable time going into the whole business, and at the time Australia was given orders the Australian officers were here and the prices were arranged here. It was considered to be a fair and reasonable price for Australia considering everything. At that time our price was $3.80. In Australia it was $5, because facilities there were not what they were here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the price of $3.80 include the billets?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I said machining and assembling.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What would be the cost of the steel billets? Would that not make the price of $3.80 still higher than the original price in Australia.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not if you add the price of the billets in each case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The billets were included in the $5 paid in Australia.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No. My information was obtained from those officers who came from Australia, and it was to the effect that they were not included.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My information is to the contrary.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand my hon. friend gets his information from some Liberal monthly; I got mine from my own officers who trained the Australian officers and fixed the price at $5 for them, and I think it is more reliable. I am going to make another statement, showing that stage by stage the prices in Canada were lower, with one or two exceptions—one of these is called No. 100 fuse—than either the British or the United States Government arsenal prices, or even the United States or British commercial prices, and that despite the fact that Canada got no bonus, and that in both Britain and the United States cash advances were made to enable the dealers to put in the machinery. I am in a position to prove that. The Canadian Shell Committe has formed a model for Great Britain; it has

formed a model for the United States and Australia. It led the way in prompt deliveries, in the quantities turned out, in the quality, in low prices, and in driving force. Canada has led the way in the British Empire.

Now, with regard to prices. On December 8, a cablegram came from England giving the recent prices paid there. The price for 4.5, mark VI, (250,000) made in England 42s. 6d., that is, $10.33. In Canada the first orders were for very small quantities, and we had to pay $10.45. The price on December 8 was $7.45. In England the machines were supplied by the Minister of Munitions; in Canada nothing was supplied, and yet our price was $7.45, while in England it was $10.33. The price for 4.5 forgings was 18s. 6d. in England, that is, $4.50, while our former price, the highest price ever paid was $4.25. The second price was $3.60 on small lots; our price on that date was $2.95. For 18-pound high-explosive shells, machining, the English price is 15s, 8d, equal to $3.81; in Canada the price is down as low as $1.85 now. For the 6-inch shells, the price in England is £4 2s, equal to $19.94, while the price in Canada is $16.85. For 6-inch forgings, the British price is £2, equal to $9.63, while the price in Canada is $7.50, and in Great Britain the machinery is put up for them at the cost of the British Government, while in Canada not one dollar is given to the Canadian manufacturer for that purpose.

Now we come to a comparison of United States and Canadian prices. First, we will take a 4.5-inch shell, including steel forging and machining. The Canadian billet costs $2, the forging formerly cost $1.60, now $1.20; the base plate formerly cost 20 cents, now 15 cents; machining formerly $6, now $4. Under the old costs for materials and work, the Canadian price of the 4.5 shell was $9.80, the present price is $7.35. The Morgans price for this shell is $10.40, with an advance in gold to start the machine going. Recent contracts let by Morgan are at the price of $9.81, or 25 per cent higher than the Canadian price, and the Morgan contracts are for millions where the Canadian contracts are for hundreds of thousands only. Since the beginning of the business, the Canadian Shell Committee has turned out in Canada 22,000,000 shells; 800,000,000 pounds of steel made by Canadian workmen in Canadian shops and turned into shells by Canadian workmen, brass, zinc and copper, 45,000,000 pounds; copper, over 22,000,000 pounds; lead, 102,000,000 pounds; black powder for shrapnel, 4,000,000 pounds; cordite, 10,000,000 pounds; nitro-cellribose powder, 4,000,000 pounds; tri-nitro-toluene, the famous high explosive, 11,000,000 pounds, put into shells in Canada, besides several millions of pounds exported to the British Government.

Canada has turned out 250,000 men under arms to fight the enemy and take their chance, and Canada has trained 90,000 skilled mechanics to turn machines to one ten-thousandth part of an inch. We have 90,000 skilled workmen who will constitute one of the greatest assets this country can have after the war is over. Shells are turned out and shipped at the rate of more than 1,100,000 a month, 1,500 inspectors are employed, and the volume of orders given out by the old Shell Committee totalled upwards of $350,000,000 in cold cash to the Dominion of Canada as the result of the institution of the Shell Committee.

Now let me say a word as to the materials forming the component parts of the shell such as Canadian steel and lead. I have already given the quantity of lead that we have produced. That means that our mines have received an impetus. At the beginning of these operations we used foreign brass, zinc and copper. To-day we use Canadian steel, Canadian lead, Canadian copper and brass and Canadian zinc for the first time in our history. We took the matter up, the Prime Minister gave us his endorsement, and as a result of Canadian enterprise, zinc is turned out at 15 cents a pound, whereas we used to pay 42 cents a pound and upwards in the United States for the same zinc. There is another point in connection with that. Our zinc was formerly refined in the United States. We would dig the zinc out of our mines, pay from $10 to $15 a ton freight, pay the duty into the United States, pay the cost of refining it, pay the freight back to Canada, and pay the duty on the refined zinc coming into Canada. To-day owing to the policy put in force by the Prime Minister, zinc is made in Canada from first to last, and we are supplying not only the Canadian demand, but the British and Russian demand at 15 cents a pound as against 42 cents a pound on the other side. Copper was never before refined in Canada, but, through the action of the Canadian Government, we are now refining our copper in this country. I have not analysed these figures myself, but I am assured that the copper, zinc and brass

industries of Canada for the last year before the war would have given employment on the work done to 30,000 skilled workmen, to meet the ordinary commercial needs of our people in brass, copper and zinc alone. There will be an asset at the conclusion of the war when these machines stop turning out shells. These workmen and these machines, with very little adaptation, will be enabled to turn to these various commodities of zinc, copper and brass in Canada, and we will be able to produce our copper at minimum rates and develop our great water powers by transmission lines and associated industries at the lowest possible figure. The prices of copper and zinc were high, and that is why we began to manufacture them in Canada. In this connection there is a point that is worth noting. As you know, zinc is found in association with silver and in lead. Formerly Canadian ores were penalized by the presence of the undisposable zinc in them. The lead and silver in these ores were of no use because they could only be extracted at a loss. To-day, the extraction of the zinc puts a premium on the ore, and more than pays for the work in connection with the silver and lead, the result being that we have the value of the silver, the lead and the zinc, and instead of the presence of zinc penalizing the ores as it formerly did, it is putting a premium upon them. Engineers and mining men had been directing the attention of the Government to this matter, and I entrusted Colonel Carnegie and General Bertram with the solution of this problem. We have worked out all the side issues, and the result has been to confer great benefit on the Dominion of Canada.

I have not had the privilege, since the war began, of addressing the House on the question of the formation of the Canadian force. I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment while I say something with regard to that subject. On August 4, 1914, war was declared; on August 7 the Canadian division was authorized, the offer of the Prime Minister having been accepted. That was on Friday. On Saturday, the 8th, Valcartier was taken over, and on Monday the 10th ranges and waterworks were begun. By the 20th three and a half miles of ranges were completed, and 1,500 targets were put in position. Up to the same date 12 miles of watermains had been laid in, and 15 miles of drains, open and covered, had been located. Army Service Corps and Ordnance buildings were constructed, railway sidings laid in, fences removed, crops harvested, ground cleared, streets made, upwards of 200 baths for the men put in, water chlorinated, electric light and telephones installed, wool made into cloth, cloth into uniforms, leather into boots, equipment provided, supplies collected, transport of all kinds purchased, and 35,000 men got under canvas in less than three weeks from the acceptance of the call.

The men were trained in marching, manoeuvring, and shooting. The men would fire five rounds in 40 seconds at the targets from five hundred yards, then they would run to the next range and fire five more rounds, and so on to the next range, and down to one hundred yards. The result was that when the troops marched out, some of the regiments scored over seventy per cent of hits on these targets, and the lowest was fifty-two per cent of hits; whereas the average number of hits in the service of any other nation is about twenty per cent. When our boys marched away from Valcartier they were an army of free men, trained to handle a rifle as no men had ever handled it before.

Canada has developed confidence in her manhood and confidence in her womanhood. The women of this country have performed noble service, perhaps even better than the men, and they continue to give great encouragement to the work that is going on. We have turned out 250,000 soldiers who have already made a historic record in the world and 100,000 skilled mechanics. Our manufacturers at the present time are capable and ready for any undertaking. As I have said, at the outbreak of war, Canadian financial and industrial life was paralyzed. After making due allowance for the imported products which went into the shells made in Canada, there has been added to the wealth of Canada, through the action of the Shell Committee, $250,000,000; or $30 each for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the minister be good enough to say why there was a change from the old Shell Committee to the Imperial Munitions Board?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The early part of the work was what I might call scientific. I chose the very best men I could get who would do the work. Bertram, Carnegie, Cantley and the others were all experts. I also picked the very best military men I could get, such as Col. Lafferty and Col. Weatherbie. I don't remember the names

of the others, but they were men who had been accustomed for years to this highly technical work. Before the Shell Committee was dissolved there were in the factories of Montreal and Toronto and the other big cities of the Dominion hundreds of men who were just as expert as these men were at the beginning of the war. So the Shell Committee became a commission to look into the question of the steel production of this country, and to look after the best interests of the steel work, for steel is the basis of the industry of any prosperous nation. I think that should be a satisfactory answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why were the services of these men dispensed with, and new men who knew nothing about the business taken on to purchase shells?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not aware that there has been any purchase of shells. Orders have been placed with certain firms. Before the Munitions Board was formed the arrangement was that a certain number of shells would come in automatically from month to month.

I should be lacking in justice if, before concluding, I did not express my appreciation and sense of gratitude to the press of this country. Let me give just an instance of how matters were managed with regard to the Ottawa papers, and the same procedure was carried on throughout the length and breadth of Canada. In Ottawa there are the local papers and the representatives of the great dailies of both political parties. I say "political parties," but I hope that party politics is ancient history now, and that there is no such thing in the country to-day. I called the representatives of these papers together and explained the position. I said that if there was any item of news that we could legitimately give them for publication we would do it, and they agreed with me that anything which was not in the interests of the Empire and the service to publish should be withheld. I explained to them that occasionally a newspaper got hold of an item of news in some back-handed fashion and published it, and very often such an item would do harm. I took these men into my confidence and gave them everything that could be legitimately published. We further let them know about the movements of troops, and transports, too, on the understanding that such items were not to be published, and in not a single instance has any of those newspaper men violated my confidence. Their conduct has been simply perfect.

I trust that no one will suggest that there has been anything like party politics in the Militia Department. Whenever I found them, I took the sons of our best men on the other side of the House out of the ranks and put them where they belonged. For instance, I knew that the son of the late Finance Minister of Canada (Mr. Fielding), who is a very excellent young man and a splendid fellow, was serving in a subordinate capacity at the front, when he was capable of filling a superior position, and without any suggestion whatever from his father, I placed him where he belonged. When I was in France I found among the fifteen men of the original Princess Patricias who had fought right through from the beginning of the war, the son of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). I took him out of the ranks and I was proud to do it, and I have done the same with others. I have already pointed out that the women of the country have helped us in every imaginable way, and so have the clergy. Hundreds of them are at the front to-day, and many of them are going as combatant officers when they cannot go as chaplains. They are showing a splendid spirit. Members of all churches are actively working for the cause in every part of the country. I had the honour recently of standing on the same platform with the Roman Catholic Bishop of Peterborough, and it was a most enjoyable sight to see the orange and the green standing shoulder to shoulder. I enjoyed it, as no doubt did His Lordship. In the trenches to-day French, English, Scotch and Irish soldiers are standing shoulder to shoulder, all doing their duty fearlessly and well; and let me say to the credit of the German-Canadians, that many of them have already given up their lives for the cause, and they are doing their duty just as well as the other boys.

Mr. DANIEL D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton, North): Mr. Speaker, this being the first time that I have had the privilege of addressing this House since you were elevated to the high office of Speaker, let me congratulate you on the distinction. Let me hope that the now regime will be able to hold a just balance between the parties, and that liberty shall exist in this House in debating the many questions that come before it consistent with the dignity of the Chair.

I realize that in rising in my turn to

address the House I am taking a great responsibility. I shall be expected, I suppose, to make some reference to the very wise and strong address presented to the House by the Minister of Militia this afternoon. Would it be expected that I, myself, or any other member of this House would make any adverse criticism of the standing that the Canadian people have attained for themselves in connection with this war? Was it contended for one moment that from start to finish the yeomanry of Canada were not ready to sacrifice their lives, their property and everything near and dear to them for the general advancement of our country, and to lay everything within their reach upon the altar of our country? Was it necessary for the minister to come here to-day and make a defence for Canadians along that line, as if anybody was taking the other position? Nobody has taken the other position and nobody in Canada will do so, but we do take the position that there has been politics from the very beginning in the department over which the hon. minister presides; there is politics in it to-day, and there will be politics in it while he presides over it. It is all very well to speak in broad and vague generalities and to tell us that this, that, and the other thing has been done. It is very well to tell us that the Canadian people can do practically anything to which they put their hand. I am glad to see that a change of heart has come over not only the Minister of Militia, but his "balance wheel" as he is pleased to call the Prime Minister. Only three or four short years ago the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Militia, reached the conclusion that Canadians could hardly do anything but the most commonplace things; that it was unsafe to break them away from anything but the ordinary humdrum tasks of every day life; that if they were asked to build ships in this country, they were absolutely unequal to the task, and it would be wasting time and energy to ask them to do so. If it is true that we can turn our hands to the making of shells and high explosives, of which we had previously no knowledge at all, and in the short period of a fortnight or three weeks or three months become experts at it, what can be said now about Canada being unable to build ships of war and commerce? I am sure that the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister have changed their views absolutely upon that question, and if the time comes when they will have an opportunity of formulating a policy on the question of shipbuilding in Canada, we shall never again hear the argument put forth that the Canadian people are not capable of performing that task.

I wish to follow for a little some of the points made by the Minister of Militia in the order in which he made them. He has told us that hundreds of millions of dollars of our money and of the money of the British Government are being expended in this country. He has told us that that money has been spent in divers ways, of which he has given us very few particulars, although he is well aware that a strong contention has been made in this House and throughout the country that a proper accounting should be given to the Canadian people of the expenditure of that money. It will not be contended in this democratic country, where we have free institutions, where we have responsible government, that millions of the public money can be taken and expended at the beck and call of a few individuals, however worthy they may be, and that we can never call upon them to account for what they have done with that money. But the very first sentence uttered in this House this afternoon by the Minister of Militia and Defence, who is particularly responsible to this House and the country for this expenditure, was that it belongs to and was subject to the control of another Parliament and another country; that we have nothing whatever to say about it, and that we are only wasting our time when we think of asking the Government to account for the manner in which they have dealt with the affairs of the country in that regard. That answer will not do, and the people of the country will not be satisfied with it from the Prime Minister or from any other member of the Government, or from any member supporting the Government. In this country we must know first the necessity for the expenditure, and secondly, that the money was spent for the public benefit, and also that every cent of it was spent in the war and for the protection and advancement of the Empire. If that is not the case, we shall hold rigidly to account those who are responsible for doing otherwise. The quotation has been given already, but in view of the statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence, who is the responsible head of his department and who above all others must be accountable to us for this war expenditure, I think it is incumbent upon me once more to place upon record

4 p.m.

the exact position which the Opposition occupy in regard to the expenditure, and the position which the Canadian people are occupying in respect to it. I refer to the statement on page 42 of Hansard of this year on this very point. The hon. Mr. Pugsley said :

Hon. Wm. Pugsley: I desire to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) if he will kindly lay on the table of the House, or if he can give now, information in a concise manner as to the arrangement between the Government of Canada and the British Government as to what proportion of the expense in connection with the carrying on of the war, in so far as Canadian soldiers are concerned, is to be borne by the Government of Canada. I desire to know whether all the expense of ammunition, guns, equipment, etc., is to be borne by the Government of Canada, or what the arrangement is.

Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance): The matter will be dealt with probably by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in introducing the War Appropriation Bill, which will provide means for continuing our participation in the war, or, if not, by myself in the Budget Speech, which will be brought down at a later date. In a general way, I may say to my hon. friend that the Government of Canada is bearing the entire expense of Canada's participation in the war. There will necessarily be certain accounts which cannot be adjusted until the war is over, or until a later date. Recently I had a conversation with Colonel Ward, who is immediately in touch with the situation in London, and I understood from him that the Canadian Government is to-day paying all the expenses connected with the Canadian Expeditionary Force at present in England, and is paying the men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in France, and Belgium, but that there will be certain adjustments of accounts necessary between the Government of Canada and the British Government at a later day covering such items as rations, supplies, and other equipment for the Canadian troops who are actually on the firing line. That matter is not susceptible of calculation and adjustment from to-day, but the Canadian Government is bearing the entire expense of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. Pugsley: That means, of course, all the ammunition, all the guns, all the boots and shoes, and all the clothing used by the Canadian soldiers at the front?

Sir Thomas White: Our understanding is that the Canadian Government will pay all, but that an adjustment is necessary and will have to take place later.

That, Mr. Speaker, without equivocation and without varnishing one way or the other, is a clear-cut statement of the situation in which we are placed. We are furnishing the money for the soldiers at the front in the same way that we furnished the money for the Hudson Bay Railway; there is not the slightest difference between the one and the other. If we have a right, therefore, to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals for a just and proper accounting of the expenditure in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway, we have an equal right to ask for an accounting of the moneys that are to be expended in connection with the war. The Canadian people do not propose to apply the same rigid form of inquiry to this matter as they would to a matter like the Hudson Bay Railway, because they are in such a frame of mind with regard to the war that they are not going to stick at trifles or ask for very close calculations. But in a general way, we have a right to make these inquiries, and we have a right to receive a proper answer to them. I submit that the minister cannot dispose of the matter by telling us, with a wave of his hand, that this is a question for the home Government; that this is a question with which we have nothing to do. The minister told us that the precedent for his course was the fact that some years ago, at the time of the South African war, an inquiry was asked by the then Opposition in regard to expenses in connection with certain provisions required by the home Government for the expeditionary forces that went to South Africa. I need hardly mention the fact that the two cases are entirely unlike. On that occasion, as I remember, there was not the slightest hint of wrong-doing; there was not a word from anybody to the effect that one dollar had been misappropriated or that there had been any graft or political favouritism in connection with the expenditure. Further, there was not the slightest hint that one cent of Canadian money went towards defraying the expenses in that connection. That being the case, it was clearly a matter which was entirely within the purview, scope and authority of the home Parliament, and only the home Parliament could deal with it. The mere fact that on that occasion we did not choose to exercise authority which we did not possess is no justification for saying that the same course should be followed now. Even if any wrong had been done—I am not admitting for one moment that there was any wrongdoing, because we had no authority or jurisdiction to enter into an investigation of the matter—but even if we had done something twenty years ago that was not quite right, is that a justification for blindfolding the people to-day and preventing them from having a thorough knowledge as to the expending of their money?

We have had a very long—not too long, perhaps, for the occasion—and a very

smooth glossing of different points by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed us. I venture to say that not a man in this House, whether he be of the Opposition or of the Government, is very much wiser now than he was when the hon. gentleman took the floor. His remarks consisted of mere generalities, with no attention to details. We are told that there are no politics in his department. I know nothing about the provinces of Quebec, of Ontario, or, indeed, of New Brunswick, but I do know that in the province of Nova Scotia, from which I come, the political line is drawn just as closely in the Militia Department as it is in the Department of Customs, and that is close enough. You have just as much right to expect an appointment from the Department of Customs if you are not recommended as a solid Tory as you have to expect any standing or any inside advantage from the Militia Department.

Mr. CARVELL: You have to go through the patronage committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: The patronage committee, pure and simple; that is the position in Nova Scotia, and I can prove it. I should not mind, Mr. Speaker, if that committee were used in what we might regard as a decent and proper manner. But I do charge, in the presence of the Prime Minister, who is a Nova Scotian of whom we are proud, that in the county of Halifax, where I hold him responsible for the patronage, the vilest sort of partisans are put at the head of battalions, in the highest positions that they can be given. If the Prime Minister, or anybody else who cares to look the matter up, will turn to the files of the Halifax Herald—the organ of the right hon. gentleman—of a few days ago, they will find on the front page the picture of a distinguished gentleman who some time ago fled the country on the pretext that he was going to the war. He will find that this gentleman is back in Nova Scotia with the title of major, and that he is going to be given a battalion in the province of Nova Scotia and sent back to the front. Why was he sent away? Why did he leave the country? He left the country, Sir, because the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was entering upon a trial at that time, in which trial he has been found guilty of forgery; in which, in not less than eight cases, he has been found guilty of being an accessory before and after the fact to perjury. He was blacklisted and disqualified by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and under that cloud he left the country. But he came back—he came back promoted to the position of major, and he is to-day honoured and petted and advanced in the county of Halifax, where the patronage belongs to the Prime Minister, and with the knowledge that the records of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia prove to the hilt everything that I say in respect of him.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no idea to whom the hon. gentleman is referring. If he desires to connect me with the person mentioned, I can say I never heard of him. I have not the slightest idea whom the hon. gentleman has in mind.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have reference to Major Muirhead, and I have nothing to take back of what I have said. The Prime Minister cannot be ignorant of the fact that, in my place in this House last year, before Dr. Hayes, who is now a captain—

Some hon. MEMBERS: A colonel.

Mr. McKENZIE: A colonel. Yes, if you please, he was appointed to the position of colonel. I pointed out to the minister that not only should he not be promoted in the army, but that he should occupy no position whatever in connection with public affairs in this country. This gentleman was the chief organizer of the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia. Without repeating the same language, I submit that he went through the same condemnation, the same charges, the same blacklisting, as this Major Muirhead, in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. I venture to assert that they could not keep him any longer in connection with the party, the thing was too nauseous altogether, and his reputation was such that they were ashamed to have him. They dumped him off on the Militia Department, and he was made a colonel by the hon. gentleman who says there is no politics in his department. That is the class of men who are being promoted in the province of Nova Scotia over the heads of good, honest, old, officials of those regiments who have, to use a vulgar expression, not got a look in at all, when there is one of these other men to be picked up anywhere and promoted to office. That, Sir, is what I complain of. And I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the most marvellous thing that ever could happen in any country, the magnificent stand that the people of Nova Scotia have taken in the face of the way in which they are treated by the Militia Department, and the class of men who

are being placed in office in that province. But so strong is the feeling, so sturdy and strong are the Acadians, Irish, Scotch, English and every one else, in our determination to do justice to our country, to our King, and to the great institutions which we are proud to defend, that we will not for a moment allow a Minister of Militia, or even a Muirhead or a Dr. Hayes, or anybody else, to stand in our way. We shall have the reputation of being a great province, a great people, and a great country when they are forever forgotten and wiped off the slate, and receive that oblivious forgetfulness in which such characters ought always to be left.

We were told this afternoon that the minister had done great things for us for which we ought to be glad. We were told that we can make shells, that we have copper, that we have brass and zinc. Of course we are well aware that for the last two or three years copper, and brass, and zinc, and the more shining metals have not been lacking at the head of the Militia Department of this country. But it is extraordinary that there should be any wonder or any surprise expressed that the Canadian people should take advantage of having great resources within their land, and that they should utilize them to the full? It would be surprising, indeed, if the contrary were the condition. Of course some marvellous things could be expected and might be expected from a great man at the head of a great party, and no doubt we are not entirely disappointed in the wonderful things that this wonderful man has done. I am sorry that the great statesman has not thought it worth while to stay a few minutes in this Chamber, that we might be able to give him some sort of an idea of what the people of this country think of the wonderful man whom they are so fortunate as to have at the head of military affairs in this country. But, of course, he would not for a moment think of staying in his seat in the House when one of the ordinary laymen of this country, one of the people of this country, was addressing the House. That would never do. But the Government of which he is a member, himself and the whole outfit, if I may use the expression, will learn, not many days hence, that there is a people in this country and that it is the people that speak, and that it is the opinion of the people that will count, that I am one of the people, here for the purpose of knowing what is being done, and that the people cannot be wiped aside by the glitter and glare of red coats and buttons, or by the rattling of the sword of so great a man as the Major General—promoted to that position, I believe, on his own recommendation. I suppose the people of this country, for many months, thought that Major General Hughes, later Sir Sam Hughes, was promoted to the major generalship on the recommendation and, of course, as the gift of the home Government. Imagine their astonishment when they found that, after a great deal of consultation with himself, after gathering his war counsel around him a great many times, taking the closest observation of his own military record and examining himself from the spurs up to the top of his head, he reached the conclusion that he could go down to the Council and present a recommendation that Mr. Hughes should be made a major general, that it was a well deserved and proper recognition of his services to his country. That is how the promotion came, and I want the people of Canada to have some conception of the inordinate vanity of any man who would think for one minute, in this democratic country, of thus trying to raise himself by pulling on his own boot straps. That is how this great distinction has come to our great friend. He has done some great things, and there have been, perhaps, a few great men to whom he can be properly compared. I heard a distinguished clergyman of this town giving a discourse on some heroes of olden days who were warriors, and I was thinking how they compared with our man. I thought of Moses, who was a warrior and a leader. Well, what did he do? He is said to have struck the rock and to have got water out of it. Well, perhaps our man did not strike any rock, but he is supposed to have struck Webster one time, with what result I do not know. This clergyman talked about such men as Joshua who did great things; he made the sun to stand and go back. Well, our great man, the general, did something perhaps better than that. I understand that he made one of Foster's horses stand up one time; I do not think that he ever made him back, because he could not back. So far as making anything stand is concerned, I do not think that Mr. Joshua has anything on the Hon. Mr. Hughes. We are told that Moses had a rod. Yes, so he had, but the hon. gentleman has a shovel that is of equal importance. There was no hole in the handle of Moses' rod, so far as we can find, but there is a a hole in the shovel that we hear so much

about. There is another peculiarity about this shovel that was not found in the rod of the great statesman and leader of ancient days. I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, what that peculiarity is, so that you and I may understand it. Will you permit me to tell a story about a man who sold a coach dog, that is a dog with spots of black and white. This coach dog was sold, and when it went out into the rain the man who bought it discovered that there was some fraud about it, that the spots which were black had become white and that the white spots had become black. The new owner of the dog, feeling very badly about it, went to the man who had sold it to him and said, "What sort of dog is this? it has all gone to pot, and is no good." "Oh," said the man, "I forgot to tell you that an umbrella goes with that dog." He had sold the dog without the umbrella. Now, about this shovel with the hole in it, which is the great wand by which the Minister of Militia and Defence performs all his miracles—let me tell you that it is a well understood thing that a woman goes with this shovel. There is a hole in the shovel so that the minister may look through and see the woman. It is impossible to use the one without the other, and in that way this shovel is a companionable sort of article which performs wonderful things with its proper concomitants. Of all the discoveries that our good friend has made, there is none really different from the mass of ordinary humdrum business connected with the running of a department except this shovel, and I waited with the greatest patience, and looked very closely at the minister, to see if he would give us some account of this shovel, or of what goes with it; but I am sorry to say we were not enlightened upon the subject.

These, Sir, are some of the great achievements of this great man who will not for a moment condescend to listen to one of the ordinary members of the House. I am pleased, not sorry, to say that on this side of the House, possibly with very few exceptions, we are ordinary people with ordinary common sense, who represent the ordinary brain and brawn and business of this country. We were told that there were no politics in the department, but, Mr. Speaker, let me put to you in the form of a few questions, some things that were put up to the minister, and let me point out to you that when these matters were put up to him he was aware that the affairs of his department were not being conducted as they ought to be. I am now going to quote from a letter put upon Hansard by the Prime Minister on April 15, 1915, a letter which gives us an idea and a clear understanding of the fact that at all events from that date the Minister of Militia and Defence had knowledge of the fact that things were not regarded as being right in his department. On page 2611, volume 3, of the Debates of 1915, we find this letter:

Ottawa, November 18, 1915.

Dear General Hughes,—When acting as Minister of Militia during your absence at Valcartier I instructed Colonel Fiset, Deputy Minister, that the use of outside agents and middlemen should be avoided and that contracts should be made directly with manufacturers so that any unnecessary commissions or increased prices might be avoided. This is undoubtedly the wise policy and is entirely in accordance with the principles laid down by our party during the years past. If for any good reason you may think it desirable in the public interest that a different course should be pursued in any particular instance by reason of conditions arising out of the war I hope that you will first consult me as I consider the principle to be of prime importance.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. Borden.

Major General,
The Hon. Sam Hughes,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa, Ont.

That, Sir, was on the 18th November, 1914, after the Prime Minister had had an opportunity of presiding over the Militia Department for a short time, and, no doubt, of learning for himself the condition of things in that department. Six months afterwards, while the department was still, of course, under the control of the same minister, and after he had been told that things were not going right, we find a strong Conservative coming down to this House with a report upon the affairs of that department which says:

In view of the evidence adduced during the course of their inquiry into the matters referred by the House to them, your committee desire to draw the attention of the House to the requirement for the inauguration of a system of purchase, inspection and audit that will adequately protect the country from irregularities and frauds.

That, Sir, is the condition which had prevailed six months after the Prime Minister had warned the Minister of Militia that things were not going right in his department. A like report was brought down from the Public Accounts Committee. It had been moved by the hon. member for Kingston and carried unanimously in a committee which had an overwhelming majority of the supporters of the minister

and of the Government. That shows that six months after the warning he had received it was absolutely impossible for the gentleman at the head of the department to get things straight.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I was going to put to you, in the form of a few questions, certain propositions that came before the Minister of Militia and Defence in regard to the running of his department. After he had received the warning which I read a moment ago he was asked by his party heelers: "Can we send the soldiers to the trenches with improperly made shoes, practically with paper shoes, and with bare feet?" The answer was: "So far as the department is concerned, yes, if you can make money out of it, and can conceal it, I have no objection." "Can we send our soldiers to the front with horses with heel-spring, horses that are spavined, horses that are blind, horses that are ring-boned, horses that are winded—can we send such horses as those for service with our troops?" "Yes, so far as General Hughes is concerned, if you can manage to do it without being found out." "Can we send the boys to the front with defective and treacherous field glasses that cannot be depended upon?" "Certainly, if you can get away with it; I will stand behind you as far as I can protect you in doing it." That is what happened in so far as these things are concerned. As we heard here last night, the question is naturally put: can we take a monopoly of the hay and oats required in any province of the Dominion of Canada, fix the price just to suit ourselves, take the farmer by the throat, take his goods whether he likes it or not and sell at our own price at the most extraordinary profit we can make? Can you stand by that and will you stand behind it? That has been done, and we have not heard a murmur from any member of the Government saying that the thing was wrong. That is what is being done to-day in the province of New Brunswick and I have no doubt in other provinces all over the country. The most extraordinary thing is that they feel called upon to fix the price for the farmer so that the farmer cannot get anything but what they are pleased to give him. After commandeering his hay at a starvation price, Tory heelers ask and receive at the hands of this Government the right of monopolizing the traffic in this country so that this hay cannot be sold in any other province or in any place outside of the Dominion except as it may please the Government to permit the farmers to do it. This is a most extraordinary condition of things and a state of affairs that was never known to have existed anywhere else, or under any government, except the Government which is presided over by the present Prime Minister and under the department with which I am dealing particularly at the present time, presided over by the hon. gentleman who has addressed us this afternoon.

In so far as the management of that department is concerned, it could not be worse than it is. There is not a thing upon which they put their hands but they leave the ear-marks of mismanagement and the ear-marks of what appears to the ordinary looker-on as dishonesty and lack of proper business principles. When this Government comes to this House, or goes to the country, and asks for a further lease of power, they are presuming to a most extraordinary degree upon the patience of the people of Canada. The war question is the paramount question, and the people of Canada, and the people of Nova Scotia, for whom I speak most particularly at the present moment, will be united in the desire to place at the disposal of the Government everything that can be used for the promotion of the war and the final and ultimate success of the Allies. But it is putting the patience, the endurance, and the loyalty of the people to the most extraordinary test when you ask to be permitted to extend the principal beyond those proper constitutional limits which should govern the management of the affairs of the country.

I pointed out a few minutes ago, and I point out again, that no minister of the Crown can come to this House and say that he never knew about wrong doing in his department until it was brought out by the Public Accounts Committee. What was brought out in connection with the Garland and Foster business was well known to the public before it was disclosed by the Public Accounts Committee. Does anybody tell me that the gentleman who was then the member for Carleton county did not go to the minister for his contract? Will anybody tell me that he was willing to play second fiddle, that he would go to anybody around the department to get his contract except to the minister himself? He certainly did not, and he certainly got his contract from the minister. Will anybody tell me that the minister did not know that he was the member for Carleton? Will anybody say that the poor innocent boy who was led to the

slaughter was anything but a mere stool pigeon in the matter? Did he not know that the money that he was throwing into the lap of this boy was going into the pocket of the member for the county? Will anybody tell this House that the minister was ignorant of these things, and that he knew nothing about them until the matter was brought out in the Public Accounts Committee? I think I am making no unwarranted deduction from the circumstances when I tell you, Sir, that the minister must have known about it, that his chief officers must have known—that all must have known everything concerning that nefarious piece of business, that when it was brought out in the Public Accounts Committee it was nothing new to them and that they knew just as much about it before as they did after.

Will anybody tell me that the Minister of Militia and Defence did not know that Mr. Foster of Kings, N.S., was not getting a contract to buy horses? Who hired him, who took him on, who gave him the money? The people of Nova Scotia and the people of this country generally will want to know if it is possible that a young man, such as the Prime Minister described Mr. Foster to be, who had no experience in business whatever, who had never been in this House before except for a term or two of the present Parliament, could have had $73,000 in cash placed to his credit, which he could squander as he pleased, without the head of the department knowing all about it. We have it on record that the Prime Minister did not know anything about it; but one thing we do want to know is, who is responsible for the handling of the money? That is something that the people of Canada will insist on knowing. What sort of an institution is this when $73,000 in cash can be taken out of the revenues of the country and put where some irresponsible, unbusinesslike man, such as we are told Mr. Foster was, could get it out at his own sweet will, while nobody knows who gave it to him, nobody knows what he is doing with it, and nobody knows how he is going to account for it? The people do know, however, where the money came from; they know that the money came out of their pockets; they know that they are contributing this money; they know that they should get proper value for it; and if this Government persist in putting it at the disposal of characters of this kind, the people will take care to find men who will look after their business in a proper way, who will know to whom the expenditure of money should be entrusted, and who will see that proper value is obtained for that expenditure.

On the closing day of last session the right hon. the Prime Minister told us about the wonderful things that he was going to do with those who were trespassing and transgressing in so far as the expenditure of money was concerned. We were told that the walls of the penitentiary would move out and make broad their wings, and then play a flanking movement and gather in the men who were stealing the money of the people. I have watched with care to see what was being done in that respect, and I find that the walls of the penitentiaries and prisons are in the same place, and that not only are the walls and doors in the same place, but those who steal the money are also in the same place, except a few of them who have got promotion from this Government. While gentlemen opposite have given no assistance in widening the doors of the penitentiaries to admit political offenders, the records show that they have given the greatest facilities for getting these offenders out after we have put them in. I remarked once to the Minister of Justice, and on another occasion to the Acting Minister of Justice, that we received little encouragement in trying to convict those who were guilty of criminal political offences, for as fast as we put them in the penitentiaries they would let them out.

Reference has already been made to the searching inquiry that the Premier promised to us on the closing day of last session. I know the ideas that hon. gentleman has of the proper procedure. He is an experienced and eminent lawyer, and I am sure that he could not have looked upon the only inquiry that went on as anything but superficial, and, to a great extent, farcical. We were given some samples of the commission's work last night, and if what we heard was a fair sample of the Davidson Commission's work, I hope that never again will we be asked to regard such an inquiry as a rigid one, or one that is likely to see that the parties who deserve it are brought within the walls of a penitentiary.

I have given my views on the political mix-up, that is, as between the Militia Department and the duties that devolve upon that department and its officers under present conditions. I hope that it is not too late even now for the minister to bring to the notice of the department that this

idea of political patronage and political preferment must be cut out, and that everybody who wants to serve his country in connection with this war comes into the Militia Department on an equal footing. If the Government would show that they were in earnest about this thing, no person would be more ready than I to give them credit for any effort in that direction. But I must tell the minister and his colleagues in the Government that so far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned we had nothing from start to finish but the closest application of the closest kind of party patronage in regard to the militia.

Let me say a few words in a general way as to the general administration of the country. This germ of dishonesty, which seems to percolate down through the ages, so far as Toryism is concerned, is again showing its head, as it has always done under a Tory Administration. It is too bad that the same sort of thing should break out whenever we have a Tory Administration. It cannot be a matter of chance. The disease always breaks out when our friends opposite are in power. If they look at the history of this country they cannot blame the people for not giving them a splendid opportunity for making good. At one time they had eighteen years in power, at another six years, and now they have been given another trial. But on every occasion the same disease breaks out, the same malady is manifested throughout the body politic. What did we find when we came into power in 1896? If a man had been sent forth into this country like the dove that Noah let out of the ark, he would have had to come back without finding one solitary place on which to place his foot that was free from the contamination of Tory politics. There was not a stump or a tree that was not contaminated. The leader of the present Opposition applied various remedies. He got honest men to work for him, and out of this chaos produced dry land. The sun began to shine, and the country prospered in the fifteen years he was in power. Unfortunately, after fifteen years of isolation, fifteen years of fumigation, of severance from wrongful handling of moneys or anything of that kind, the Canadian people made the mistake of thinking they could trust honourable gentlemen opposite again. They said: We will put them back in power again now that the country has been thoroughly fumigated; they know what that fumigation was for, and surely they will profit by that experience. Sad to relate, no sooner was the old hut occupied again than the old disease broke out. I am afraid it is something like the old story that we have heard so often, and which is quite true. I suppose I should not touch upon theology in this discussion; but you will remember, Sir, that when the evil spirit that was sent out of the man into many dry places came back and found the old place swept and garnished and empty, it brought back seven devils worse than himself so that the last state of that man was worse than the first. That seems to be what has happened in this country. From Manitoba the doctrine has gone forth that we did not know, that even the Tories did not know, how to play politics. You have been too honest to play the game, they said. The Minister of Elections said in our presence: "I know how to win elections; I will show you a thing or two as to how elections should be handled." And I am sorry to say that in our province by the sea the people reached the conclusion that they had only been playing at politics. In New Brunswick the thing was adopted at once by unanimous vote of the Tory party. The disease is breaking out here and there all over Canada. Worse still, it broke out in Manitoba, and the Minister of Elections could not control the situation. He is now something like the Scotchman's flea, driven from home—there is no place in Manitoba now where he can win elections by the old method. This doctrine which went forth from Manitoba was accepted in New Brunswick as the proper dodge, the proper trick, the science from the master hand, and what has been the result? It has driven the Premier in disgrace from his seat in New Brunswick, and more should follow him.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to inform the House that he is the nominee of the Conservative party in my constituency, so that he is not disgraced in their eyes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Well, he has evidently been disgraced in the eyes of some decent people, because there are some decent people in New Brunswick. But he evidently has been promoted to a certain level at which certain parties are supposed to be fit to be supporters of this Administration. That is what is happening in New Brunswick. Now let us see what has happened in the little province in the bosom of the Gulf. A very few years ago we had only one man supporting the Liberal party in the legislature of the province of Prince Edward

Island. To-day the Conservatives are hanging on by their eyebrows; and at the very first opportunity, because the Liberals did not know how strong they were so far as that province was concerned, the people will go back to their old life and to Liberalism. I need not tell you, Sir, what has happened in the province of British Columbia. You know that the people there are rising in their might to have clean government and clean administration and to have back again the condition of things which we brought to them when we put the Conservatives out of house and home before, and the time will come when our old grand chieftain will once more give clean government to the people of this country, and when we shall all rally around him and the old conditions will prevail.

I wish to say a little in regard to the partyism which has been rampant in this country since the Conservatives came into power in 1911, and to point out that, in so far as my part of the country is concerned, this Government has been to us a disappointment. We had laid out for ourselves certain schemes, and it was the policy of the Administration of Sir Wilfred Laurier that large developments in railway matters should be brought about in our part of the country so that our fisheries and our farming industry and all our other large industries should be put in touch with the heart pulsations of this country. A railway policy was adopted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government for the province of Nova Scotia, but I am sorry to say that with the exception of that part of the road which is in the constituency of the present Premier, everything else was cut out. I am sure that the Premier himself cannot be to proud of this matter. For years before 1911 the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), and all the members for the island of Cape Breton, including myself were pulling on the same oar with the then leader of the Opposition for the obtaining of better railway facilities in the eastern part of the Maritime Provinces. While our railway was to be built, his railway was to be built as well; but when the wheel of fortune turned and we had no further say as to the expenditure of money, the present Prime Minister built his own railway and pitched us over the side of the boat into the sea and would not look at us at all. That is not a very big way for a big man to deal with a question of such importance to us and to our people.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

We were told by Conservatives at that time that they would build the railroad that we were to have, but one year, two years, three years, four years have passed and the fifth year is passing and nothing has been done. They do not intend to do anything and nothing will be done until the Liberals come back into power. It would not be so bad if our friends had been saving the money, if it could be said that although they were not building the rail-

5 p.m. ways for us, the money was in the treasury. We left them with all bills paid, everything squared up and the finances of the country in first-class condition. To show you, Sir, in how excellent a condition the finances were, I simply refer to the first Budget speech delivered by Sir Thomas White when he became Minister of Finance. We were told by the present Prime Minister, a few months before our friends came into power, that an expenditure of something like $87,000,000 was the clearest evidence of dishonesty and misappropriation of the money of the people of this country, and that, if they came into power, they could run the country with much less money and show better results for it. If the Prime Minister had been in earnest about that, we should have had some evidence of it when he came into power, and that evidence would be that he would reduce the expenditure. What do we find? The first year our friends were in power, the expenditure was $98,000,000, or 11,000,000 more than this horrible expenditure of which the Prime Minister spoke. The second year the expenditure was $112,000,000, or $25,000,000 of an increase. The next year the expenditure was $127,000,000, or $40,000,000 of an increase, and the fourth and last year of which we have an account the expenditure was $140,000,000, or $53,000,000 of an increase. That shows that the expenditure was growing by leaps and bounds, and that the Government was absolutely regardless of the promise of retrenchment that we had heard so much about a few years ago.

What about the interest charges? When we came into power in 1896 the interest expenditure of this country was $10,000,000. We went out of office in 1911, the interest expenditure was only $12,000,000, or an annual increase during the fifteen years of the Laurier Administration of $135,337. The interest expenditure, or the interest appropriation for the last year of which we have an account, that is so far as the ordinary expenditure is concerned, outside of war

expenditure, was $21,500,000, or a yearly increase since the Conservative party came into power of $3,166,000, and this expenditure is getting worse instead of better as time goes on.

It is up to us all to put all our energies together in order to put an end to this war, to do all that we can as a great country, to put forth all our resources of men and money in order to bring about a victorious ending to this struggle. But let us not forget and let not the people of this country forget the conditions which prevail to-day in British Columbia, in Manitoba, in Prince Edward Island, and in New Brunswick, or wherever else the Tories have sway in this country. We must not forget that our great duty is not only to bring back to power the leader of the Opposition, who is the old political physician in this country, but to bring back the conditions, both financial and moral, which he created in this country, and which no other party than that of which he is the leader is capable of restoring and perpetuating in this great country of ours.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, you will permit me, in rising to speak on the motion for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne, to join with the other members of this House in congratulating you upon your being elevated to the office which you now occupy. I am not a very old member of this House, but I have had the pleasure of sitting under the administration of three Speakers. I think that those of us who sat in the House during that length of time realize, as I do, that the task of the Speaker is not by any means easy; that it calls for qualities of an exceptionally high character; that it calls not only for great tact and great impartiality, but for great firmness as well. Upon many occasions these qualities have been tested to the very uttermost, and it is inspiring to find in the young democracy of Canada, where we are carrying on institutions British in character, that under those tests the Canadian character has risen to the same level as that of their Anglo-Saxon forebears, and that democracy has held its own in the conduct of the affairs of this House.

I wish also to congratulate the mover of the Address, the hon. member from the far West (Mr. Alfred Thompson), and the seconder, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Eugène Paquet). I was particularly glad that the hon. member for the Yukon had the honour of moving the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I myself am a western man, and, as the northern part of my constituency touches that great country from which the member for Yukon comes, naturally we have a good many things in common, and, perhaps, look at national questions at a different angle from that of other members who have not been familiar with the West.

I noted with a great deal of interest the length at which hon. gentlemen dealt with the question of the war, which, after all, occupies our thoughts to the exclusion of almost everything else at this time. I suppose there is not a member in this House, from the leader of the Government to the leader of the Opposition and down to the youngest member, who does not feel, in common with the rest of the people of this country, the presence of the shadow of this great conflict. I think that every waking moment of our lives is to some extent affected by the grave and tragic character of the struggle that is now going on. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in opening his remarks, observed that we meet again under the shadow of this disastrous war. We unquestionably do, and it is, perhaps, a sad feature of our democratic life and of our party government that we lay too much stress on these smaller affairs of party interest, to the neglect of the paramount issue that is before the Canadian people at the present time. The morning after war was declared, I happened to be in the city of Vancouver, that beautiful, far-western province with which so many members of the House are familiar. It so happened that the Prime Minister had asked me to address a convention of Canadian Clubs; it was on August 5. War was declared late in the night of August 4, and I reached Vancouver the night before. I am not likely to forget the deep emotion that stirred all those people on that occasion. I am not likely to forget the wave of passion that swept over every man and woman present, or the profound conviction that these people had as to the underlying justice of the cause which had at last driven Great Britain into the war on the side of the Allies. Nor am I likely to forget the determination that moved every heart and every mind, out in that far-western province, to stay with this thing and to see it through, no matter what it

might cost. It was with a recollection of this incident, which would naturally burn itself into one's brain, that I watched with the deepest sympathy and the deepest pride the generous response that was made by our far-western country when the Empire called for their support in this great struggle. I recall many instances of men in my own constituency in the far north who walked twenty, even thirty and forty miles from distant and isolated sections of the country in order that they might be on hand at the earliest possible moment to answer the call. I remember one typical instance: that of a man, living in one of the beautiful valleys in the northern part of British Columbia. He was English by birth; he had been in the country a great many years, and had finally built his house, developed his small farm, and arrived at the point where he expected to get some little comfort from his labours and some little enjoyment from his life. His mother was still alive; his father was not. His mother had three sons in the war: one in the navy and two in the army. Not very long after the outbreak of war she wrote her son that one of his brothers had been wounded and another killed, and that she thought the hour had struck when he too should take his turn. He did not hesitate. He packed the few small things that he wished to take with him on his journey, nailed fast the door of his small house, took the train and answered the call, believing that he was fulfilling the highest duties of a British subject in his country's hour of trial. It is that spirit, Sir, that has dominated the people of the West generally in regard to the call which was so strong and which came with such sudden and terrific force. The fact that they responded to that call and that they responded to it in that spirit is the best guarantee of the final outcome of this war.

I should be a very poor Canadian if I did not share the pride of those who are living in eastern and central Canada that the response which I have described in the far West was also made, with equal vigour and equal patriotism, throughout the length and breadth of the eastern country. Certainly, if there should be any inspiration to those of us who are not at the front to do our duty here, it should be the feeling that those men have given up everything they possess in the world—home, comforts, even honourable and distinguished positions—in order that they might fight our battles. I have seen these men march through the city of Ottawa; it has been my pleasure to be present on many occasions, especially when the western divisions have gone through, when the Duke of Connaught, whom we are all so delighted to have with us in this time of stress, and the hon. Minister of Militia, were present to review the troops. I have seen scores of personal friends amongst them; I have watched their career. I have, as every man in this House has, lost by death in the battle trenches many a warm personal friend. I have known others who were wounded, and some have returned. It has been an immense satisfaction to a man from my province, who has known these men, not only to watch the response that they made, but to see that they have borne themselves not only as we would expect a Canadian to bear himself, but in such a way as to line up with the very finest traditions of the whole Empire. I do not dwell on these things, because it was not for that purpose that I rose to speak. My hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. McKenzie) will perhaps pardon me if I do not allude to the matter he has given us in the last hour. I found it, I confess, a little bit mixed. He was talking about chaos, and the sun and stars and military shovels, and the iniquities of the Conservative Administrations in Manitoba, New Brunswick and British Columbia, and the rampant partyism that has been observable in this country since the unfortunate hour when the Conservatives assumed office in Ottawa. I think, perhaps, we can take all that for what it is worth; at least my hon. friend will not think I am discourteous to him if I do not touch on the matter which he produced just now. No man could take any exception to the tone of a good many of the speeches that have been delivered. No man could take exception to the tone of the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or that of my hon. friend from the West who sits behind him (Mr. Michael Clark), or those of several other hon. gentlemen opposite. It is true that some of those speeches have contained a good deal of criticism of things in connection with which we must expect criticism. I do not know that any man can object to having strong and keen criticism levelled against him, when he is placed in a position of responsibility, as members of a government are. Nobody will complain of that. But I think, also, we can realize that there is a good deal of criticism that is expressed, and a certain amount of criticism has been

heard in this debate, which is not of a helpful character, but is entirely designed to make political capital for the man who advances it. The suggestion that the recruiting meetings addressed by members of this Government and others on this side of the House during the past year have been simply instruments to advance the political interests of those who have taken part in them, I regret. It has been my pleasure to take part, as it is every man's pleasure and duty to take part, in meetings of that kind, not only in other parts of Canada, but in Ontario. I attended one or two with my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. Graham). I would just as little think of accusing him of trying to make political capital out of a speech of that kind when appealing to the best instincts of the Canadian people, in a common cause, as he would think of accusing me of trying to make political capital out of such a meeting.

While we have had several speeches in which there might be nothing to object to, we have had two speeches to which there has been every reason to object, both as to their tone and their matter. I refer particularly to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). We all know our hon. friend from St. John. He is a gentleman who has occupied a prominent position in the counsels of the Liberal party and of the late Government. He is a Privy Councillor, a man who has been a distinguished member of the Bar, and who, of all men, should weigh his words when he speaks in public. We know his methods, we know that particularly suave way of his. There is an old saying of a certain man, that the words of his mouth were softer than butter, but war was in his heart. I do not know that the words could be as applicable to anybody else as to my hon. friend from St. John. He is very astute. His methods are of such a kind that he can suggest all sorts of desperate and sinister motives in those whom he politically opposes without coming out flatfooted in such a way as to expose himself to be called to order for transgressing the rules of parliamentary procedure—although he must be accused of coming very near the limit of parliamentary debate on some occasions this session.

The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., is a man of different mould altogether. In his tactics and his manner, if he will permit me to say so, he could never be accused of suavity, whatever else we may accuse him of. I think we can say that he is of the sand-bagging, bludgeoning type, using that expression in a parliamentary sense; and I think it is perhaps fair to say that he is not at all handicapped by any lack of recklessness or inaccuracy in a great many of the statements he makes. The members of this House have long learned to take anything that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., may say with a very large grain of salt. I shall have occasion later on to touch on some of the utterances of my hon. friend, as they were directed to myself.

I wish first to refer to a subject which has been freely discussed in this House, which happens to affect me in a rather important way, inasmuch as I am the minister representing the province of British Columbia in this Government, and because, particularly, I happened to be in Victoria on the day that war broke out; and it happened to fall to my lot to have something to do with the purchase of the submarines about which so much discussion has waged in this House. I shall not discuss the evidence, which is bulky, which has been open to the inspection of members on both sides, and which has been extensively quoted from by both the hon. the Solicitor General and the hon. the Minister of Marine. I regret, in the deepest way, the language that has been used in the discussion of that question by both the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. I do not know Sir Charles Davidson very well. I know him, as a good many members of the House know him, on a slight personal acquaintance, and from hearing of his reputation from others who are able to judge. Never, until the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for Carleton referred to that distinguished gentleman in the way they did, did I hear one word of blame or harsh criticism, or criticism that could be looked upon as regrettable in any way, applied to the ex-Chief Justice of Quebec, Sir Charles Davidson. Perhaps the best answer that could be given to either of these members is the answer that was read by the Solicitor General, from the chief Liberal organ in this country, the Toronto Globe. If my hon. friend from Carleton and my hon. friend from St. John are not satisfied with Sir Charles Davidson, if they think he is the type of man who has been biased, superficial, shallow, I think they could be referred to no better authority than the leading organ of their own party, the

Toronto Globe, which has expressed a very different opinion of that distinguished man. It was not, however, so much in regard to Sir Charles Davidson that I wanted to speak. he is a man well enough known to be able to take care of himself; and he has friends enough, on both sides of the House, to resent the references made to him. I wanted to say half a word in regard to the counsel appointed, not, as has been stated again and again by these two members, as a party counsel, to look after the interests of the Conservative party, but as a counsel who was looking after the interests of this country. I refer now to Mr. John Thompson, who happens to have been for years a strong personal friend of my own, and who, as many members of this House know, is a distinguished and honourable son of a distinguished and honourable father. I think that the references that were made to him, the contemptuous references made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who has just come in, and the references which were made only yesterday by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), who I think, used the phrase that Mr. Thompson pursued the police court methods—

Mr. CARVELL: I made no such reference to Mr. Thompson.

Mr. BURRELL: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I think he applied these words to the Solicitor General.

Mr. CARVELL: I did.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend allow me to correct him? I made no contemptuous reference to Mr. Thompson; my reference was entirely to the shallow investigation which Mr. Thompson conducted.

Mr. BURRELL: The astute and sophisticated mind of my hon. friend very often sees fine distinctions that are not differences.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have known some very able counsels conceal the facts.

Mr. BURRELL: I think that is the last conclusion which any one would reach regarding Mr. Thompson. At all events, I think I am fully justified in using the words I did in characterizing the references of my hon. friend. Both of these hon. gentlemen certainly gave the impression that not only was this commission conducting a very shallow and partisan commission, but that the methods employed by Mr. Thompson, to whom, I think, my hon. friend from St. John referred as an ordinary student—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all. What I said was—

Mr. BURRELL: Excuse me, I have the floor. If my hon. friend will allow me to finish my sentence—

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to correct my hon. friend right now. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member for St. John rises to a point of order. When the hon. member states his point of order I shall rule upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My point of order is this. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture says that I compared Mr. Thompson with a law student. I did not. I said that any law student would have known that, in order to obtain the truth, and to get out the facts, it was necessary to ask the question which I suggested.

Mr. BURRELL: If my hon. friend can take any comfort from that difference, he is welcome to it. If my hon. friend had allowed me to finish my sentence, which he would not do—he is always so ready to interrupt—he would have heard me say that his reference to Mr. Thompson was that he did the work in a way an ordinary law student would do it. It was a slighting reference. I say to hon. members opposite that if they would put aside their desire to make political capital out of a commission which has done its duty to this country in the fullest sense, they would at least give credit to these gentlemen for the highest possible motives, and show some recognition, as most people have shown, of the way in which they have done their work.

Mr. KNOWLES: Knowing Mr. Thompson, does my hon. friend say that he proved himself equal to the onerous work of investigating a $50,000,000 transaction?

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend must not expect me to answer questions like that. I think Mr. Thompson was capable of doing the work. I am not a lawyer—I understand my hon. friend has the distinction of being a lawyer, and possibly he is a better judge—but a good many lawyers think so. On this subject of interruptions I would like to point out that when my

hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was speaking he was interrupted I think forty or fifty times, certainly thirty or forty times, by hon. members on the other side of the House, especially by my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and sometimes by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and yet when my hon. friend from Carleton was interrupted twice yesterday he said, "I will not be interrupted; I do not want to be interfered with." The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) asked a perfectly natural question, and my hon. friend from Carleton told him to sit down, that he had the floor, and would not be interfered with. That may be one way of playing the game, but I do not think it is one which can appeal to the fairness of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have observed these things. I hope I will not object to answer any proper question which may be put, but my hon. friend would not be interrupted at all, and I think that at least he might extend some courtesy to members on this side of the House.

Before I leave the subject of Mr. Thompson, let me say to my hon. friends from St. John and Carleton that Mr. Thompson, who is, at all events in the opinion of some people, well qualified for the work which he undertook,—my two hon. friends are both lawyers, and I presume they are regarded, by some people at all events, as something more than ordinary members of the bar—gave his services in the finest spirit of patriotism for absolutely nothing all through that Commission, and he is now in the King's uniform ready to go and fight for his country. When my two hon. friends can rise to that height, it will be time for them to criticise.

Mr. ROGERS: Rise to a point of order now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend allow me?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my duty to remind the House of Rule 23 which says: "No member shall interrupt another member."

Mr. DEVLIN: Except with his permission.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule does not mention that, but if the hon. member who is asked a question is willing to be interrupted, of course I will not interfere. I think it is the desire of the hon. minister not to be interrupted, and he is entitled to have Rule 23 applied.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understood that my hon. friend did not object.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend wants to know why I am not in uniform, I have the answer here in a file of correspondence, which I will show him if he wants to see it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Agriculture has the floor.

Mr. BURRELL: I am not complaining of these hon. gentlemen if they interrupt to ask a question; I simply ask that the same fair play which is extended to hon. gentlemen opposite will be shown to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend should not fire shots across the floor.

Mr. BURRELL: To return for a minute to the question of the investigation of the submarines, I am not going into the evidence, as I have stated, for various reasons. My hon. friend from St. John rose, as he has risen a great many times during the debate, to interject a criticism and some remarks. The last time the subject came up, when, I think, he made a speech on a point of order, he asked again about the three cheques; he asked why these three cheques were given instead of one cheque. Now, all that matter was fully gone into and thoroughly explained by my hon. friend the Solicitor General. The statement is on page 140 of Hansard, and I am not going into that question again because my hon. friend knows all about it as well as I do.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It does not explain it at all.

Mr. BURRELL: I am not going into the question of buoyancy and efficiency, because my hon. friends are perfectly familiar with them. They have had the evidence placed before them, the cumulative evidence of experts who know what they are talking about. It is only beating the air to go on suggesting—

Mr. CARVELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURRELL: I say that it is absolutely beating the air to go on suggesting that the matter which has been referred to exhaustively in the evidence as proved under the testimony of experts can be insufficient in the belief of this gentleman who has never given it any close study at all. A discussion took place as to the price of these vessels and it fell to my lot to be in Victoria when the matter first came up.

I was asked to go down to the Navy yard by the commanding officer and I went down with Captain Logan. I was there two days running and when the question came up as to the possibility and advisability of getting these submarines at a time when there was critical danger to the coast cities of British Columbia the commanding officer was urging in the strongest way possible that they should be got. Captain Logan, whose testimony is given in the evidence, was comparatively familiar with the type of these vessels, the class to which they belonged and to some extent with their efficiency. He did not know anything about the price. I was standing at the "phone" when Captain Logan asked the agent in Seattle to quote a price if these boats could be procured. My recollection is now—and I think it is pretty clear—that they did not know at Seattle and had to obtain that information from the Electric Boat Company in New York. At all events, the price was quoted over the phone as $1,150,000 or $575,000 each. That amount was inserted in the telegram advising my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) of the fact and it was stated from the commanding officer: I thoroughly concurred as to the advisability of getting these boats but the question of price, or anything of that kind I left to the Government to deal with. I cannot see, in view of the evidence that there can be the slightest question in any reasonable man's mind as to the value of these boats. Let me ask my hon. friend from St. John: Why was there all this suspicion? Why was it that from the start he was so suspicious of these boats?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend desire an answer?

Mr. BURRELL: Oh, no, I do not think I will ask the hon. gentleman to give an answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would be very glad to give the answer.

Mr. BURRELL: I know perfectly well that my hon. friend would be quite willing to talk for half an hour if necessary, but I do not think it is necessary at all. When a man is in serious danger of his life and finds that a rifle is the only weapon he can get to save his life, and it is a question of whether the rifle is going to cost $10, $15, or $20 he is not very much concerned whether he is going to pay $10, $15 or $20; he is going to get the rifle in order to save his life. I cannot understand my hon. friend not giving credit to the situation which existed in British Columbia at that time. He ought to know, as every man in this House should know, that at the particular time at which this transaction took place the declaration of war was a matter of hours, that there was no time to enter into lengthy negotiations, even if we had disputed the price of these boats. It was a matter of necessity to get them. I know what the condition of things in Victoria and Vancouver was at that time, and I know how seriously alarmed the people were. It was a matter not only of possibility, but of probability that the German fleet on the Pacific were liable at any time to steam in and shell the two cities of Victoria and Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They had a Japanese cruiser there.

Mr. BURRELL: The only thing that saved the western coast from a possibility of the kind that I have described was the presence of the submarines that we purchased at that time.

Mr. MACDONALD: There were no guns on them.

Mr. MURPHY: And no torpedoes.

Mr. BURRELL: It was not very long before torpedoes were put on these boats. But the fact that it was known that these submarines were in possession of the authorities at Esquimalt did more to ensure the safety of these two coast cities than anything else that possibly could be done.

In discussing this question the other day, the hon. member for Carleton made this remarkable statement and it is characteristic of the methods of my hon. friend that he should have made it. I am reading from page 274 of Hansard, and it will be seen that the statement was made when he was nearing the close of his speech:

> The submarine business has been pretty well discussed by speakers on both sides of this House. I am only going to call the attention of the House to the fact that one of the most serious charges that could be made against a public man in Canada was made against Sir Richard McBride, practically alleging that there had been a rake off of $350,000 in the purchase of these submarines, taking advantage of the nation in its hour of need, when these things were a real necessity, considering the fact that they were obsolete, that they had been refused by the government of a South American republic, not because they would not shoot torpedoes, but because the things would not come to the surface when they wanted them to.

That is a pretty bold, a pretty reckless statement for the hon. gentleman to have made and it is the most regrettable statement that he could have made and one which he would not have made had he been in Victoria or outside the precincts of this House. The hon. member for Carleton would not have dared to have repeated that statement if he had been in Victoria at that time. Sir Richard McBride did, as the people of British Columbia think, a patriotic thing for his country in getting these submarines or by giving his services to the extent that he did in getting them, and for the hon. member for Carleton to get up in the way in which he did and behind a man's back, and enjoying the privileges of this House, to accuse a man of being a grafter to the extent of $350,000 is something that must strike every member of this House as surprising and deplorable. Why did he not have the manliness to do these things in the proper place where he could be called to account for them?

An hon. MEMBER: He was out there.

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, and could have been given an opportunity—

Mr. CARVELL: I could have got a Davidson investigation, I suppose.

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, or anything else; or, the hon. gentleman could have said this in such a way that the gentleman to whom he referred would have had an opportunity of replying. There is nothing more regrettable or deplorable, amongst all the phrases that have been put upon Hansard than the statement of my hon. friend. Speaking as a British Columbian, knowing something of the facts that existed at that time, knowing the gravity of the situation, as it affected a large part of the Canadian people in the far West—and they are no less Canadian because they live in Victoria or in the province of British Columbia, whatever opinion my hon. friend may have of that province—knowing the situation as I do, Sir Richard McBride is to be congratulated and he is to be admired for the efforts which he made, financially and otherwise, through his Government to enable this Government to obtain possession of these two boats which practically made the Pacific coast immune from danger in that particular.

My hon. friend from St. John never seemed to have realized that there was a situation of considerable gravity at that time in the western coast. He is all the time harping on suspicions as to the fact of a possible rake-off. I presume he will find time to thoroughly examine the evidence that has been submitted. He is a good enough lawyer to sift that evidence and I venture to say that if he gives an honest opinion upon it he will admit that there never was a more thorough examination into anything and that there never was a clearer transaction put through in our country's history than that which was put through in connection with this matter. Let me say to my hon. friend, who is so regardless of the position and the perils of the people of Victoria and Vancouver, how differently would he have spoken if a German cruiser had been within fifty miles of St. John. He would have been down on his knees begging the Government to do something. One million, three millions, would not have been enough if it were necessary to ensure protection, and he who so lightly disregards the peril of a city on the far western coast and would have taken a very different tone if the danger applied to his own city, should be the last man to cast reflections on those who had anything to do with that matter. As I have several letters here which I wish to put on file in connection with another matter to which my hon. friend from Carleton referred yesterday, I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will allow me to call it six o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister allow me to ask him who actually purchased the submarines? Was it Mr. Logan or Sir Richard McBride.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend can find out all that information without any trouble. This Government bought the submarines through the good offices of the British Columbia Government, who helped us because those people had to have the money then and there, or we should never have had the submarines before war was declared. I should think both governments were fully justified.

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

Thursday, January 27, 1916.

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

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, January 26.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night I had just finished presenting to the House a few words in connection with matters which had been brought up during the course of this debate, and I was about to refer to some things which had been lengthily discussed by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). That hon. member has seen fit to discuss at very great length in this House a question which, from my point of view, and I think from the point of view of a good many other people, it was not in the public interest to discuss. On that point I shall speak a little later. I shall not attempt to follow the ramifications of my hon. friend's arguments, because it would be very hard to follow them, even should I desire to do so; neither shall I attempt to follow all the reckless statements that he made in connection with the subject. I sometimes think that democracy, for whose existence we are fighting now, and coupled with democracy the love of freedom and the liberty of free speech, is not an unmixed blessing when the privilege of freedom of speech degenerates as it sometimes does into license. My hon. friend has made a good many reckless speeches in the course of his career in this House; and he has got into trouble a good many times in this House; he would have got into trouble a good many more times outside the House if he had said outside the House what he has said inside the House. I might, in that connection, direct my hon. friend's attention to the excellent editorial in the Ottawa Free Press of last night, in which the editor cordially invites my hon. friend to repeat the remarks made here in reference to the Free Press outside of this House, when he will find himseslf in the law courts.

Mr. CARVELL: Would my hon. friend pardon me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BURRELL: Have I made a misstatement?

Mr. CARVELL: I just want——

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. BURRELL: If I have made a misstatement——

Mr. CARVELL: I want to inform my hon. friend that I have written a letter to the Free Press, and I am going to give them all the opportunity to bring all the actions they want in the courts of law.

Mr. BURRELL: I am perfectly sure that the House is exceedingly interested in that, and I would suggest that if my hon. friend is very hard pressed he can secure the distinguished legal services of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. CARVELL: And he will win for me, too.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend, in the very long speech which he made the other day, started out with a misstatement of fact. Of course that is not very surprising, although it is rather astonishing to hear a gentleman who is always so keenly desirous of bringing down proof for every statement he makes, starting out on an argument with an absolute misstatement of fact. In starting to discuss the question of hay in New Brunswick, he made the statement that the contractors in 1915, the Atlantic Hay Company, had a contract for 7,000 tons of hay which was increased later to 10,000 tons. My hon. friend, if he is going to make statements of that kind, should try and get somewhere near the truth because that contract of 7,000 tons was never increased to 10,000 tons. And he makes the statement further on in that speech, that after they had filled the terms of this contract they immediately went after more, and he broadly intimates that they got more. I am here to say that they never had any other contract than that for 7,000 tons. A little further on, he states that the contract was given for $24 a ton for compressed hay; and then at page 263 Hansard he says:

> These men were given a contract for 7,000 tons of hay, afterwards increased to about 10,000 tons—

I have shown the inaccuracy of that.

> —at $24 a ton, delivered in St. John from press, ready to be put on board the vessel—I am not sure; I was—

I thought my hon. friend was always so sure of the facts.

> —under the impression that the contract price was $24.50. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs knows about this, because he and I talked the matter over.

Mr. J. D. Reid: When was that?

Mr. Carvell: That was one night last spring.

Mr. Reid: You are referring to something which took place a year ago.

Mr. Carvell: I am referring to something which took place a year ago.

An hon. Member: That is too deep for him.

Mr. Carvell: No, it is not too deep for him. The Minister of Customs and I will not quarrel over the matter. If he had been allowed to handle this thing there would not have been the terrible condition of affairs that exists in New Brunswick to-day. The Minister of Customs told me that the contract price was $24.50.

There was never a contract given for $24.50. There was no mention of it, and the Minister of Customs could never have said it. My hon. friend the member for Carleton should not have believed it, because he did not get the facts, and he could have got them if he had wanted to. I shall not go into the whole question of that contract, but I wish to touch on some features of it. It was given on January 4, 1915. I did not happen to be here at the time, because I was then recovering from pneumonia and was in the Southern States. The department, however, and those who had anything to do with the department, acted in perfectly good faith in giving that contract. My hon. friend refers in very scathing tones to the iniquities—he almost used that phrase—of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who, he gives us to understand, is playing havoc with everything that is good and pure and righteous in New Brunswick, and whom he holds responsible for these things. Well, if a matter came up concerning the province of New Brunswick, I do not know that it would be a crime to ask the advice of, or to consult with, the minister who represents that province in the Government. If my hon. friend ever achieves the distinction—I do not think it likely that he will—of being a cabinet minister, I can easily believe that he of all men—

Mr. CARVELL: You know that some very ordinary men have become cabinet ministers.

Mr. BURRELL: If my hon. friend ever did achieve such a distinction, he would be the first to expect to be consulted when things come up in connection with his own province. I do not think my hon. friend is ever likely to achieve that distinction; looking at his record, I certainly do not think he ever will. The hon. member for Carleton was elected in 1904 by a majority of 274. He appealed to the electors again in 1908, and he had meanwhile forfeited their confidence to the extent that he got in by a majority of only 154. He appealed again in 1911, to find that he had forfeited nearly all the confidence of the electors because he only got a majority of 11; that time he got elected by the skin of his teeth, and if he continues to keep up his reputation in this House he will certainly not get elected next time. I think it would be good policy on the part of my hon. friend to support an extension of the term of the present Parliament, otherwise we may not see much more of him.

Mr. GRAHAM: Was that the argument used in caucus?

Mr. BURRELL: Now let me refer for a moment or two to the question of hay. The first offer we had of pressed hay was from Kennealy and Wetmore. I think they are Conservatives——

Mr. CARVELL: No, Liberals; one of them is anyway.

Mr. BURRELL: I am not sure about their politics. Anyway, on January 2, 1915, they made an offer of 10,000 tons of hay at $21.50 a ton. The condition was made that the Department of Agriculture should furnish the presses and the tender was not accepted. I think, perhaps, it would be well in that connection to put two letters on Hansard, because they will show how the thing took place.

St. John, N.B., Jan. 2, 1915.

J. A. Ruddick, Esq.,
Commissioner, Department of Agriculture,
Ottawa.

Dear sir,—At the request of Hon. J. D. Hazen we have submitted a tender for ten thousand tons compressed hay delivered West St. John for War Office account.

Hon. Mr. Hazen advises us that your department can arrange for the presses for this business. Will you advise us full particulars of the arrangements covering this item so that we may take the necessary steps to complete arrangements providing our tender is accepted.

Awaiting your reply, we are,

Yours very truly,

Kennealy & Wetmore, Ltd.

Messrs. Kennealy & Wetmore, Ltd.,
St. John, N.B.

Dear sirs,—I have your letter of the 2nd instant, which has crossed mine of the same date. I do not know what the Honourable Mr. Hazen had in mind when he advised you that this department could arrange for compressors to handle New Brunswick hay. As a matter of fact the only presses which the department has control of at the present time are those which are in use at Montreal. There must be some, misunderstanding on that point.

Yours truly,

J. A. Ruddick,
Commissioner.

These letters explain why at that time Kennealy & Wetmore did not get that contract. The Atlantic Hay Co. was the only other tender received or considered at that time, and a gentleman came down here—I am now only speaking from memory of what Mr. Ruddick said, because I was not here at the time,—I think he was the son of a member of the firm, or at all events he was some one connected with the firm. The matter was discussed, and he asked for a contract at the price of $24, at which price they offered to supply their own presses. My hon. friend knows that the cost of freight, and of the installation of presses and motors comes to a very considerable sum; they put it at about $20,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Thirty cents a ton will pay for the whole thing; I did it.

Mr. BURRELL: Will my hon. friend sit down.

Mr. CARVELL: I will keep the hon. gentleman straight.

Mr. BURRELL: May I speak to a point of order, Mr. Speaker; we may as well get the air cleared before we start on this subject. I would not object to any hon. gentleman opposite asking the privilege to correct a statement of fact. I hope I would not object to that; I have never objected to it, and no man would object. But I do object to be constantly interrupted if the interruption does not relate to any question of fact. The interruption of my hon. friend had nothing to do with the statement I made. I simply referred to the cost of the presses; I am not referring to the cost of the pressing at all. I made the plain statement that this firm stated that the presses cost them nearly $20,000 to purchase, to freight, to install and to operate the motors.

Mr. CARVELL: I deny that; that is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think my hon. friend should correct his statement. The words "not true" are certainly not parliamentary.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say it is not a correct statement of fact as to the cost of these presses; that is all.

Mr. BURRELL: I am amazed at my hon. friend who is a lawyer, being so absolutely out of his province, and showing such a lack of intelligence. I did not say it was a fact; I stated that the gentleman who came here claimed that the cost was $20,000.

Mr. CARVELL: It is a wonder they did not say $40,000.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. BURRELL: Just keep quiet. Let me tell my hon. friend that he will get all he wants before I am through.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members not to interrupt the hon. minister. I understand he desires to have the protection of Rule 23, which every hon. member is entitled to when addressing the House. I ask hon. members not to interrupt the hon. member.

Mr. CARVELL: All right.

Mr. BURRELL: Now, I can elucidate this point which we were discussing perhaps a little more clearly. I made the statement that the contractors who came up here considered that it cost them nearly $20,000 to install those four presses, with their equipment. My hon. friend says that is not a fact, if I said it, but I did not say it. I do say that it comes pretty nearly to that sum, and I am going to give the best proof I can for that statement. It is a fact that my hon. friend himself when he had a contract with the Government in 1902 put in a certain claim for loss after finishing his contract, and in that claim he stated that the amount invested in his pressing plant, consisting of two presses, was $8,530. That comes pretty close to it.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is not $20,000 for one press.

Mr. BURRELL: So much for that. At that time when this contract was given, and given in perfectly good faith by the department, the department had no accurate knowledge as to the cost of compression, for it was not until after this date that the presses at Montreal were taken over by the department, and that we could get knowledge of these facts. At that time we were paying, under the arrangement that had been made in the earlier stages of the pressing at Montreal, $4.95 to the firm that was pressing, and adding $18.75, which was paid for the hay, and adding the freight to St. John, that brought the cost to us of the compressed article at West St. John up to $25.70. So that at this price we were saving $1.70 as compared with the Montreal price. There were other contracts given that year in addition to this one of 7,000 tons, because Kennealy & Wetmore came back with the request that we might give them one at a higher figure, but my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), who was, I think, Acting Minister of Agriculture at that time, took the ground that as they had tendered for $21.50, whether they thought the presses were going

to be supplied or not he was going to keep the price down to that figure, and so it was kept down to $21.50. George Stevenson & Company, Mr. Stevenson also being a Conservative, had been given a contract for 3,000 tons, and Charles Cyr one for 2,000 tons. The hon. member for Carleton has something to say at page 271 of Hansard particularly about the quality of the hay. He spoke of the fact that these people, after completing their 7,000-ton contract, reached out for more, and intimates that they got more. He says:

I find no fault with the Government for giving all the contracts they could, because they want the hay. But these people bought up every ton of the rotten, black, condemned clover hay—

Nobody can fail to recognize where that language came from.

—there was in the county of Carleton. There were 300 tons of hay condemned at the plant of the Phillips-Estey Co. at Woodstock; there must have been more than 300 tons at the plant of the McCain Company at Woodstock, and 300 tons more at different points along the line. And, mind, at the two plants to which I have referred, this hay was condemned by Government inspectors. But every ton of that black, rotten hay was loaded on the cars, sent to St. John, put through the Atlantic Hay Company's presses, and they got $24 a ton for it from the British Government. No, I want to qualify that. There may have been a carload or two that did not go through their presses. I was in the shed at St. John in the summer, and there was a little lot of hay piled up in one corner. Now, what kind of inspectors must they have in St. John?

You know the tone he would speak that in if he were saying it.

What kind of supervision does the department give to the purchase of this hay? What kind of cursed influence must the Minister of Marine and Fisheries exercise upon the minister of this department, and upon all the rest of them, to allow these things to go on unchallenged?

I will have a word or two to say about this hay. My hon. friend takes the broad ground that a great lot of this hay was not only neglected in the way of inspection, but was disgraceful in character, and should never have gone over to the War Office at all. What I shall read here will apply to a lot of the hay with which we had to deal in New Brunswick last year. The following is a telegram from Thomas C. Strong, who was one of our inspectors at Woodstock:

Car of hay No. 42844 C.P. inspected at Woodstock by me and rejected has been reshipped to St. John by the James A. Scott Co. to the Atlantic Hay Co. for compressing as they claim that I am too hard on the grading and they will receive hay in St. John that I reject. Please keep a check on this car and let me know the results.

Yours,

Thos. C. Strong.

The following is a telegram from Mr. J. A. Ruddick to Mr. J. L. Cooke:

Ottawa, March 13, 1915.

Car C.P. 42844 rejected by our Woodstock inspector has been shipped to Atlantic Co. Look out for it.

(Sgd.) J. A. Ruddick.

The following letter was written to Mr. J. L. Cooke by Mr. Moore, who has had this matter in hand. I may here interject in reply to my hon. friend, who asked me in stentorian tones what kind of inspectors we have in St. John, that we have a very efficient man in Mr. J. L. Cooke, who was appointed under the late regime in 1909. He is the man who did the inspecting. Is my hon. friend satisfied now?

Mr. J. L. Cooke,
256 Rodney street,
West St. John, N.B.

Dear Sir,—I have just telegraphed you as follows: "Car C.P. 42844 rejected by our Woodstock inspector has been shipped to Atlantic Co. Look out for it."

It would be unfortunate if hay that is rejected by an inspector for the department at Woodstock should be accepted by an inspector for the department at West St. John. Of course, I expect you to use your own judgment and accept or reject this car on its merits, but in this particular case it would be better to be too severe rather than too lenient. It is possible that the main objection to this hay may be an excess of clover and, as I told you when I saw you, I think you are allowing a greater percentage of clover than they are at Woodstock. In fact I have been somewhat uneasy since I left St. John because I fear that you are taking rather too much clover, which at this season of the year is apt to be dusty and when it is pressed very hard will present anything but a fine appearance when the bales are opened up in France. If the clover can be properly blended with straight timothy it is all right, but compressed bales containing more than forty per cent clover will, I am afraid, prove objectionable. Be sure to let us know what action you take with regard to this car.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. W. Moore,
Chief, Markets Division.

Here is a letter to Mr. Moore from Mr. Cooke, the inspector, dated March 15:

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 13th inst., with regard to C.P. car 42844. This car arrived alongside of shed 15 last night and was opened this morning. I found contents of car to be of poor quality, consisting mostly of wild grass mixed with a small per cent of timothy.

This car was not unloaded, only a few bales were taken out of the doorway for the purpose of seeing into the car. I found contents

to be worse, I had the bales put back and rejected same.

I have the honour to be sir,
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) J. L. Cooke.

This is a letter to Mr. Ruddick from Thos. C. Strong:

Dear Sir,—I feel it my duty to let you know what is being done in regard to the Kennealy & Wetmore contract—

I am dealing now with the general question of the class of hay which was accepted, and with my hon. friend's charge that black, rotten hay went to the War Office, a thing which would certainly distress me as much as it would him, if it were a fact:

—I feel it my duty to let you know what is being done in regard to the Kennealy & Wetmore contract.

These parties are buying all the cull hay that I sorted out of two thousand tons and are shipping it to St. John and having it compressed there, so you can take whatever action in the matter you see fit.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) Thos. C. Strong.

Then here is a telegram from Mr. Ruddick to Mr. Cooke:

Inspector Strong, Woodstock, reports Kennealy & Wetmore shipping all hay rejected by him to West St. John. Look out for it.

With respect to this transaction, I may tell the House that this hay was watched very carefully and that little, if any, hay, that should not have gone did actually go. The best proof that such is the fact is that Messrs Kennealy & Wetmore say that they could not fill their contract owing to the heavy rejections. They say:

Owing to heavy rejections it is possible we may be short about thousand tons; we have more hay on track than presses are handling; we are not delaying them; may possibly be able to complete in Montreal.

Both Kennealy & Wetmore, and Stevenson, who also shipped hay to Montreal, had a large amount rejected, and, as I have stated that Kennealy & Wetmore were absolutely unable to fill their contracts because they could not get the hay owing to the heavy rejections. I have referred to the Stevenson contract. As he could not get the amount of hay he wanted in time, he shipped to Montreal and very much of the poor hay was rejected and he was therefore put in a similar position. Certainly there were a lot of difficulties about these 1915 contracts. The point I want to make is this: It is quite possible that, looking back, it would have been better to have paid the contractors, who certainly had a very hard row to hoe a little more and the Atlantic Hay Company a little less. But the whole transaction was conducted in absolutely good faith by those who were here while I was absent and statements made about the exorbitant profits of the company are absolutely beside the mark. The best proof that the hay was not of the character that my hon. friend described it to be is that we had not a single complaint about the hay from the War Office when it arrived in France and they were absolutely satisfied with it. We furnished the War Office with all the accounts and details that they wanted in regard to these transactions and no complaint whatever was made. In the earlier stages of large undertakings of this kind which are suddenly thrust upon a department, it would be astonishing if mistakes and blunders were not made. Does my hon. friend think that any department of the Government in times such as these can suddenly take hold of a transaction of this kind and make no mistake whatever? I do not profess to be infallible, neither do the officers of the department; but we all endeavour to make as few mistakes as possible, and in absolute good faith to rectify those mistakes which may have been made in the past. Let me point out to my hon. friend, that the War Office, having had a full account of all these transactions up to that time placed before them, not only did not say: we find no fault in you in connection with these transactions, but since that time they have placed on my shoulders increased responsibilities in connection with supplies for the armies at the front.

I come now to the transactions of this year, with which I am a little more familiar. This is a story which I think will interest, if it does not weary the House, for my hon. friend has dealt with it pretty vigorously already. A contract was given to the Atlantic Hay Company this year for 15,000 tons at $23 a ton. This contract was for hay, compressed from eighty to one hundred cubic feet to the ton, and which would pass inspection at St. John. This company owned four presses. We thought that it was not at all likely—and I think my hon. friend will admit this—that there would be as much hay available in New Brunswick this year as last. We thought, and rightly so, that it would be more convenient for us to deal with the one firm owning the four presses. I think there was only one other press in the whole province able to do that work. Furthermore, we thought it would

be better for the War Office we should have our inspection at one point, and at the price of $23 a ton it would be giving the hay to the War Office at $2 less a ton than was being paid for Montreal hay, adding freight to St. John.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it not a fact that the four presses now used by the Atlantic Hay Company were not at that time in the province of New Brunswick but in Montreal?

Mr. BURRELL: I did not say they were in New Brunswick. I said that the Atlantic Hay Company owned them, and that they were available.

Mr. CARVELL: No. Mr. McDonald owns them.

Mr. BURRELL: Mr. McDonald is, and has been, a member of the Atlantic Hay Company. We thought that in giving this contract we should not only be ensuring to the War Office a good class of hay at a reasonable price, but that the contractors would also be able to give a fair price to the farmers, and not make any undue profit for themselves. We believed in good faith that it was a contract that could be entirely justified. Other offers came in soon afterwards, and I may say for the benefit of my hon. friend from Carleton, who thinks that we do everything for Conservatives and nothing for anybody else, that several of these offers came from strong Conservatives and were not considered for the reasons I have mentioned.

Mr. CARVELL: I know it.

Mr. BURRELL: Subsequently the honourable member for Carleton started in the press a great controversy on hay matters generally in the province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend cherishes a very poor opinion of the contractor, Mr. B. F. Smith. I am not very familiar with New Brunswick politics—I know they are very vigorous—but I think that Mr. Smith may have been my hon. friend's political opponent, or is going to be. Anyway, my hon. friend cherishes an exceedingly mean opinion of Mr. Smith, judging from what I have seen of the controversy, and I am quite sure Mr. Smith cherishes an equally poor opinion of my hon. friend opposite. When I was ill with the grippe a little while ago, the hon. member for Carleton came to Ottawa to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was at that time acting premier, and who, as an old citizen of New Brunswick, knew conditions in that province fairly well, I suppose. My hon. friend from Carleton set forth a great many statements in regard to this hay controversy in New Brunswick, and produced a dazzling array of figures as to cost of pressing, freight, shrinkages, and various other things, to such an extent that he made out that an iniquitous state of affairs existed, and that the farmers were not getting a look in. He demanded, in very vigorous tones, I should gather, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should immediately compel those rascals down there to give to the farmer two more dollars, or whatever it was, or that another contract should be let, or that the embargo which had been imposed should be lifted. I may say that the embargo does not affect New Brunswick to anything like the same extent that it affects Quebec, inasmuch as during the whole four months since the last hay crop and prior to the imposing of the embargo, only 400 or 420 tons were shipped from New Brunswick to the United States. My hon. friend made all these statements, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, as he naturally would under the circumstances, that if such a state of affairs existed it was deplorable, and that he would turn the matter over to the Minister of Agriculture. He said he would have Mr. Ruddick come over and discuss the matter with him, and if everything was as the hon. member for Carleton had stated, something ought to be done to remedy it. In that visit—and I am not breaking any confidence in saying this—my hon. friend from Carleton mentioned that he himself would benefit to the tune of several hundred dollars if the farmers got a bigger price; I presume he has several hundred tons of hay himself. He said to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as he has in effect said to me since in a letter: Give this extra money to the farmers, make these people pay more, or let the work out to other contractors, or lift the embargo; and if you will do one of these things I will not say a thing about it.

Mr. CARVELL: That is all true.

Mr. BURRELL: He was going to get a bigger price for the farmer, for his friends and for himself. I may say for the benefit of my hon. friend that in everything connected with this hay business I have been only too glad to consult with the Minister of Trade and Commerce on every step that I have taken, and on the correspondence, and anything that has been done in that

matter since my hon. friend visited the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been with the entire concurrence of my colleague. Among other things that my hon. friend discussed with the Minister of Trade and Commerce at that time was that we should give to Mr. McCain, a friend of my hon. friend opposite, a contract for three, or four, or five thousand tons of hay in that part of New Brunswick where my hon. friend lives, and that this would settle it. Subsequently Mr. McCain wrote to the department; he had written once before. In one case he wrote offering to take a contract for from three to five thousand tons at $22.50 a ton. He could well do that. In any case it would not have been much better than what we were doing, even if other circumstances had been equal. We should have had to send a special inspector up there, and more expense would have been involved in pressing the hay at Woodstock. Mr. McCain subsequently made an offer of $23 a ton and pay $15 to the farmers. He could well do that. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, who knows the fact, observed that it might be possible in one small district where there was a considerable quantity of hay and conditions were more favourable in regard to labour, and freights not so much as in other parts of the province, to get the hay for less than we could at St. John; but he pointed out that that would interfere with the general arrangement for the whole province. That point was well recognized, because as my hon. friend has stated, when Mr. McCain got a contract in 1902 there was a considerable difference in the price, viz.—$14 f.o.b. Florenceville, as against $17 St. John. We therefore did not consider it advisable to take that step, nor did I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce consider it advisable. Subsequent to the visit of my hon. friend, Mr. Smith came to Ottawa. He also went into this hay question and put up a lot of facts and figures and I think was able to show that some of the statements of the hon. member for Carleton might be questioned as regards expenses of operation and various other details. At all events, he made the statement—and there may have been some force in it—that they were getting only a reasonable price for their hay contract and that he was willing to pay and would pay what he considered a fair price. That price might fluctuate from time to time to the farmers, and he did not expect to make an unreasonable profit; but as so much had been said about it, and as Mr. Smith and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) had been scrapping and fighting so hard and filling the newspapers of St. John and other parts of New Brunswick with this controversy, Mr. Smith offered to transfer his contract to any other firm in New Brunswick, under exactly the same conditions, and allowing the department to fix a reasonable price by arbitration for the expenditure he had incurred and for the expenses of his plant. Now, that was a pretty fair offer. We did not accept that offer, nor did we accept another offer that he made, for very sufficient reasons. In the first place, it would have been inadvisable, from the department's point of view, even if the offer had been accepted, to transfer the contract, because it would have meant delay in the delivery of hay and in the adjustment which would have been necessary under the conditions of the transfer. Mr. Smith also made another offer to which I am now going to allude. It is strange, however, during all this time that the controversy was going on and under the dismal state of affairs as pictured by the hon. member for Carleton, that neither the department nor I, myself, received a single protest from any farmer in New Brunswick in reference to this matter, and the only protest that I ever heard of at all came through one letter that was sent, I think, by the hon. member for Carleton to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and which is not now in my possession, because I returned it, and the letter which my hon. friend read in the House. The letter to which my hon. friend referred was from a Mr. Fawcett, whom I do not know at all. My hon. friend referred to him in most eulogistic terms, and I recall, in the opening phrase of Mr. Fawcett's letter which he addressed to Mr. Carvell at Woodstock, that he looked upon Mr. Carvell as the one man in New Brunswick who would give agriculture a square deal, and that it was a matter of great thankfulness that they had such a man in the country. It would not be very difficult to infer that he is of the same affiliation as my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no doubt about that at all. He is a good Grit, if there ever was one.

Mr. BURRELL: The point I make is that not once had there been any protest to the department, or to myself, or any explanation or suggestion, and I am informed from other sources that on the

whole the New Brunswick farmers have been fairly well satisfied with the condition of things. However, I was not going to leave the matter there, and I did not leave it there. I went into the matter again and discussed it thoroughly. I asserted to Mr. Smith, what I have always asserted from the start and what I asserted in a letter to my hon. friend, namely: that the sole object the department has as a trustee for the British War Office in this matter is to help as far as we can to get a market for the Canadian farmer, and while getting him a fair price for his product—and he would get a much fairer price in this way throughout the country than he would have got if the War Office had not stepped in—at the same time to get the War Office a good article at a reasonable price, and to ensure that the contractors do not make an unreasonable profit. On that occasion, or subsequently, Mr. Smith wrote me this letter, which, with my reply, I wish to place upon Hansard:

Ottawa, 10th January, 1916.

The Hon. Martin Burrell,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—On my return to New Brunswick from a trip to the cities of Ontario and Quebec I found that the number of reckless, absurd and indeed silly assertions which had been bandied about in the public press and otherwise, in regard to the contract of this company to supply hay to the Department of Agriculture, had been indeed larger and their character more gross than I was aware of at the time of my recent visit to your department.

On that occasion and on January 3 following, as an evidence of the good faith of this company, I submitted two alternative propositions. One addressed both to the department and the public was as follows:

"We, the Atlantic Hay Company of St. John, New Brunswick, are willing to transfer our hay contract with the Department of Agriculture to any firm in New Brunswick who will agree to deliver the quantity of hay to the department, and carry out the terms of the contract; provided such firm or person arranges to pay us for expenses incurred to the date of the transfer and takes over for use our plant at St. John, the figures to be paid for the use of plant and for disbursements incurred to be determined by arbitration under the direction of the Department of Agriculture."

The other was made direct to your department and reads of follows:

"We, the Atlantic Hay Company of St. John, N.B., agree to cancel our contract with the Department of Agriculture (Dominion) and buy and compress their hay in the war bale on the basis of 5 per cent for handling the entire output of the province available for that purpose during the season, all books and vouchers to be open at all times to the department and a final audit made under the direction of them. Price to be paid the farmer and for hay delivered at West St. John to be fixed from time to time by the department."

I have explained why we did not think it advisable to consider the first offer, and I thought that it was not advisable to accept the second one, because, after I had consulted with the department, it did not seem clear that there would be any inducement to keep down the expenses of operation. The letter goes on:

As a further evidence, however, of the determination of the company to deal absolutely fairly both with the farmers and the department, and to show that the contract as originally made is based on that principle, we now make this additional voluntary offer:

We are ready to submit to the Department of Agriculture all purchase vouchers, books, documents and papers relating to the carrying out of the contract. The department may determine the sum which may be fairly allowed for all expenses connected with the purchase of said hay, freight, the operation of compressing plant and otherwise incidental to the final delivery of the compressed hay, and having so determined we agree that if the department finds there is any profit to our company beyond one dollar ($1.00) per ton, such excess profit will be retained by the department for the benefit of the Imperial Government.

I will be glad to hear from you at once as to the above.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) B. F. Smith,
for the Atlantic Hay Company.

To that letter I replied:

Ottawa, Ont. Jan. 11, 1916.

B. F. Smith, Esq.,
The Atlantic Hay Company,
East Florenceville, N.B.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter and note what you say in reference to the controversy which has taken place about your hay contract.

There was certainly no intention on the department's part when this contract was given that it would permit any exorbitant profits to be made. Our desire was that the War Office should be supplied with hay at a reasonable price, that the farmers should get an opportunity of disposing of their product at fair figures, and at the same time the contractor should not reap undue profits.

You have made several suggestions, but I think that the one contained in your letter of the 10th, namely, that you are willing to undertake that your profits shall not succeed $1 a ton, and that the department itself shall fix upon a proper basis for the expenses, is very fair and affords strong evidence of your good faith in the whole matter, and I shall therefore be glad to act upon it.

Yours truly,
(Sgd) M. Burrell.

My hon. friend might say, perhaps, that it would be very hard to determine that.

Mr. CARVELL: Impossible. You do not know whom you are up against.

Mr. BURRELL: All right. We know the opinion of these people, and we also know

the opinion of the hon. member. We need not discuss that. We have some pretty good men in the department who know as much about operating hay plants as any man about that plant, but I can tell my hon. friend and the contractors (because I presume they will get some knowledge of this debate) that it is my intention not only to have our expert officers to determine those operating expenditures, and to go into it all thoroughly, but to assist the officers of any department by giving them the services of a chartered accountant from time to time before the contractors are settled with in order that there may not be the slightest doubt on this matter. In connection with those letters which I have read, I also want to say that while my hon. friend had been howling all over New Brunswick that these men were iniquitous in their dealings, and that they were grinding down everybody and making extraordinary profits, and he was urging me to give more contracts, that on the 6th of January there appeared in the public press of New Brunswick statements, which I have read, from these contractors, saying that they would be willing to transfer that contract to any firm that would take it on the same terms. The hon. gentleman or his friends could have taken it up, but they never touched it, and nothing on the subject came to our department. I think that fact should have prevented the hon. gentleman from making some of the remarks that fell from his lips the other day.

Now, the hon. gentleman wrote me some time ago and gave me his views on these matters, and he gave them in pretty strong terms. He pleaded that more contracts should be given, but I said that we were not considering giving any more. He wrote again, a very strong letter, which letter he read in this House the other day. The hon. gentleman will remember that the closing phrase in that letter was to the effect that if something was not done to stop all this, at least he thought I would admit that he had the power of speech. He has—speech of a kind; and such as it is he has a great deal of it. At page 268 of Hansard he referred to this matter. I would like my hon. friend to pay particular attention to what I have to say within the next ten or fifteen minutes, including the reading of this quotation:

> Mr. Speaker, what do you suppose was the answer I got to that?

That answer was to his letter of the 6th January.

> [Mr. Burrell.]
>
> I had been here and had gone home again, and I found this letter on my desk acknowledging receipt of it, but the answer I got was a personal invitation from the Minister of Agriculture—

This I am going to discuss by itself later, and so shall need to quote this again.

> —begging me, for God's sake, not to refer to this matter in the House of Commons.

Now, my hon. friend might as well have been frank in this matter. He talks about stating the facts and sticking close to the mark; why, then, did not he read this letter which I wrote to him? I did not answer his letter because I knew he would be coming to Ottawa soon, but I wrote him on the 14th January:

4 p.m.

> 14th January, 1916.
>
> F. B. Carvell, Esq., M.P.,
> House of Commons,
> Ottawa.
>
> Dear Mr. Carvell,—I duly received your letter of the 6th. I assume you did not expect me to reply to you at Woodstock, as you expected to be in Ottawa so shortly and I thought perhaps I would run across you before this.
>
> You say you understand I agreed to give Mr. Hatfield an order for two thousand tons, but you must have been wrongly informed on this. I have not made any agreement of the kind.
>
> In this whole matter, as I stated to you in my previous letter, it is my desire to see that the War Office does not have to pay unnecessarily high prices and that, while the farmer gets a fair figure for his product, the contractors should not make an unreasonable profit. This has always been my viewpoint when any contracts have been entered into and I can hardly think that the contractors themselves could take any other view.
>
> At all events, I am glad to assure you that the arrangements which exist preclude the possibility of the contractors getting anything more than a reasonable remuneration for the work and responsibilities they have undertaken.
>
> Yours very truly,
> M. Burrell.

But though I wrote to the hon. gentleman that letter, he makes no allusion to it. He does not take the trouble to put that on Hansard. But, if he demands fairness, surely he ought to be fair and do the square thing that he so often talks about.

Now I come to a matter which while, perhaps, not of real public importance, is of such importance to me as a member of the Government and personally that I feel that I have the right to touch upon it, and in a rather strong way, though, I am afraid, in a poor way. I hope I shall keep within the bounds of parliamentary rule and procedure in any language I use in regard to my hon. friend, though I am bound to say it is

extremely difficult to do so after the episode of the other day. Now, for the purpose of exactness, let me quote again from page 268 of Hansard:

> Mr. Speaker, what do you suppose was the answer I got to that? I had been here and had gone home again, and I found this letter on my desk acknowledging receipt of it, but the answer I got was a personal invitation from the Minister of Agriculture begging me, for God's sake, not to refer to this matter in the House of Commons, and telling me that it would look bad if it were published in the newspapers.

Now, we might as well clear this thing up. A few pages later on, at page 273, the hon. member for Carleton spoke as follows:

> I see that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) is in his seat. I think I have a right to ask the minister if he intends to discuss this matter in reply to what I have said to-day, and, if so, whether he will allow me to relate the conversation which he and I had in Room 16, which he asked me to treat as confidential. I do not want to do this unless the hon. gentleman himself is going to refer to it. If he is going to refer to it, I think I should have a right to give it to the House.
>
> Mr. Burrell: If my hon. friend's relation of that conversation is not more accurate than his relation of the conversation that he has already given to the House, I should prefer that he would not say anything at all about it.
>
> Mr. Carvell: All right; I accept that. I assume from that that the minister will not refer to it either.
>
> Mr. Burrell: Since my hon. friend puts that question, I think he will grant me the same privilege to state what took place and to put before the House a version as against the version that he gave this afternoon.
>
> Mr. Carvell: So far as I have gone, certainly.
>
> Mr. Burrell: So far as you have gone.

The hon. members of this House will see that this is an extraordinary state of things. Here is an hon. gentleman who asks me to give him the right to divulge a private and confidential conversation which had taken place between us, after he had not only divulged it but put an interpretation upon it that was absolutely false to the fact. What sort of stuff is the hon. member for Carleton made of? I do not think there is a man in this House who would have done this except himself.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker,——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. minister knows that I was referring to——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend is stating that the portion of the conversation I gave was the confidential portion, when it was not, and my hon. friend knows that it was not. The portion he refers to——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not through with my point of order. The portion he referred to as confidential was the new contract——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, and the hon. member knows perfectly well that it is not.

Mr. BURRELL: I am going to discuss this episode pretty thoroughly, and I am going to keep myself within the bounds of the rules of this House, but I am going to set forth the facts so that there cannot be any mistake. My hon. friend and myself may have some difference of view as to what was confidential and what was not. So far as the whole matter that took place is concerned, it would not hurt me very much if anybody had been there to take it all down, and reproduce it in the public press. As to the contract, I did say, perhaps, that that was confidential, but it scarcely mattered becasue I had given the hon. gentleman the assurance in that very letter that I had ample safeguards. But this is what I am complaining of. I understood he did not want me to refer to this thing unless he took it up; but it seemed to me an extraordinary thing to try to tie my hands and rob me of any defence in this, when I had already been stabbed in the back by these other statements he had made. I want to say to my hon. friend, and nobody knows this better than he, that I never used the phrase "In God's name do not bring this up;" that I never said it would be bad in the newspapers, because there is nothing that I have ever done in this Parliament that I would be ashamed to put in every newspaper in the country. Talk about being amazed! I never was more amazed in my life than when the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) used the phrase de did. I cannot understand any man doing such a thing. To my mind it is the most deplorable incident that has ever taken place in this House, since I have known it. My hon. friend may laugh, it does not do him credit; that is all I can say about it.

Mr. CARVELL: What did you say?

Mr. BURRELL: I do not know what his own view of these matters is, but if he has this interpretation of what is an honourable

course to take—I say nothing about my hon. friend's conduct or character or anything else in his private life—but if that is his interpretation of what can be done in public life, nothing can stamp him so well as being absolutely unfitted for public life as that one thing. I think I can comment on this, and show the absolute grotesqueness and absurdity of my hon. friend's contention. I went to the Prime Minister soon after I got my hon. friend's letter telling me that he had the power of speech, and intimating, as I thought, and rightly thought, that he was going to bring all hay matters in connection with the War Office up in this House, and I stated to the Prime Minister my views on the matter, as I did to the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). My views were these; that we were operating in a very large way for the War Office, on account of the military forces all over this country, purchasing hay, oats and flour. When the whole story comes to be written, when the war is over, it will be only too great a pleasure for me to bring down the whole details to the country, for it is a great work, a very much larger work than anybody imagines. But no business man in this House can come to any other conclusion than that it is inadvisable to bring up these matters in Parliament when the war is on and these supplies are being contracted for, and large operations are going on in all these businesses all over the country. It does not matter so much in his own newspapers down there; they would not attach the same importance to any remarks the hon. member for Carleton might make as they would to his remarks in the House where he gets a fictitious importance by virtue of being a member of this House, and to give it publicity for that reason, from my point of view, was not in the best interests of the War Office or of the public. At all events, I stated that view to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They understood it was not in the public interest, and they will bear out what I say. I said it did not matter to me personally whether it was brought up or not, that I had, I thought, a sufficient answer to anything that might be said; but that, solely and entirely on account of the public interest and the War Office interest, I thought it not advisable to discuss this in the House. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce agreed, and I suggested, and they concurred, that I should speak to my hon. friend and put that view before him. In fact, the Minister of Trade and Commerce suggested that I could appeal to my hon. friend's patriotism in this matter, and it was suggested, by either myself or the Prime Minister, that, if I liked, I could speak to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on this broad line. I was very glad to do it for this reason also, that on the 7th of April, 1902 a gentleman in this House, who has now passed away, the late lamented Hon. F. D. Monk, placed a question on the Order Paper asking for particulars about the purchase of hay for the War Office during the South African war; and Mr. Speaker, the then Minister of Agriculture gave this answer, which I think was an absolutely correct and proper answer to give:

This question, relating entirely to the business of the Imperial War Office, I am not at liberty to answer it.

I think that was a perfectly proper answer, and not a man on our side disputed its justness. In 1903 the matter came up again in the shape of an Order asked for on the floor of the House by the Hon. Mr. Monk, for all this information, because the war was then over. A long debate took place, which was referred to by the hon. Solicitor General the other night. We asked for all correspondence, documents, papers, etc., all the particulars about the transactions, of people like my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) who then had a contract with the Government for the War Office. The debate was participated in by my right hon. friend, by Mr. Fielding, by the late Postmaster General and others. We took the ground that, as the war was over, it was perfectly proper to bring down all these matters, as they did, to some extent, concern the people of Canada. I am not disputing whether they were right or wrong, but the late Government took the ground, very emphatically, that, as it related to the War Office and it was Imperial money which was spent here, it was not a responsibility incurred to this House, and they did not think it right to bring the information down, and they did not bring it down. They put it to a vote and the motion was negatived and the Order was not granted. I am not disputing whether the position of the late Government in 1903 was right or not; I say it was absolutely right in 1902 but in 1903 it might be open to question; and I say right here and now, that after the war is over, speaking for myself, and I think the Prime Minister

would feel the same way, I would have absolutely no hesitation in bringing down every single record we have got in connection with these transactions.

At all events, I took the course which I have outlined, a course which was suggested or concurred in by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not know whether I am counted as a very strict party man. Sometimes I think that some of my friends who are strong party men do not so regard me. I am a good Conservative; I think I have a right to stick up for Conservative principles and Conservative practice, however deplorable that may be to gentlemen like the hon. member for Carleton. I have a great many friends in my own constituency on the Liberal side. I have many Liberal friends in Ottawa—some of my warmest friends are Liberals in politics. I hope I have some friends in this House who are Liberals in politics and sit on the other side. I never held the doctrine that one should carry one's political animosities into private life, nor would I regard life as being tolerable if I had to do it. I want to say this further in regard to this matter with which we are dealing, that I would rather go out of public life forever, and walk out now, and keep such regard as I may have been fortunate enough to get from any of my friends as a public man, than remain in public life at the price of descending to the depths to which my hon. friend for Carleton, N.B., has descended. It may be said that that is not a matter of very great public interest; but I do appeal to you, and to the older members of this House who have sat here for many years, that this is the sort of thing that touches the finer side of life, and makes public life tolerable. And so it is well worth touching when we are dealing with this matter. I have already spoken of the grotesqueness of my hon. friend's assertion that I said "for God's sake don't bring the matter up in the House; the papers will get it, and how bad that will be." I have already said that there was absolutely no truth in that assertion. I never used such words at all; I did not refer to the newspapers, nor did I use the name of God at all in any shape or form, so that my hon. friend does not know where he is at. If I feared anything; if my hon. friend was so absurd as to think I was afraid that there might be public exposure, why I had an easy way out; I could have done what the member for Carleton demanded, and got out of the mess, if mess there was. But of course I was not in any way afraid, because I had nothing to conceal. I was simply speaking in the public interest. Now I do not like to bring the names of other people into this matter, and I will apologise to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition for mentioning his name in connection with it. I would not have done so if it had not been for what the hon. member who sits behind him (Mr. Carvell) said. He not only made the absolutely inaccurate statement I have referred to; he intimated—he did not say so in so many words—that I had gone running to the leader of the Opposition and to the Liberal Whip for the same reason, that I was afraid of this thing coming up in the House.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend made the statement first; I did not.

Mr. BURRELL: I spoke to the hon. member for Carleton, and he refused to promise that he would not speak on it.

Mr. CARVELL: That is right.

Mr. BURRELL: I was actuated absolutely and solely by the view that this matter affected or might affect the War Office and the public interest. I said I did not think it would be advisable in the interests of the War Office to do so, but that if he did, he must do it according to his own judgment. I met the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) in the corridor, I think a few days afterwards. I told the Liberal Whip that I would like to speak to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in regard to the matter, as I thought it of sufficient public importance to place my views before him, as the Prime Minister had suggested. My right hon. friend was busy at the time, and I could not get access to him. I told Mr. Pardee, the chief Liberal Whip, the circumstances in exactly the same way, namely, that I did not think it advisable in the interests of the War Office to bring this matter up, but that my hon. friend from Carleton seemed determined to do so, and if he did, all right. I said that I would reply and would be able to refute anything he might say that seemed to reflect on the department or on myself. Subsequently I was enabled to see my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and I was treated by him with the courtesy which he has always shown to me since I came here in 1908 as a back bencher from the far western province. I am appealing

to him in a sense; it is an appeal to Caesar from one of Caesar's very insignificant legionaries. I know my right hon. friend will bear me out that it was precisely in this tone that I placed the circumstances before him. I simply said I did not think that a discussion of this matter would be in the best interests of the War Office, that we had not made any of our proceedings public, that we did not think it desirable to do so, and that I thought the contract sufficiently safeguarded the public interest. I said, I am not in a position to implore you to insist that Mr. Carvell shall not speak; I simply put this to you, and if he does speak, well, all right. I ask again, I ask any man in this House if my attitude has not been absolutely consistent throughout this whole matter, and I leave it to the judgment of the House to say whether what has been done, in order, I presume—for there could be no other object in view—to secure some little political capital by having it repeated in the press, that I begged somebody to call him off. Is this fair? I ask what sort of fighting in the House of Commons of Canada in this year of grace, 1916, that is! I say that if ever there was in this House an exhibition of hitting below the belt that was it. My hon. friend expressed pity for me the other day. He said he was sorry from the bottom of his heart for the poor Minister of Agriculture, who had fallen an innocent victim to the wiles and machinations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen); that I was a very decent chap and so forth. What sort of man is this that can violate the code of ethics which is prized by those who cherish the good old name of gentleman?

Now, Sir, much as I hate the tu quoque argument; much as I dislike saying that the other fellow has been doing things, therefore pitch into him; I think it only right to ask who this man is who brings these charges and makes those wild and reckless assertions. Who is this gentleman who has such a disinterested and passionate zeal to secure better prices for the farmers in New Brunswick and for my hon. friend's friends. Who is he? Well, I noticed the other night that he was a little uneasy. He seemed to think that I would probably speak after him, and he was quite right. He used these words:

> I know what kind of defence my hon. friend is going to put up; he is going to say that in 1902 when I had a small contract,

and so on. My hon. friend was beginning to get uneasy, and was afraid I might say something that would hurt. On page 265 of Hansard he says this:

> I have had experience in this matter. During the South African war I was a member of a company that compressed hay, and I speak with knowledge. I was not then a member of the legislature or of the House of Commons, I was a member of the New Brunswick Hay Company.

My hon. friend was secretary and treasurer, the whole body and bones of the institution; at all events he was the most prominent man in it, and the man who appeared here to do all the business with the department. He added, "We had a small contract from the Department of Agriculture, about $7,000 altogether."

Mr. CARVELL: Seven thousand tons, not dollars.

Mr. BURRELL: It is $7,000 in Hansard, but I accept my hon. friend's correction. He says it was a small contract. My hon. friend had contracts altogether amounting to about 11,000 tons.

Mr. CARVELL: Not filled.

Mr. BURRELL: Pretty nearly all filled; we have the records, and they show that they came pretty nearly to 11,000 tons, which, figured up at the price he got, which was $17, came to about $187,000; not very small. Now, my hon. friend at that time got a price of $17 a ton for compressed hay at West St. John; he will correct me if I am wrong in any of my statements. My hon. friend anticipated that I would deal with this or would say something about it. He pointed out that they were giving the farmer at that time $8 a ton, and he thought what an exceedingly good price that was, considering what hay was at that time. In fact, he went the length of saying—I could give the exact figures, and I shall come to them presently. They were giving the farmers $8 a ton.

I want to point out one or two things. My hon. friend has contended that under this contract, at $23 a ton, the spread between the price obtained by the farmer for his loose hay and the price that the contractor gets for his compressed hay, which passes inspection, is a tremendous one, and that the contractor is going to make the enormous profit of two or three dollars a ton—three dollars, was it?—or, at all events, a very enormous profit. Under a contract like this it would amount to some $45,000. The contractors, unquestionably, in different parts of the province of New

Brunswick, pay different prices. We have never insisted on fixing a price, but we have insisted that he shall give a fair price. He has given as high as $13.75. I have had that information in most positive terms. My hon. friend admitted that he had given $13.50. I will take my hon. friend's lower figure of $13.50, which gives a spread of $9.50 between the loose hay of the farmer and the compressed hay supplied to the Government. But my hon. friend says that at that he makes a tremendous profit. There was a spread when my hon. friend had a contract of $9. I do not think that my hon. friend will dispute that the cost of operation in 1902 was lower than it is to-day.

Mr. CARVELL: I dispute it.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend disputes it. When I make a statement of fact my hon. friend feels it incumbent upon himself to dispute it. He had four hours in which to speak, and I do not think he can begrudge me another half hour. I do not think any business man would doubt that the cost of operation would be heavier to-day than it was in 1902. My hon. friend has made the statement that it cost more because they had to compress to a limit of 70 cubic feet to the ton at that time, and we are now compressing to a limit of from 80 to 100 cubic feet to the ton. We have compressed a good deal to 80 cubic feet. My hon. friend did not compress all of this hay to 70 cubic feet; there was much of it that was compressed to a less degree than that.

Mr. CARVELL: Have you any record of that?

Mr. BURRELL: At all events, this is a small matter, because I am informed by those who know what they are talking about in the department, that the difference in the cost of compression as between 70 and 80 feet would be absolutely trifling, and that they would use less wire with the tighter compression than with the other. When my hon. friend says that these people, with a contract at $23 a ton, are imposing on the farmer, and that I am filching out of the pockets of the farmer and holding up the War Office and everybody else for the sake of enabling these contractors to amass filthy lucre, how does it compare with the amount that he himse f made when he had the contract? What are the facts? So far from his having amassed a fortune out of the business in 1902, when the war closed, he came back on the department with a claim for $13,000. I must in fairness say that no doubt his was a harder position, because, the war having closed, it left a certain amount of hay on his hands. But that was not included within the terms of his contract. He came back upon the department with a claim for $13,435 to compensate him for loss under his contract, because the termination of the war left him with a considerable amount of hay on his hands. A Liberal Government was then in power, the department was presided over by Mr. Sydney Fisher, but he could not stand for the rapacity of my hon. friend, and he turned him down and would not give him the amount that he asked for.

An hon. MEMBER: He is a patriot.

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, he is a kind of patriot. I do not like saying these things, I hate saying them, but I think it is time the House should know the type of man who is making these reckless charges. In regard to the price paid, my hon. friend, at page 272 of Hansard said this:

> Among the men in that arrangement were Mr. Smith, Mr. McCain, and a dozen other hay merchants in the county and in the three or four adjoining counties. Prior to that time hay had never been worth more than $6 a ton, loose in the farmer's barns.

He qualified that by adding that it had not been worth more than $6 or $6.50 a ton. I am not a New Brunswicker, but I am informed by a New Brunswick man that for a long time the price had been from $6 to $10 a ton for loose hay in the farmers' barns and I cannot believe that there is any province where the maximum price of loose hay to the farmer in his barn would be only $6. I have farmed myself for a good many years and it would be a discouraging business if all that a man could get for loose hay in his barn, after paying the expense of cultivating, seeding and harvesting, was $6 a ton. If that is my hon. friend's experience I do not wonder that he is looking like a very unhappy type of farmer. My hon. friend introduced this argument—or so it looks to me—because he evidently knew that I was going to allude to the price which he had to pay at that time. He goes on to refer to the fact that he had to pay $8, but I have been informed that at the time my hon. friend's contract was in force, and when he was performing it, he brought hay in from Quebec which assisted in regulating the price. If my

hon. friend denies it I will accept his statement that he did not bring any hay in from Quebec.

Mr. CARVELL: My recollection is that we brought in about ten cars of hay.

Mr. BURRELL: I am glad to know that because it fixes the price at $8 and if my hon. friend brought in hay from Quebec it looks like a very judicious way of keeping the farmer in New Brunswick satisfied at not getting more than that. Further on my hon. friend says, in regard to this $8 a ton, that they bought hay from sub-contractors and that the sub-contractors among themselves made an arrangement by which they would pay $8 a ton to the farmer. The House will gather, and I think everybody will gather, from that suggestion, that $8 was a reasonable price and that my hon. friend, who had a large contract, and who was to supply 11,000 tons to this Government, with a spread of $9 between the price that he paid for loose hay and the price which he received for compressed hay, should make something substantial out of his contract; whereas the fact is that it landed him in the hole to the extent of $13,000 according to his own showing. But, at all events, they were paying the farmers only $8. My hon. friend made the contracts with the sub-contractors and, by the irony of fate, one of the sub-contractors was the very firm which has the contract now that my hon. friend is denouncing in this House. I have a copy of the contract which my hon. friend drew up in regard to the sub-contractors. My hon. friend said, you will recall, that the sub-contractors made an arrangement amongst themselves by which they would pay the farmers $8 a ton. I want you to listen to some of the phrases. I take it for granted that, as my hon. friend was the sec'y-treasurer of this company, a gentleman who had been very active in coming up and getting contracts made with the Government and in presenting the claims, he would have everything to do with the framing of the sub-contracts.

I presume that, being an astute lawyer, he would not adopt any cheap police court methods, or have any junior law students around, but would do the work himself because of his knowledge of the law and out of his born zeal for the farmer. He says we are bleeding the farmers. Inflamed with that splendid passion of patriotism, of a local kind, and sympathizing with these unfortunate men, he of course would do the right thing. Let us see what was put in this contract.

Memorandum of agreement entered into this thirteenth day of December, A.D. 1901, between A. C. Smith & Company, of West St. John, commission merchants, of the one part and "The New Brunswick Hay Company, Limited," of Woodstock, in the county of Carleton, hereinafter referred to as 'The Company," on the second part.

Witnesseth, First.—Subject to the following conditions the said A. C. Smith & Co., hereby agree to sell and deliver to the said Company between this date and the first day of April next, four thousand tons of first and second qualities of Carleton county hay in carload lots.

Second.—The said Company, in consideration of the foregoing agreement hereby agree to pay the said A. C. Smith & Company the sum of ten dollars and twenty-five cents per ton, f.o.b. points in Carleton county, subject to being weighed by the Company at McAdam Junction, provided, however, that if on such weighing the whole amount does not fall short more than twenty tons, then no deduction shall be made for shortages, and any shortages above that amount will be borne by the said A. C. Smith & Company. The hay to be paid for on delivery.

and so on. It continues:

The said Company, in consideration of this contract hereby agree that they will not pay any other person or persons whatsoever, a greater amount for hay, during the continuance of this contract, than the sum of ten dollars and twenty-five cents,—

That is for baled hay.

—as aforesaid, f.o.b., nor will they allow Mathias Meagher, William A. Estey, Coles W. Dugan, Harris Everett, George A. Davis, H. H. McCain, Bohan Bros., Charles E. Gallagher nor Rupert Hutchison, being the only persons from whom they are buying hay in the county of Carleton, to pay more than eight dollars to the farmers for loose hay in their barns.

The hon. member for Carleton came down here and demanded that I fix the price and fix it high, or he would expose me in this House by his power of speech; but here we see in this contract these men were not allowed to pay more than $8 to the farmer. Let us read on a little further, and my legal friends who understand legal phraseology will of course be better able to appreciate this than a simple farmer like myself:

And in case any of the said parties shall, during the continuance of this contract, pay, or offer to pay any farmer in the county of Carleton a greater sum that eight dollars, then they agree, upon satisfactory proof of such paying or offering to pay, to refuse to purchase or receive any hay from the said offending—

Mark the word, Mr. Speaker, "offending."

—from the said offending party or parties, and also, that in case Bohan Bros. shall pay or offer to pay to any farmer in the counties of Carleton or Victoria, excepting that por-

tion of the parish of Kent lying north of Bath Station and east of the River St. John, more than eight dollars for their loose hay, as aforesaid, then, upon satisfactory proof of such payment or offering of payment, the Company agree to pay the said A. C. Smith & Company for the remainder of their contract then unfulfilled, whatever amount the said Bohan Bros., shall have offered or paid above eight dollars in excess of the ten dollars and twenty-five cents.

I do not know New Brunswick geography or politics very well, but I understand that Bohan Bros. were doing business in a small section where there was a great hive of votes, all of them the right way, and therefore they could pay a little more. But I am not insisting upon that, I do not want to be unfair to my hon. friend. Here is another interesting clause:

It is also agreed that neither of the above parties shall be at liberty to pay for hay already pressed to any farmer more than nine dollars and twenty-five cents per ton, under the same penalties hereinbefore mentioned as in the case of an offer of more than eight dollars for loose hay.

It is also agreed between the parties hereto, and made a condition hereof, that in case the said A. C. Smith & Company, or any of their recognized agents or representatives in the counties of Carleton or Victoria, shall be known to have paid or offered to pay to any farmer a greater sum than eight dollars for loose hay—

My hon. friend even gave credit to these notorious people for having some bowels of compassion and thought that out of the kindness of their hearts they might possibly pay a little more in some cases. So he says that if they pay more than eight dollars for loose hay—

—that for the balance of the contract then unfulfilled they shall deduct the sum of twenty-five cents per ton, excepting in the case where trades have been legally concluded prior to the date hereof, and in the case of the other parties above mentioned who are buying hay for the said Company shall bona-fide, prior to the date hereof, have made legal trades for hay in excess of eight dollars, then—
—then the punishment hereinbefore provided.

Mr. Speaker, you can hardly wonder at my asking what sort of a patriot this is. He says I am bleeding the farmers, this gentleman who binds them down hard and fast says that these contractors shall be punished if they pay the farmers more than eight dollars. It continues:

Then the punishment hereinbefore provided shall not apply in such case, and also, that in the case of any of the parties purchasing hay for the Company as aforesaid, shall be known hereafter to pay or offer to pay any farmer more than eight dollars for his hay, excepting in the case above mentioned where a bona-fide trade has previously been concluded, then upon proof of such paying or offering to pay, there shall be the sum of twenty-five cents per ton deducted on all hay not actually paid for up to that date.

In plain language the contractor is not allowed to pay more than eight dollars to the farmer; and if this contractor, who now is the Government contractor and upon whom I am imposing no strong conditions except that he shall not get more than $1 a ton profit, should under this agreement I have in my hands pay $8.40 to the farmers, say on two thousand tons, then he would be find $500 for doing it. All that I have to say on this matter has been said. I think it is a pretty sordid sort of tale and I do not want to touch on it any further. I have, I think, made a fair presentation of the department's point of view, and in disposing of this hay matter I repeat that the country owes a debt of gratitude to the officials of the department, who, night and day, in season and out of season, without an extra cent of pay, have for over a year tried to do the square thing by the country and by the War Office. As far as I am concerned I have been animated by no other motive. I have nothing to conceal, and I am willing to be judged on this whole matter by the speech I have made in the House here to-day. I do not want to discuss the matter further.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not much more to add, and have indeed already taken up too much time; but in connection with such matters as have been discussed here during the last few days, I would like to point out that in the multifarious and complicated situations that war brings, especially to those democratic nations who are not organized for war, the constant pressure, the necessity of large and hasty industrial adjustments, place almost impossible burdens on the shoulders of governments. No government under such circumstances can avoid blunders and mistakes. The British Government is not immune, nor is it likely that the Government of a young country like this, which never had a thought of war in its heart before this outbreak occurred, could be—the millennium is not yet come.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who is not in his seat, referred to the heavy additional obligations that were placed on ministers. He made a graceful reference to the Prime Minister, and unquestionably this House and this country will recognize that never since Confederation has so heavy a load been placed on one man's shoulders as upon his, and they will also bear testimony that that burden has been borne and those duties discharged with unflagging devotion and conspicuous

ability. We shall agree also with the hon. member for Pictou in his reference to the heavy additional work on the Minister of Militia, whose tremendous energy has been an inspiration in these trying days. To the Minister of Finance also such a tribute is due. Ministers holding that portfolio do not always get the full recognition that they might, possibly because the work involved does not make so obvious and forcible an appeal to the public as in other cases. But in the case of my hon. friend who now occupies that high office, (Sir Thomas White), we all abundantly recognize the tribute which the country owes to him for steering with such consummate ability the financial ship of state through the present troubled waters.

The hon. member for Pictou thought other ministers did not have much to do. I suppose we can let that pass, though he probably did not intend that that should be taken very seriously. But I would like to add that not only in the case of ministers holding portfolios, but in the case of the three members of the Government without portfolios, and I refer to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), to Senator Lougheed and to Sir George Perley, each one is doing as earnest, self-sacrificing and useful work as any of the members of the Administration.

I think it is due also to those very many departmental officers upon whom heavy burdens have been imposed, that a tribute should be paid to the spirit in which they are doing their bit, not minding much heavy and extra work and much longer hours than in times of peace.

What all countries want in such times is that their governments should earnestly strive night and day to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion, and if they do these mistakes and blunders will be forgiven, and in any case such mistakes and blunders will be judged by the people at the conclusion of the war.

There is a worse thing, however, than making mistakes, and that is to have a mind poisoned by the desire continually to criticise and carp, not for constructive but for destructive purposes. It was satirically said of the Republican party in the United States prior to the last election, that it was a party consecrated to keep in office. If it is bad to be consecrated to keep in office, it is equally bad to be consecrated to the task of trying to get into office.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has made a speech of between four and five hours in this House. He made a brief ten minutes' reference to the war. The whole of the rest of his time was taken up in a reckless discussion of scandals, or alleged scandals. I presume he is patriotic enough to want to win this war; but if one were to judge merely by the length of time that he has given to the respective subjects, one would be almost justified in saying that he was far more anxious to smash this Government than he was to smash the Germans. He spoke of the pain caused him by having to speak of all these dreadful things, and shed crocodile tears while suffering the acute distress of a manufactured anguish. The hon. member for Carleton has no doubt heard of Pecksniff, and I will refer him to a fresh study of his great prototype.

In view, however, of all that he has said and of my own already too long remarks, if he is inspired with any sense of manliness, he might well regret and deplore having made such reckless and baseless assertions as he did in this House on Tuesday evening last. I again apologise to the House, not only for taking the time, but for dealing with this subject as I have had to do. It is a task that I have hated and loathed. I am quite sure—and in this I am sure I shall have the concurrence of my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), who takes the larger view—that the country is sick of this intercalumniation at this time. There are bigger things and more vital things filling the thoughts and minds of the people, and I would not have touched on this subject had it not been forced upon me by the hon. member for Carleton.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in his remarks in reference to the shadow of this great war in which we are all resting, said that the shadow was even greater at the present time than when this House last met. I trust this is not so, and that, trying as the present condition of things is, there may be much behind the scenes that makes for a speedier and happier turn of events than we think. Not one of us can or must doubt the final achievement of victory, and to that event all our thoughts and energies should be turned.

There are very many other important questions that should be touched on in a time like this, some that my hon. friend from Pictou touched on in the close of his speech—questions of great importance to Canada after the war, such as land settlement, educational work, etc. It is the business of the Government, not only to

think of all these things, but to welcome the criticism and the suggestions of all our friends opposite, and of other people in the country who have helpful criticisms and suggestions to make, in order to enable us to do something more, something bigger in the way of constructive work for the country which we love.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, allow me to assure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) that I will not follow him upon the hay question, which apparently has been pressed and compressed and thrown into the troubled waters of this debate, and in which I might prove too poor a navigator. I will leave it to hon. members from the province of New Brunswick, to the electors of New Brunswick, and to an investigation if one is to be held, to decide.

I shall allude to one or two other points of the hon. minister's remarks, before he disobeyed a teaching of Shakespeare and tore passion to tatters. I thoroughly agree with the hon. gentleman in the patriotic utterances with which he opened his speech. I subscribe to all the sentiments of patriotism that have been given expression to by the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) and by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It seems to me that the very enjoyment of our constitutional rights and of our free institutions in this autonomous country, is sufficient cause to force every citizen of Canada, no matter what may be his origin or his creed, to be loyal to the authority which makes that constitution and that freedom secure: the King of England, and the flag of the Empire. We recognize that without the security of the throne and the flag, while we are a country of great area and small population we would be wholly dependent on the good will of the greater nations, and liable at any time to have the same treatment meted out to us as Belgium suffered under at the hands of Germany, and as Serbia received at the hands of Austria. If we are loyal to our constitution we shall aid to the utmost of our power in maintaining our status as Canadian subjects of the King. That, I conceive to be the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House and of every citizen of Canada. Therefore bearing that in mind, we. as members of the Opposition, readily asented to the war measures introduced by the hon. gentleman who leads the Government.

But, Sir, before I begin to discuss what I conceive to be our other duties besides those that rest upon us as members of the family of dominions which make up this Empire—our duties respecting the domestic affairs of this country to the electors of Canada—I should like to deal with one particular matter, and that is, the purchase of two submarines by this Government, through the good offices of the British Columbia Government, and of Sir Richard McBride. I think the Minister of Agriculture misapprehends our criticism on this transaction. Our complaint is not that he purchased vessels, but rather that he paid too much for obsolete vessels. I for one should feel quite disposed to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the exercise of his judgment in saying to Sir Richard McBride—if he did say it to him—that he had done well to purchase these two vessels. He told us in this House, that at the moment this country was in critical danger, when our coasts were imperilled by the enemy, his very first thought, and the very first thought, of the people of British Columbia, was, not to cable money over to Great Britain, but to take refuge under the Naval Service Act passed by the late Liberal Government of Canada, and purchase where they could, how they could, and for no matter what amount, the necessary submarines. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman is one of those who, prior to 1911, denounced the Liberal party as disloyal because we ventured, in the exercise of our judgment, to pass legislation to permit the purchase of war vessels, submarines included, for the defence of the coast of Canada, and for the help of England in the hour of her peril. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, what the attitude of the Liberal party was prior to 1911. You will remember that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and his friends went to the province of Quebec and throughout the Dominion of Canada, and said to the people we will be ready to pay when it becomes necesary to pay; we will be ready to give our assent, as under our constitution we must, to our young men going to fight the battles of the Empire if they so desire; but at the present moment we deem it essential to inaugurate a system by which this country shall first be protected. What was the language of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture in referring to this point? I quote from Hansard:

I know what the condition of things in Victoria and Vancouver was at that time, and I know

how seriously alarmed the people were. It was a matter not only of possibility, but of probability that the German fleet on the Pacific were liable at any time to steam in and shell the two cities of Victoria and Vancouver.

And you remember that, prior to the election of 1911, the Conservative party, having joined hands with the Nationalist party of the province of Quebec, went about this country declaring that should this country be in peril they would appeal to the British navy which owed us protection. But the Minister of Agriculture told us that the very moment he saw that the province of British Columbia was in danger, he set about purchasing submarines.

5 p.m.

Mr. Pugsley, the hon. member for St. John, then interjected:

They had a Japanese cruiser there?

I want you, Sir, to mark these words:

Mr. Burrell: The only thing that saved the western coast from a possibility of the kind that I have described was—

not the British navy and not the Japanese cruiser—

—was the presence of the submarines that we purchased at that time.

What is the inference? The inference is that if this Government had not dismantled the Niobe and the Rainbow and had left them in operation, as they brought them into action later on, they would not have had to purchase those two submarines which they got from the Chilian Government, and would not have had to pay for them such an enormous price. The hon. member for Pictou ventured this further remark:

Mr. Macdonald: There were no guns on them.

Mr. Murphy: And no torpedoes.

Who ever heard of the purchase of submarines for immediate action, at a moment when the Empire was in danger, at a moment when Canada was in danger, without torpedoes, or the machinery necessary to fire the torpedoes? Is that the way the Pacific coast was to be protected? Is that the way our Atlantic coast would be protected? The Minister of Agriculture gives this answer:

It was not very long before torpodoes were put on these boats.

Not very long, Sir, but it was imperative, at the very moment that the submarines were purchased, to purchase them, so as to prevent an attack by German battleships. The Minister said that the Japanese cruiser did not protect the Pacific coast, but that the two submarines did it. Then, how did they protect the coast? Going out without armament or torpedoes, as we might send out two of the barges that lie in the Ottawa river, to protect the coast of British Columbia? He goes on to say:

But the fact that it was known that these submarines were in the possession of the authorities at Esquimalt did more to assure the safety of these two coast cities than anything else that possibly could be done.

Imagine the Kaiser's navy being afraid of two little submarines! Imagine the Minister of Agriculture asking us, in this deliberative assembly, to believe seriously that because he purchased two submarines, unfit for action, at an exorbitant price, he put the fear of the Lord into the Kaiser and his navy, and protected the Dominion of Canada! May I leave it at that, Sir?

The Minister of Agriculture, in opening his remarks, said, and apparently rightly, that it was the duty of the Opposition to criticise, that he for one welcomed criticism, and that the Government should expect criticism. You will note, however, the tone in which he answered the criticism. I do not want to enter into any personalities, and therefore will not allude to it. But I do propose, in the discharge of my duties as a member of the Opposition, to offer some criticism of the Government before I take my seat. This, under ordinary circumstances, would be the last session of this Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite would naturally go before the electors and tell them what they have done as nation builders in laying the foundation for future wealth in this country, because wealth will not come through inertia. What has the Government done for the future prosperity, for the future wealth of this country? The Government has done absolutely nothing except to rely upon the patience of the Canadian people in increasing by every means possible their taxes; and upon the credit of the country in effecting loans to cover, in great part, their extravagant expenditure, which to-day is a by word throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. The best service we can do to the people of Canada at the present moment is to keep the keenest watch upon the way that the people's money is spent and to watch these blunders and this extravagance that the Minister of Agriculture informed us this Government was liable to on account of the war. The people have willingly and patriotically given their

assent to the levying of the funds necessary to carry on Canada's share in this world-wide war; but the people will hold their representatives responsible for any failure in controlling or condemning looting and speculation in the administration. Every dollar that has been voted for war purposes must reach the channels of war, or be saved to the people of Canada. The people of Canada fully realize that the members of the Opposition have gone far in supporting the Government in their war measures and will go further; but the people of Canada must also realize that in the expenditure of that money not even my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), whose whole life has been one of unselfish and unswerving devotion to Canada and to the Empire, has been consulted. What is our position in Canada? We are borrowing; we are taxing the people of Canada. The Government informs us, through the Minister of Finance, that it is absolutely necessary to raise money by way of borrowing and by way of taxation. We have been told that there are two ways to meet the Canadian financial situation. The Minister of Finance, in a very able address in the city of Toronto before the Board of Trade, dealing with that particular subject of how we shall face the financial situation, used these words:

> Well, I am old-fashioned. I do not know any other way for Canada to become a lending country and to save more money than to produce more and save more. I do not know any way whereby an individual can save money and have it for investment except the old fashioned mode of living within his income and his profits to the extent that he can.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, when in Opposition, constantly laid down the principle that the only way that a wise and economic Government could act in dealing with the financial situation of the country was to control the public expenditures; and, he added, a second way is by seeing that the trade balance, instead of being against the country, should be favourable to it.

We believe that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was quite serious in the advice that he gave, otherwise I might feel tempted to apply a criticism to him that has been applied to others in other places, and say,

> Though fraught with all learning, yet straining his throat
> To persuade Tommy Townsend to lend him a vote.

What is our condition in Canada? I do not think I could put it better than it was put in the Toronto Globe some time ago, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote from the Globe. The article is entitled—I beg the Government's pardon for giving the title—"Have spent money like a drunken sailor."

> As the people of Canada begin to understand that the heavy burden of the new taxation is not imposed to pay the Dominion's war bill, but to meet a huge deficit in the ordinary expenditure of the country, a feeling of amaze ment spreads throughout all classes of the community.
>
> The ordinary expenditure during the last four years of the Laurier government was, in 1908, $76,641,000; 1909, $84,064,000; 1910, $79,411,000; 1911 $87,740,000. The Borden government came in during October, 1911, and became responsible for the expenditures of the year ending March, 1912, which were $98,161,000. These expenditures were based in some measure on Mr. Fielding's figures, so that responsability may be said to rest on both parties for 1912. In 1913 the expenditure on consolidated revenue account went up $112,059,000, in 1914 to $127,384,000, and for the current year ending March 31, 1915, Mr. White says it will be $140,000,000. For the year ending March, 1916, he estimates that it will be the same amount.
>
> Now what does this mean to the taxpayer? Setting aside all war expenditures and all expenditures on capital account, the Borden government, less than four years in office, has increased the cost of operating the ordinary services of the country and of paying interest on the country's debt from $87,774,000 to $140,000,000. Assuming that there are now eight and a half million people in Canada, this means additional expenditure of $6.14 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion.
>
> In the year ending March, 1911, the country's revenue from taxes was $89,835,000. In 1914 it was $127,478,000. In the current year ending March 31 there will be a great falling-off in customs revenue, and as a result an enormous increase in the public debt. In the year ending March, 1916, the people of Canada will have to contribute in taxes at least $140,000,000 if they are to pay their ordinary current expenditure, apart entirely from the cost of the war.
>
> The government of Canada has been spending money like a drunken sailor, and now the people must pay for the debauch. They will have to keep on paying long after the present generation has ceased to bother about taxes. The year the Laurier government came into power the interest on the public debt was $10,645,000. When it went out fifteen years afterwards it was $12,535,000. Mr. White tells us that in the year ending March, 1916, it will be $21,000,000. Before such figures is it to be wondered at that the country stands amazed?

Now what is the solution which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance offers in regard to that situation? He says: "borrow money and raise taxes," and I suppose he implies that our income will increase, and that we must live on that income. His

words, uttered in this House at the last session of Parliament, were:

It is therefore the intention of the Government to negotiate for a continuance of the arrangement which I have mentioned with the Imperial Government for the purpose of procuring the funds necessary to meet our special war expenditure. . .

It is not a question of raising a few millions by stamp taxes, by income tax or other minor means of supplementing revenue. We must endeavour to raise additional revenue to an amount of at least thirty million dollars, and when we have accomplished this we shall still be obliged to borrow heavily over the next fourteen months, that is to say, between now and March 31, 1916, to meet expenditure for purposes other than for war.

I have a very great respect, I may say, for the Minister of Finance, and I fully realize the difficult position in which he has been placed since the beginning of the war. I sympathize with him, perhaps, on account of the very humiliating position in which the Government placed him when they sent him to New York to borrow $45,000,000. I have not very strong feelings as to where we get the money, provided we get it; as to where we get our trade, provided we have it; as to where we sell our goods, provided we sell them. But, just prior to the election of 1911 I had almost become—how shall I put it?—I had almost become convinced after listening to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who were then in Opposition (my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was not among them at that time, that is why I presume he was chosen to go to New York) that we must have no trade or truck with the American people. Up to that time I had thought the Americans were a very fine people. I make a point of visiting the United States at least once a year, and there are some things in their institutions one cannot yet admire; yet there are many things to admire, and one is the great progress the United States has made commercially and financially. Hon. gentlemen opposite told us that it was disloyal to have any trade or truck with the American people. I did not much believe in this lip-loyalty, but in my own humble and modest way I did want to be loyal to the institutions of my country, and of the Empire. Hon. gentlemen opposite said it was disloyal to deal with the American people, but how much more disloyal must it be to go begging to the American people for money to carry on the business of this country. The day I saw the Minister of Finance starting down to the station to buy his ticket for New York, carrying that carpet handbag which had been bequeathed to him by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce

—the same carpet bag which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce had used in his former trips to Washington—I felt that his position was a painful one, and I have wondered how he explained it to the American people. I suppose he said: "I was not in the House at the time they were saying it would be disloyal to trade with you; I need money now; I have become converted to other ideas; I will pay a higher rate of interest than any one else; will you lend us a little? I congratulated him when I saw him come back with $45,000,000 in his pocket. He will be back again. I put this question to my hon. friends opposite: What are you going to say to your loyal constituents—that you deceived the people? Prior to 1911 you taught them that we must have no trade or truck with the people of the United States. What did the Finance Minister do with that $45,000,000? He told us, in his Budget speech last year, that he required the money to fill the gap between revenue and expenditure. Here are his words:

It is obvious upon consideration of the figures which I have submitted that we shall not, by any reasonable supplemental taxation measures, be able to close the gap between revenue and expenditure, much less to pay a portion of the principal of our special war outlays.

But, what about those taxes imposed in the Inland Revenue Department? What about the increased postage on our letters? How did we get that deficit in the Post Office Department this year of some $3,000,000? Where has the money gone that was received for the stamps? We pointed out that the stamps would go to pay no part of the war expenditures, but the minister assured the country that not only had they to impose special taxation but they had to go and beg of the American people to loan them $45,000,000 to fill the gap between the revenue and their expenditure. Now, Sir, may I be permitted to offer a word of advice to the Government at this moment? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) says we must live within our revenue. I can conceive the scene around the Treasury Board when my hon. friend repeated that advice to his colleagues, and when he said to them: We are practically financially bankrupt; you have been spending, according to the Toronto Globe, like a drunken sailor. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) says: We need the money, we have to give the boys the buildings they want. The Minister of

Finance says: I cannot possibly give you any more money; I have not got it. The Minister of Public Works says: We must have that money. His friends upon the other side of the House insisted upon getting the luxuries to which they were accustomed before the war. Then what did the Minister of Finance do? He appealed to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden)—he will correct me if I am wrong—and said to him: Can you not help me to control my colleagues? They are accustomed to all the luxuries; we had heaps of money when we came into office because the country was prosperous and the Liberal Government had left the coffers full, but we have spent the money and we have no more. The Prime Minister shrugged his shoulders, looked more bothered than usual and said: What can I do; I am not the Finance Minister? The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) apparently needed more money to purchase hay. These hon. gentlemen around the treasury board called out as one man: Mr. White, take up your carpet bag and go back and get more money from the American people. But he said: I cannot go back to the American people; it is too humiliating a position. Where will you go? they asked. He said: I will go to the Canadian people, and he went to the Canadian people and borrowed more money. What does Sir Edward Walker, President of the Bank of Commerce and chief financial adviser to the Borden Government, say about all this borrowing? I am not objecting to the borrowing of money for war purposes; I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am as ready as any man in this House to vote every dollar necessary to carry on this war to a successful issue, but what I do complain of is the way that the money, apparently required for war purposes, is being spent by the Cabinet to help their friends and supply them with the luxuries which they had been accustomed to since 1911. What does Sir Edmund Walker say?

> In the years to come we shall be bending our backs to a taxation, such as in this country, which has been singularly free of taxation, we have never known before and so also will our children for generations to come.

It is apparent that the Minister of Finance, do what he would, work as hard as he could, and I admit that he has worked hard, has been unable to live up to the doctrines that he was advocating in the city of Toronto of living within his income. He has signally failed in that and now he is appealing to the Minister of Trade and Commerce for a solution which brings me to the second point of the remarks which I propose to offer to the House in that fair criticism that the Minister of Agriculture said the Government invited us to make. In fairness to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I want to quote his words from Hansard, 1910-1911, and which may be found at page 6604. I commend them most earnestly to hon. gentlemen opposite who are constantly asking for buildings in their constituencies which are absolutely of no use to the public service. Here are his words:

> Now, ought there not to be a check on expenditure?

I appeal to my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), to my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and to other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—can you not almost imagine that you hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce crying out a "check upon expenditures"? Then he asks:

> Here you have, for instance, millions of dollars being spent every year for the construction of public buildings, and on what principle is this money spent? There is no proper principle upon which it should be spent but one! Build a public building because the public service needs it and cannot be properly carried on without it.

Let us apply that doctrine to the history of our hon. friends opposite since they assumed power. Erect a public building because the public service needs it and cannot be properly carried on without it! Did the public service absolutely need, and could it not be properly carried on, without expending $50,000, as per the estimates of 1914-15—war time—at Amherst for a post office and $70,000 for a drill hall when the total population of Amherst, single, married, widowed, divorced and legally separated, was 8,973? Did the public service at Bear river call for a public building costing $4,000 when the population, by the census of 1911, is simply 589? Did the public service demand that Bridgetown should have a post office costing $4,000 when the population was simply 996?

Does the public service of Canada demand that at Dunnville (Haldimand county) which, according to the census of 1911 had a population of 2,861, there should be erected a public building at a cost of $20,000; or that there should be erected at Elmira (Waterloo North), with a population of 1,782, a public building costing $37,000? In

order that the public service may be efficiently carried on, is it necessary that we should spend the sum of $5,000 at Gore Bay (Algoma), which in 1901 had a population of 723, and in 1911 a population of only 703.

Mr. SMYTHE: When was that spent?

Mr. DEVLIN: That amount was in the estimates of 1914-15, and has not been withdrawn yet.

Mr. SMYTHE: You said it had been spent.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will my hon. friend guarantee that it will not be spent?

Mr. SMYTHE: I will give no such guarantee, it should be spent.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am criticising honestly and, I hope, impartially the finances of this country and the Government's control of expenditures. If the money is not going to be spent, what is it in the estimates for? Members of this House must be guided by the Estimates. Was it absolutely necessary that in order to carry on the public service of this country an item of $20,000 should be placed in the Estimates for a public building at Mill Brook (Durham), which in 1911 had a population of only 793? These are only a few instances of what has happened, and perhaps the Government, which has invited this criticism will enlighten us as to the need for these public buildings.

Let me quote from the Canadian Financial Post of January 22, 1916, and this is not a party organ, but a financial paper published in Toronto:

> The country has made a magnificent response to the calls upon it since July, 1914, and is prepared for further sacrifices; but the people will not go on listening to ministers mouthing homilies on economy, while extravagance riots in the department under their administration.
>
> The annual report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915, shows a deficit of nearly three million dollars. This increase in expenditure is not only very large, but also very unexpected. It is nearly 2 per cent more than in 1914, while the population can have increased very little, if at all, so that it can hardly be claimed to be due to natural expansion.
>
> The question of expenditure has become as important as that of revenue. Speculation is aroused as to what is happening during the current fiscal year and induces a feeling of unrest. It would be well if monthly returns by the Government, published in the Canada Gazette, gave the itemized expenditure in similar form to that now used for revenue.

> The amount of capital expenditure for the first nine months of the fiscal year ending March 31 next, is $113,118,691, as against $55,002,443, the increase being entirely due to war expenditure. The amount expended on public works, $26,151,882 against $28,342,347 in 1914, seems very large, however, in comparison with the drastic cuts made by the great railway corporations and leading municipalities in the Dominion.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, what these great corporations are doing.

> The Canadian Pacific railway reduced its capital expenditure on branches, improvements, rolling stock and shops, from $79,186,958 in 1913, to $58,037,236 in 1914, and $11,774,094 in 1915.
>
> The building permits for 1915 amounted to only $25,000,000, for the whole Dominion, against $170,000,000 in 1913, and $200,000,000 in 1912.
>
> Four cities in the West—Edmonton, Calgary, Moosejaw and Saskatoon, reduced their capital expenditure in all, from $15,195,013 in 1913, to $6,758,303 in 1914, and $1,247,617 in 1915.
>
> These drastic economies effected by our great railroads and leading municipalities are striking instances of what can and has been done in this way. And if by these corporations, why not by a government department?
>
> Members of the Government never lose an opportunity of preaching the necessity for economy to the Canadian people; which is as it should be. At the same time the Canadian people look to see the ministers never losing an opportunity of practising that virtue in the administration of their respective departments.

I wonder if my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce thinks that one way of controlling public expenditure is to dismiss and cause to retire, as hon. gentlemen did when they assumed office, 13,000 civil servants or persons connected with the Civil Service, and to replace them by 25,613. You will remember, Sir, that this Government dangled before the eyes of the civil servants for a very long time a promise to increase their salaries. They got Sir George Murray over from England to make a report on the Civil Service. Hon. gentlemen opposite may find that report in a pigeon hole of the Prime Minister's desk down in the west block, all covered up with dust and cobwebs. Sir George Murray reported how a saving might be effected in the Civil Service, but the Government, instead of following the advice of this special commissioner and increasing the wages of the civil servants and others attached to the service, caused to resign 13,000 employees, and put in their places 25,000 others. In the department presided over by the Minister of Agriculture, who worked himself up into such a passion this afternoon, 138 were put out and 579 put in. I will

not take every department, but to the credit of the Minister of Trade and Commerce let me say that he carried out in his own department his theory of controlling expenditures. He saw only 54 go out and 49 come in. If it were absolutely necessary that the 54 should go out, that is very much to his credit; but if they were put out for party reasons, I think it was rather cruel and somewhat crude. In the Marine Department there were 464 dismissals, 340 caused to resign, and 1,608 appointments. This Government, following out their theory of controlling expenditure, has succeeded in increasing the cost of civil government in this country from $88,000,000 in 1911 to $127,000,000 in 1914, and to $140,000,000 in 1915. We are told that we can not control expenditures because of the war, but expenditure is being controlled, as I have already pointed out, by the big corporations, by companies, by individuals and by governments in this country; and I know of no better example to offer hon. gentlemen opposite than the example set by the Government of the province of Quebec. The Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. Walter Mitchell, has just given to the public his financial statement.

The fiscal conditions in the province of Quebec must be the same, or about the same, as they are throughout the Dominion. The financial statement of the province shows that the ordinary revenue was $9,597,925.67, the ordinary expenditure $8,330,257.01, which left a surplus of $1,267,668.66. The extraordinary expenditure was $380,258.63, leaving a surplus over ordinary and extraordinary expenditure of $887,410.03. The Provincial Government have expended $692,994 in war donations in the way of grants to the British Government, l'Hôpital des Paroisses Canadiennes Francaises in Paris, the committee for the relief of the Belgian war victims, and the Comité de Secours National, Paris, and individuals in the province of Quebec have most generously given to the different funds that have been raised. Now, after giving for war purposes, all this money, which was a great deal considering their very small budget, after being able to control their expenditure, ordinary and extraordinary, they are able to show to the people of the province of Quebec in this year of war a surplus of $194,416. That is somewhat to the credit of the Hon. Sir Lomer Gouin, who is at the head of the Government of that province, and it is somewhat to the credit of a Liberal Government to show that they at least are able to control their expenditure when hon. gentlemen opposite in a Conservative Government are forced to confess to the people of Canada that they are altogether unable to control the expenditures which have been occasioned, not only by the war, but by the exigencies of their party friends.

I shall now refer to the advice of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who said that in order properly to deal with the financial situation of Canada, we should convert our adverse trade balance into a favourable one. I wish to point out that the agricultural classes, who control the basic wealth of this country, have not been protected to the same degree as the manufacturing classes, and it is important to protect them in view of the fact that after the war we shall have to look to them to make up the awful deficit with which this country will be faced —a greater deficit, perhaps, than any we have had since Confederation.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DEVLIN: When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, was proceeding to show that the advice given to us by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) was that in order to make this country's affairs prosperous and to regulate its finances it was essential to prevent an adverse balance of trade. In the session of 1910-11, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking in this House, used this language:

> I find in connection with the United Kingdom that our favourable balance of trade is $44,146,518. That looks good, but it is not as good as it ought to be. When we come to the United States of America, what do we find? We find that last year we imported from the United States $217,500,000 worth, that we sold to them $104,000,000 worth in round figures, and that there was an adverse balance against us of $113,000,000 odd.

His conclusion was that the sooner we could remedy that and the more completely we could remedy it the better. Now, I wish to call your attention to the way in which the present Government, on coming into power, proceeded to remedy this condition of affairs. Take our trade with the United States as an example. The Minister of Trade and Commerce complained that it was a bad thing for us to purchase $217,000,000 worth of goods from the United States; in fact, if my recollection is right,

that was the theory generally accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and apparently accepted at that time by the majority of the electors—that it was a bad thing to trade at all with the United States. The reports which we have in hand show us that in 1912, after these hon. gentlemen got into office, we imported from the United States goods to the value, not of $217,000,000, as in the previous year, but to the value of $330,000,000. In 1913, we purchased from the United States goods to the value of $435,000,000, and in 1914, of $395,000,000. At the same time our exports to the United States were: In 1912, $102,000,000; in 1913, $139,000,000, and in 1914, $163,000,000. Now, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce was sincere in believing that an adverse balance of trade was a bad thing and should be remedied, he must have believed that when he and his friends came into power they could so control trade that this adverse balance would quickly be righted. In fairness to hon. gentlemen opposite—and I wish to be fair in my criticism—I must admit that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, following out the theories which he advocated, sought channels of commerce other than those which seemed to be bringing to Canada no very great wealth, and so he went off to China. Believing, as he did, that it was a bad thing to trade with the United States, and being unable to trade wholly with British countries, he felt that he had to seek other countries with which to trade. He succeeded fairly well in China, and on his return he gave this House a fair description of his travels; he told us that he had exacted of certain agents of the Government there that they should learn as much as possible of the Chinese language, and incidentally had prepared the ground for some trade with China. Being of a curious turn of mind at times, I have looked up the trade reports for this country, and I find that this has been the result of the hon. gentleman's mission to China: For the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1914, we sold to China $473,000 worth of goods and we bought from China over $1,000,000 worth. The net result of that trip to China by the Minister of Trade and Commerce was to convince the people of China that this was a great country to sell to and a poor country to buy from, and so he succeeded in establishing an adverse trade balance in our commerce with China.

What is our aggregate trade; how has that gone on under this noble theory that we must not have an adverse trade balance? In 1913, the total exports from Canada were $393,000,000, and the total imports, $692,000,000. There we had an adverse balance of trade under these same hon. gentlemen of about $298,000,000. In 1914, we exported $478,000,000, and imported $650,000,000, an adverse balance of trade of $171,000,000. In 1915, our imports were $629,000,000, and we sold abroad $490,000,000, leaving a trade balance against Canada of $138,000,000. I appeal to the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), for whom I have the greatest personal regard, to take his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce into his confidence, have that hon. gentleman step aside, and assure him that when he preached that it was a bad thing to establish an adverse trade balance he was apparently preaching something that he did not know anything at all about.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance might answer me at once and say: Have you looked over the figures of this year? I presume the hon. Minister of Finance will deal with that in the Budget speech which he will deliver in a few days. But I wish to call his attention to the fact that this year is not a year that might stand out as an example in Canada. Conditions are such, because of the war, that we cannot claim that our trade has been upon a basis upon which it will rest in the future. But we have the United States alongside of us; they are not at war; and while Canada under the present Government has gone on increasing its adverse balance of trade, we find that the American people have established the greatest financial trade in the history of their country.

And what is it? The American exports increased 70 per cent in 1915 and reached a total of three and a half billions, breaking all previous records. The figures of the Department of Commerce to-day show that heavy exports and declining imports together set a new American trade balance record at $1,772,000,000. The imports were the smallest since 1912. The country's total foreign trade, exports and imports, passed the five billion dollar mark during the year, each month showing heavier exports, until December's reached $350,000,000, a trade balance of close to $2,000,000,000 was five times greater than that in 1914, when it stopped at $324,000,000.

Compare that with ours. In 1912 our adverse trade balance was $225,000,000. In 1914, when hon. gentlemen opposite had had

three years to work out their theory, the adverse balance of trade was $180,000,000.

In the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite agriculture, which is a basic industry of Canada, has been sacrificed to manufactures. To prove this contention I desire to cite the exports of agriculture and manufacture from Canada in the years 1913, 1914, and 1915. The figures are as follows:

1913.	
Agricultural produce	$196,134,043
Manufactures	52,212,592
Excess agriculture over manufactures	$143,921,451
1914.	
Agricultural produce	$150,201,314
Manufactures	66,989,308
Excess agriculture over manufactures	$ 83,212,006
1915.	
Agricultural produce	$193,543,711
Manufactures	137,702,849
Excess agriculture over manufactures	$ 55,840,862

In 1913 the excess of our agricultural exports over exports of manufactured goods amounted to $143,000,000; whereas, for the year ending November, 1915, our exports of agricultural products exceeded our exports of manufactured products by only $55,000,000

What conclusion can we draw from this? I draw a conclusion which, I feel, must appeal to the people of this country, in view of the fact that the war must, of necessity, cease some time. The agriculture of this country forms two-thirds of the basic wealth of Canada. Manufactures help to a certain degree, to a very large degree, but the farmers, before everybody else, produce the wealth of which we have been so proud in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite—and I appeal to them very seriously at the present moment—should see to it that whilst the manufacturers are protected, whilst railways are protected by way of subsidies, the farmers of this country should not remain the only unprotected class of people in Canada. If we expect from the farmers the wealth that will be necessary to carry on the affairs of this country we must, in turn, protect the farmers. This year's figures which I have just put to the House show that exports of manufactured goods have been on the increase, and that agricultural exports have slightly increased. We must not forget for one moment the fact, which is apparent to every hon. member, that, with our agricultural products, at the present moment we are helping to feed millions of men who are now fighting the battles of the Empire and of the allied countries; and that the very moment the war ceases these exports of agricultural products must, of necessity, cease, because the Governments which are to-day purchasing our agricultural products will not then require them to the same degree. Whilst our exports of manufactured products have increased this also has been due entirely to the conditions brought on by the war. We have exported this year shrapnel, we have exported shells, we have exported ammunition—practically everything that is required by the armies on the other side. The moment the war ceases we will cease exporting anything in the nature of the ammunition, or at least very little.

In thus urging the Government to be careful how they face the problems of the future, I want to tell them that, whilst the farmers of this country have much to fear through the actions, or lack of action, of the present Government, the manufacturers of this country certainly also have very much to fear because this Government is so tiding them at the present moment to increase this output in the way of war munitions, whilst at the same time following out the main plank in the policy of the Conservative party, as I think every hon. gentleman opposite will admit, whilst following out their theory of offering every possible protection to manufacturers in the way of an increase in the customs duties. In order to prove what I have just advanced relative to the condition of our manufactures owing to the war, I want to quote an item which I find in the Labour Gazette, a newspaper published by this Government:

> Exceptionally active conditions prevailed throughout the year in the large iron and steel works at Sydney and Sydney Mines, and also in similar industries in Quebec and Ontario. Practically all foundry and machine shops in the country were busy in the manufacture of munitions, and large orders for cottons, woollens, clothing, leather and other goods used in military equipment kept establishments handling these lines in the main industrial centres of the Dominion very busy. The steel plant at Sault Ste. Marie was also very active during the year.

We therefore have it announced in this mouthpiece of the Government, the very reason why we have an increase in the export of manufactured goods. The Minister of Finance, I know, will agree that the increased exportation of agricultural products is entirely due to the war, so that this year is not a year upon which my hon. friends opposite can claim to have found a new system by which they have lessened this

adverse balance of trade against Canada. They must of necessity appeal to normal conditions, to the conditions which existed in this country prior to the war, in 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914; and I claim that the Government has signally failed in that respect to meet the conditions which confront Canada. The Financial Post of Toronto, of January 22, had a very significant article entitled, "Business outlook after the war." I will not quote the whole of the article, but for the purposes of my argument I read:

Whether or not in the readjustment Canadian manufacturers will be able to obtain business to replace in volume that of making war materials is a problem which the future can best solve, but it would appear conclusive that Canada's best hope will be large agricultural products. Along this line the directors of the Banque d'Hochelaga emphasize the necessity for increased population to offset the lowering of prices when the war ends. The report, after advising caution on the grounds that the present war prosperity is not healthy nor likely to be permanent, continues:

The annual report of the Banque d'Hochelaga contains this statement:

"One may assume that, at the end of the war, Europe impoverished and weakened, anxious to recover and to get back its economic situation, will endeavour firstly to provision itself in greater measure at home, and then at prices as advantageous as possible. It will therefore be necessary for us to see to it that we regain by increased production what is lost through the lowering of prices. To this end, the increase in our population by the colonization of our vast territories, the improvement in methods of agriculture and a special attention on the part of our farmers to the raising of live stock must remain from a material point of view, our greatest natural aim."

When I say, Sir, that it is the duty of the Government to show the people of this country that they have some policy in view by which they hope to meet conditions after the war, I am simply asking the Government, in the name of the people whom I represent, and of a good many people in this country, to give an indication of how they expect to meet the conditions the moment war ceases.

I shall refer for a moment to the Shell Committee, which has been prominently discussed during this debate, and in that connection I do not intend to make allusion to any particular person, or persons. We have heard it said that there is a general demand for an investigation into the operations of the defunct Shell Committee. That demand has come from hon. members in this House, and apparently the feeling is general throughout Canada. It is not confined to those of the political faith to which I belong; it has also come from Conservative sources. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) quoted from the Electrical News in the course of his speech, and I shall cite from the same paper, an article written by a gentleman who said he preferred the Borden Government with all its fault to the Liberal Administration. The article says:

The Shell Committee was appointed by the Government, was representative of the Government and consequently representative of Canada. In so far as our dealings with the British Munitions Board is concerned that committee was Canada. And in this great war, which Lloyd George has said is a war of munitions rather than men, shall it be said that when the Empire, called for aid, when the brave men in the trenches shouted for munitions, Canada rushed to their aid with $1 worth of shell in one hand while the other was held out for $5.15? Shall it be said that while we are wont to twit the United Statesers with their fondness for the dollar our own country has outdone them in the hour of the Empire's peril? It is unjust that Canada should be allowed to rest under any such stigma; it is unjust that the manufacturing members of the Shell Committee should be retired under suspicion of having placed such stigma on their native land. In justice to those men and to justice to Canada the shell contracts and the Shell Committee should be given the fullest and most searching investigation.

Yesterday the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, acting upon his responsibility as a member of this House, brought very serious charges against the Shell Committee. These charges were of such a nature that, it seems to me, the Government, for its own honour, to preserve its dignity, and for the honour and dignity of the people of Canada, should at once grant an investigation. I am not always governed by what appears in newspapers, Grit or Tory, but the Montreal Star, which professes to be a strong adherent of this Government, and which has been a very staunch supporter of my hon. friends opposite, on the 26th of this month, editorially used this language:

It must be increasingly apparent to every well-wisher of the Government that a public and complete investigation into the work of the late Shell Committee and other war purchases cannot be denied. If the consent of the British War Office must be secured to legalize such an inquiry, then it should be asked for by a unanimous Canadian Parliament. Too much has been charged to enable public opinion in this country—deadly in earnest as it is in its determination to win the war—to sit down in patient ignorance as to the real facts of the case.

The charges are far too serious—the questions at issue far too vital. The finest young men in Canada are giving their lives to defend the Empire and the fixed principles of liberty and honour for which it stands before humanity and history. If, while these noble young men

have been going out of our homes to die "somewhere in France" ghouls in human shape have emerged from homes of similar outward appearance next-door to pad their pocket books with unfair and unearned profits on the arming and equipping of these young men, then the whole country wants to know it—and to know them— and to know what the Government proposes to do to them.

Every dollar taken unfairly from the money which this nation has to spend in self-defence, is like striking up a rifle aimed at a German. Worse still, it may even be disarming a Canadian lad in the face of a German charge. The whole business must be searched through and through with the vivid light of patriotism and publicity. If the moneys we are literally sweating out of ourselves to save freedom and the flag, are being diverted into traitorous pockets, then there are far worse Germans in Canada than those whom we have interned.

That is very strong language, but it is not as strong as that which was used by the Right Hon. Lloyd George, who, speaking in the British House of Commons last July, said that on account of the very high prices demanded for war munitions in some quarters, delay was caused and in consequence a great deal of sacrifice resulted on the battlefield in France. Where are those quarters? Is Canada one of the quarters to which Mr. Lloyd George referred? The Canadian people are asking that question to-day. What is the reason that is prompting the Canadian Government to refuse this investigation? The Minister of Militia, discussing this subject yesterday, spoke very bravely, according to his view, when he said:

For a double reason, therefore, I do not see that it is the function of this House specially to inquire into any of the transactions in connection with that committee—

That is a question that I will come to in a moment.

—although I should be more than pleased, so far as I am able, to give all the elucidation of the facts, and all the enlightenment as to them which it is possible for me to give.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will say, and I thoroughly agree with them, that the Minister of Militia is a man of such mettle as to stand up in this House and say in effect: I am one man in this Cabinet and I will give all the information I have. Then, I ask the other members of the Cabinet: Why is it you do not hold an investigation and give the Minister of Militia a chance to give to the people of Canada all the information which he has in his possession? The only answer given so far is the answer given by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). The Solicitor General is a very keen reasoner; he has a very nimble political conscience, and he satisfied himself and apparently satisfied the leader of the Government when he said: The Shell Committee is a creature of the Imperial Government; the Shell Committee is responsible to the Imperial Government; the Shell Committee communicates directly with the Imperial Government, and therefore, this Government has absolutely no jurisdiction over it. Has this Parliament no jurisdiction over the actions of the Shell Committee which was dealing with persons and property in this country? Have you ever heard of any man in Canada who could state a fallacy better than the Solicior General and build up an argument upon it just as if it were a truism? He said he was not going to speak for the Shell Committee, although he made as able a defence of it as he knew how, but that he was going to speak in the name of the Government and give the reasons why there should be no investigation. He started out by saying:

I do not know that it is a matter that requires much elucidation that the prices should at first have been higher in Canada than in the United States. It may be that the prices were higher than the conditions warranted; I am not an expert, and I do not know.

Mr. Lloyd George, on the other hand, said in the British House of Commons that on account of the prices being higher there was some sacrifice on the part of the Allied armies. This is, of course, a matter of indifference to the Solicitor General because it has nothing to do with the legal phase of the case. He proceeds to say:

I have said that I have no knowledge that he (the Minister of Militia) was a member, and I would like my hon. friend to get the names of the respective committees and show that the Minister of Militia was a member. The committee, however constituted, and whatever its personnel, was, from the time of its institution, a committee acting under the authority of the Imperial Government.

This country is innocent, this House must be innocent, to believe that the Solicitor General did not know who were the members of the Shell Committee, and did not even know that the Minister of Militia was a member of that committee. He concludes his argument, and this is what I deem to be the best portion of it, with these words:

If we have the right to review part of the moneys that are payable to the Imperial Government we have the right to review all the expenditures in which we are interested. We are interested in the same degree in the money paid by the Imperial Government in the United States as in the money paid in Canada. We have to pay some part of that, and we have to pay some part of the money that has been

spent in Japan, and in Great Britain itself, and if there is a duty upon the Parliament of Canada to investigate the expenditure of Imperial moneys for the munitions of Canada, the same duty must apply to all the moneys in which we are interested expended by the Imperial authorities.

Are we interested in the money spent in Japan? If we are, we recognize that this Government, in the exercise if its plenary powers, has no jurisdiction over Japan. Everybody knows that. The Solicitor General says that we would have jurisdiction over the money spent in Japan if this Government had jurisdiction over the money that has been spent in this country and given to persons under the control of this Government.

The Minister of Finance, speaking in Toronto, gave us a further inkling into what was being done in connection with financing the contracts entered into by the Shell Committee. Here is the language he used when speaking to the Toronto Board of Trade:

Now in addition to that the Finance Department has advanced to the Imperial Treasury, in order to make payment for commitments of the Shell Committee in Canada, no less a sum than 63 million dollars.

That 63 million dollars has been repaid to Canada from time to time by the Imperial Treasury. But this is the point to which I want to call your attention. How has it been paid?

I had a statement from my deputy this morning in which he states that it has been paid by gold to the extent of many millions of dollars. In fact to the extent of 15 million dollars actually shipped in to the Finance Department. That is one reason why Canada has more gold to-day than she had when the war broke out, in liquidation for advances made to the Imperial Treasury for the purpose of financing the Shell Committee.

In addition to that, payment has been made by exchange operations, on which there would be a heavy discount, running from 3 to 5 per cent, amounting to over 20 million dollars.

And he proceeds with his very able speech. However, he tells us, and this I want to lay down as one of the premises of my argument, that the money of Canada, over which this Government have absolute control, was expended in payment of contracts entered into by the Shell Committee. We have at least jurisdiction over the money that this Government expends; hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that. Whether that money is paid by way of advances, or by way of loans, or otherwise, the moment the money of Canada has been paid this Parliament has jurisdiction over the expenditure. I think hon. gentlemen who are just will admit that. My hon. friend the member for

[Mr. Devlin.]

St. John (Mr. Pugsley), on the 13th day of April, 1915, asked a question of the Minister of Militia in regard to the following article which appeared in the Ottawa Free Press of the previous day:

Revelations of war purchases on boots, bandages, binoculars and bad horses apparently have crossed the Atlantic.

It looks as if the British Government had begun to sit up and take notice. Soon after the opening of the war the British Government entrusted the Canadian Government with the purchasing of some war supplies in Canada for the use of the British and allied forces. The British Government was to pay the bills.

It is understood that within the last few days the War Office or the British Government has cancelled the buying commissions which it gave to the Canadian Government.

This does not mean an end to the purchase of supplies in Canada by the British Government, as War Office buyers are on their way to Canada and the United States, and hereafter the British Government will deal direct with producers and manufacturers on this continent without the intervention of Ottawa.

My hon. friend from St. John based a question on that article, the purpose of which I take to be that up to date the Canadian Government alone had full control of these purchases, that they had been purchasing for the Imperial Government, if you will, but that it was the intention of the Imperial Government to deal directly with manufacturers in Canada without the intervention of Ottawa. My hon. friend from St. John proceeded to say:

I ask the Minister of Militia if the Government has received notice from the British War Office that they are sending their agents to the United States and Canada for the purpose of making purchases direct from the manufacturers, and are not to continue making them through my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and others who have been appointed by him?

Major General Hughes: The hon. gentleman asks me a question concerning the Department of Militia, and I am in the happy position of being able to answer him. There is not a word of truth in that article, so far as the Department of Militia is concerned. So far as the Government is concerned the Prime Minister is the proper gentleman to ask.

Sir Robert Borden: The statements in the article are absolutely without foundation, so far as I am aware. On the contrary, I know that within the past four or five days the British Government have asked the Canadian Government to act in respect of the procuring of a large amount of supplies in Canada for the War Office.

So that it would appear that up to this date the British Government had absolutely no agents in this country for the purchase of war supplies. I take it that the British Government had asked the Canadian Government to act in the matter, and that the Canadian Government would appoint

their agents to purchase any supplies that might be required by the War Office and could be got in Canada. In corroboration of my statement that the British Government had no agents in this country at that time, I refer to a question asked in the British House of Commons on the 15th of March, just exactly one month before the hon. member for St. John asked his question in this House. Mr. MacVeagh, a member of the British House, asked the Under-Secretary of State for War:

Whether the contracts being placed in Canada and the United States, are being placed by special agents, and if so, what is their commercial experience; whether the remuneration is by salary or commission, and if so, how much; and whether the co-operation of the Canadian Government has been invited?

Mr. Baker, who was then Financial Secretary to the War Office, replied:

Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Company, of New York, who are in close touch with all the American markets, have been appointed commercial agents to the Government for the purpose of placing orders in the United States. Their remuneration is by commission, but it is not considered to be in the public interest to give the details of the contract.

The British Government then, had agents in the United States, and their agents were Messrs. J. P. Morgan and Company. But as regards Canada Mr. Baker proceeded to say:

No special agents have been appointed for purchasing in Canada. Close touch has been maintained with the Canadian Government in regard to orders placed in that country.

According to the War Office, then, the Canadian Government had absolute control of all purchases and over all contracts entered into in this country. Now at this time the Shell Committee had been formed by the Minister of Militia, and in the report which was laid on the table by the Prime Minister on the 15th of April last, General Bertram speaks of the Shell Committee as follows:

In addition to the foregoing, the Minister of Militia, through his committee—

Through "his" committee, mark you, General Bertram was supposed to be the chairman of the committee that was supposed to be the go-between with the manufacturers of Canada and the Imperial Government, and he says that the committee was not the committee of the Imperial Government, but the committe of the Minister of Militia of Canada. The committee was formed, then, by the Minister of Militia, who was at that time and is now a member of this Government. The Shell Committee was absolutely under his control and under the control of the Canadian Government, and reported to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Militia. The fact is, however, that the only report which has been laid upon the table as coming from the Shell Committee was made directly to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister of Canada. General Bertram, in another part of his report, uses this language:

We informed the various officials at the War Office that it was the intention of the Minister of Militia and his committee—

Again it is "his" committee. Throughout his whole report Colonel Bertram spoke of the Shell Committee as the committee of the Minister of Militia, and as the commitee of the Canadian Government. The Right Hon. Mr. Baker, the Financial Secretary of the War Office, made in the British House of Commons the statement that the War Office had no agents in Canada, that the Canadian Government was making the purchases. It appears from this debate, and from what papers we have in our possession, that the Canadian Government controlled every contract that was entered into with the manufacturers, that they had absolute control over the Shell Committee, over the appointment of inspectors, and over every other detail of the committee's work. The Solicitor General, speaking of the Shell Committee, said:

They conducted their business directly with the Imperial authorities. Communications passed from the Shell Committee to the Imperial Government and from the Imperial Government to the Shell Committee. Had they been in a position where we had authority over them, had they been constituted as a committee under a department of this Government—

And you must mark General Bertram's statement that the committee was a committee of the Minister of Militia.

—they would have been answerable to this Government; we would have had authority over them and we would have been reaponsible.

In view of these statements; in view of the statement of General Bertram, the chairman of the Shell Committee, that the committee was a committee under the Department of Militia; in view of the statement of the Solicitor General that the Shell Committee had direct communication with the Imperial Government when it is in proof and in evidence that this communication was directly with the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister of this country, and in view of the fact that the Solicitor General said that if the Shell Committee had been constituted as a committee under a department of this Government, they would have

been answerable to this Government,—when we have the Minister of Militia telling us yesterday that he was the father of the committee, and when we have the evidence that it was a committee under the Department of Militia, I ask this Government and the Solicitor General, what further excuse will the Government give to the people of Canada for refusing the investigation which has been asked by the Opposition, and which is being asked by the people of this country?

I feel that I have spoken at greater length than I had intended, and as I am about to resume my seat I want to say that I believe it to be the first duty of this Government and of the people of this country to see this war brought to a successful issue; but at the same time I want to remind the Minister of Finance, before he puts on any more taxes, that his raising of duties last year has simply had the effect of adding to the burdens of the consumer and of protecting a class already protected in this country, namely, the manufacturers. I would like to recall to him the language used by the Right Hon. Mr. Asquith in the British House of Commons:

> If there is one thing that is axiomatic in fiscal theory and practice, it is this, that you cannot combine in one and the same imposition a revenue and a protective duty.

So far the increase in the duty has failed to give us the revenue we require; so far the increase in the duty has borne heavily upon the consumer, and yet we are obliged, in order to meet the ordinary expenditure, to go out and borrow. I have said, and I repeat that we have in this country untold wealth, agricultural, mineral, and industrial. I want to say to the Government: You should see to it that you do not rely upon your customs duties as your source of revenue. Your greatest source of revenue is in the wealth produced by your agriculture; it is your basic wealth, protect it. You are asking the farmers to produce more. They are the only unprotected class in this country, and yet you are taxing the essentials which they require, and without which they cannot clear the additional land necessary for increased production; they cannot build the additional buildings necessary to hold the greater volume of crops; they cannot till the soil and reap the harvest. You are increasing those burdens already on their shoulders by increasing your duties without thereby increasing your revenue. Now is the time for the Government to lay down a system for securing immediately after this war the best possible class of immigrants. Now is the time for them to lay down a system by which they will perfect the means of transportation by rail and by water. Now is the time for them to develop the mineral resources of this country, to save the forests, to lessen industrial disputes by giving due regard to the grievances of the labouring classes. In the different departments of the public service, now is the time for the Government to abolish the patronage system, and to call to their service the best class of officials obtainable and to pay them a just wage. I have always had unbounded confidence in the future of my country. I believe that our people have awakened to the great possibilities of Canada, and whilst we are assuming tremendous financial obligations, I believe that by a judicious and economic expenditure and administration, in spite of the awful strain upon this country caused by the depression through which we have passed and by the war, we shall again be able to travel upon that road upon which we had made such headway before 1911, in building up this country and bringing it on towards nationhood.

9 p.m.

[Mr. Devlin.]

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, I would like to add my congratulations to those which have already been offered to you on your elevation to the high and honourable position which you occupy with so much grace and dignity. I would like also to offer my congratulations to the mover and to the seconder of the Address on the able and eloquent manner in which they discharged their duties.

Speeches in Parliament on the Address and on the Budget may be taken as giving a fair index of the popular mind on questions of public interest. At this particular time, when the liberties of mankind are in the balance, and when the very foundations of civilization are being threatened, the utterances of public men are of more than ordinary interest. Many of the speeches which have been delivered in this debate have been free from partisanship. That does not, in my estimation, indicate by any means that the members who delivered those speeches are less party men than they formerly were, but if they have had grievances, they have felt that at the present time and under existing circumstances they had better hide those grievances or grieve inwardly, so to speak, and wait for another

opportunity of attacking the Government on matters in regard to which, in their opinion, the Government should be attacked. But all the speeches which have been delivered in this House have not been free from partisanship. So far as the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) is concerned, I have no fault to find; in fact, I most cordially agree with many of his utterances. I do not agree with his views on some matters, and I will briefly refer to a few of the points on which I am at variance with him.

In his remarks on the purchase of the submarines, he stated that his complaint was that the price paid was too high for obsolete vessels. He did not question the necessity for these vessels and therefore did not question their usefulness. We have the statement made by a responsible minister of the Crown from British Columbia, that these vessels were of the greatest use in protecting the coast cities of Victoria and Vancouver. It does seem to me that when we consider the situation of Victoria and Vancouver at the outbreak of the war, we must see that the knowledge on the part of the German Government—and I think we may assume that Germany had that knowledge—that these submarines had been purchased, would have a very strong effect in preventing Germany from sending any of her cruisers so far away from their base of supplies. For my part, I am willing to leave the matter of the submarines to the consideration and judgment of the people of this country. I do not think the Government will be blamed; on the contrary I think the greatest credit will be given to those who effected the purchase of these submarines at that time.

The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) said that a few years ago hon. members on this side of the House declared that we "should not have truck or trade with the Yankees." That statement has often been made in a general way, but it has not been attributed to any individual. That was not the position taken by the Conservative party in 1911. We have never taken a position that we did not want to "truck or trade with the Yankees," but we did take the position—and which was diametrically opposed to the position taken by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his friends—that we were not prepared to allow this country to become a mere adjunct to the United States, and we were not prepared to hand over Canada to the United States. We were prepared then, and we are prepared to-day, to trade with the people of the United States or any other people on a fair basis, but we are not prepared to give away this country. as hon. gentlemen opposite have been disposed to do on more than one occasion.

As to my hon. friend's criticism of the expenditure of money on post offices in small towns, I would remind him that previous to the advent to power of the party which he supports in 1896, there was a generally understood, though unwritten, law that these buildings should not be constructed in towns of less population than about five thousand, and previous to the coming into power of the Laurier Government there were very few deviations from that general rule. If that rule was departed from, and if buildings were put up in small places at enormous expense to the country, that policy was introduced by the party which my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) supports.

The hon. gentleman made a statement with regard to the farmer, which, if I heard it correctly, I heartily endorse. He said that the farmer should not be the only unprotected man in this country; that if the manufacturers were protected the farmers ought to be protected also. If I am not giving correctly the substance of his words I hope he will correct me. Understanding the statement in that way, I heartily agree with it. But what was the position the hon. gentleman and his friends took in 1911 with regard to the farmer when they proposed to this country their policy of reciprocity with the United States? They proposed by that policy to throw open the doors of Canada to every country of agricultural production on the face of the globe. That is the proposition they offered then and that is the policy that the country rejected. What would be the position of our farmers in Canada to-day had that policy been carried out? With the products of the various countries practically excluded from the markets of Europe, those markets being made very dangerous of access by the war, we may be quite certain that if there was a low price for any farm product in any part of the world, that low price would be given to the farmers of Canada, for if our prices here at any time fell to a figure that would attract the producers of other countries, our farmers would have no protection, but the agricultural products of these other countries would be thrown into our market to the injury of our farming population.

Now, a word as to the hon. gentleman's

observations concerning the transactions of the Shell Committee, and his observations on this subject were almost in the same words as those used by other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. I wish, first, to make one or two quotations. At the time of the South African war, the good offices of the Laurier Government then in power, were given to Britain in the purchasing of supplies in Canada for the use of the British Government. In 1902 a resolution was moved in this House asking for an investigation in regard to these transactions. The investigation was refused on the ground that the war was in progress. Next year, 1903, the same request came up, and I will quote briefly to show the grounds on which that request for an investigation was then refused. The Minister of Finance of that time, Hon. W. S. Fielding, used these words:

> If we loaned the good offices of any of the officials of Canada, I cannot admit that we thereby are liable to account to this House for any expenditure of Imperial money which may happen to have been made in that connection.

And here is a brief extract from the speech made by the Prime Minister of that time, now the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier):

> We have had no complaint from the British Government and I therefore see no reason why this House should inquire into the expenditure of money which does not concern it.

That was the position taken by two of the most prominent members of the Liberal Government, and that position was endorsed by every member on the Liberal side of the House at that time. I cannot see that the position to-day is any different from what it was then. I might use the very words used by the present leader of the Opposition and say: We have no complaint from the British Government in regard to the whole business. And if fair consideration be given to the facts stated here yesterday by the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) I think it will be seen that there is no cause for hon. gentlemen opposite to make the complaint that they do. In the course of the speech of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) I asked a question of that gentleman. He was discussing the giving of a shell contract to some firm in St. Catharines. I asked him a very proper question, simply when the order was given to this company. I got no direct answer to that, and I repeated my question. Then the hon. member for Carleton appealed to the Chair and refused to give me an answer. Of course it is the privilege of any member to answer or not to answer a question that is put to him. The reason the hon. member for Carleton did not answer the question was because, if he had answered it, it would have done away with the argument he was trying to advance, in so far as that one firm was concerned, because, as a matter of fact, that firm was not given an order for shells at that time, but an order for cartridge cases, and so did not come within the line of argument the gentleman was pursuing.

My hon. friend from Carleton has told us that he does not allow the Ottawa Free Press to speak for him. The Free Press is to be congratulated in that it does not have to speak for the hon. member for Carleton, or to endorse what he says. The hon. member left out one thing in his speech this year. Last session he rang the changes on two men whom he called Bill and Dan. In future, I expect, it will be Sir William and Sir Daniel with the hon. member for Carleton. Why? Because during the past summer Sir William and Sir Daniel gave the hon. member for Carleton a free ride across this continent, and he came back so extremely mellowed that it is now Sir William and Sir Daniel, and he is ready to swallow one-half or two-thirds of what he said about them in this House last session. The Government has no right to complain of criticism; and although at this time, with the war in progress, they might expect that some of the harsher criticism should be postponed, yet they naturally do expect to get an occasional shot from the other side. But while they may be willing to submit to a little political sniping from some hon. gentlemen opposite, I do think, and I am sure the country will agree with me in this, that they have a right to expect that hon. gentlemen opposite should not use poison gas in their attacks. As far as the hon. member for Carleton is concerned, when his hand grenades or rather his mouth grenades, his shrapnel and high explosives and his sniping failed to make a hit, he undertook to make use of the poisonous gas of misrepresentation; and, a very short time after he had started that gas in the direction of the Government, the wind changed and it was blown back in his own face, and he has gone away now, pretty sick. So far as his very wild statements concerning shell contracts, etc., are concerned, the speech of the Minister

of Militia is the fullest and most complete answer. In so far as his equally wild and reckless statements concerning the purchase of hay are concerned, I should think that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., would never mention hay again. He was very much concerned about the farmers of his county. Contracts for hay had been let and the farmers had been paid $11, $12.50, $13 a ton for the hay; and he said they were being bled in the interests of favourites of the Government. He shed very copious tears for the farmers in his county. He told us that not only were they prohibited from exporting by an embargo on the export of hay but, worse than that, hay was being brought by the schooner load from the Annapolis valley of Nova Scotia in competition with the product of the farmers in his part of the country. He said:

> The whole intention is to show the farmers of New Brunswick that they can get the 15,000 tons of hay without them, and make them accept the price they are willing to pay.

In other words, we see the reason for the action of the hon. member for Carleton when he was buying hay to ship over to England at the time of the Boer war, because he admitted that he brought in several carloads from Quebec for the express purpose, unquestionably, as he puts it here himself, of showing the farmers in his part of the country that it was possible for him to get the hay elsewhere, and thus forcing them to accept the seven or eight dollars a ton he was kind enough to give them. Not only that, but he himself made a binding contract with the sub-contractors, holding them down in such a way that they dare not buy hay from the poor farmers at a higher price than he wanted to pay, or otherwise the punishment clause in the contract would be invoked, and they would be subject to a penalty. Never since I have had the honour of a seat in this House have I seen any person make such reckless statements as the hon. member for Carleton made, statements which, if applied to his own conduct a few years ago, would meet the condemnation from his own mouth which he was trying to place on members on this side of the House. Not alone in regard to hay did the hon. member speak; he also had something to say about horses. He said: In regard to fifty horses which were offered by Mr. Cox:

> When Sir Adam Beck was put in charge, for some accountable reason, I do not know why, he refused this gift; he sent around other veterinary inspectors, and they refused to accept every one of these fifty horses. Then the man who had charge of these horses—I think that perhaps Mr. Cox may have had a little finger in the pie as well—decided to test the sincerity of those who were acting for the Government in this matter. Mr. Cox said: We will see how serious these men are in their rejection of these horses.

And so on. I have in my hand the Toronto Daily Star, of Wednesday, January 26, and, since the hon. member for Carleton introduced the name of Mr. Cox in this matter, I want to quote what Mr. Cox himself says in regard to this transaction, and then leave it to the judgment of the House how far they can rely upon statements made by the hon. member for Carleton. The Toronto Daily Star is a Liberal paper. The article to which I refer is headed:

> H. C. Cox Drops Thousands on Horses.
> Came back on his hands because Mounted Units went as Infantry.

This is what Mr. Cox has to say in regard to this matter:

> If there is any insinuation that the horses were unfit, or that there was anything irregular about the transaction in regard to these horses, in all fairness to the Government and myself it ought to be cleared up, though ordinarily I do not care to add anything in debates of this kind, where politics are to some extent involved. I am honourary colonel of the 9th Mississauga Horse, of which H. D. Lockart Gordon, now at the front, is the colonel. He was very anxious to have the regiment go to the front as a mounted unit, and so I bought fifty horses for the boys to take out to camp at Long Branch for training purposes, and the city bought them fifty more. The bodyguard also were furnished with fifty horses by the city and fifty by Mr. Aemilius Jarvis, the honorary colonel of that regiment. These horses were brought in with the regiment when they went into winter quarters at Exhibition Camp but when these troops finally were ready to leave for the front the Government decided not to send them as mounted troops, but as dismounted cavalry, or infantry, until such time as conditions at the front warranted the use of horsemen as such. Consequently I was left with fifty horses on my hands, horses which had cost on the average of $200 each. I sold some of them at Grand's stable, and some—I do not know how many; it may have been twelve, as stated—were sold to the Government Commission's Purchasing agent for remounts, or for whatever purpose they were required. I dropped several thousand dollars over the matter from first to last, but I only mention it now to clear up any misapprehension that may be raised by the discussion in the House of Commons yesterday.

Mr. Cox, who is a well known Liberal, whose sympathies are naturally with the party on the other side of the House, makes the statement that he does not wish any insinuation to be made that the horses

were unfit, or that there was anything irregular in the transaction; and he makes it as a matter of fair play, not only to himself, but to the Government as well. Now, Sir, that is certainly a very different attitude from that taken by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., and conveys a very different impression. Why is it that the hon. member for Carleton took the course he did? Why is it that he plainly misrepresented the facts in regard to the horses, in regard to the shells, and in regard to the hay? What is it for, if it is not for this: That he believes that by circulating such reckless statements in the press they will have some political effect.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) stated this afternoon that he had had certain talks with the hon. member for Carleton, who asserted that the Minister of Agriculture had requested him for God's sake not to bring up the matter of the purchase of the hay. That does not seem reasonable on the face of it. It is apparent, however, that there were some confidential talks between the Minister of Agriculture and the hon. member for Carleton. The only explanation I can think of is to be found in the statement of the minister himself, that he had been sick for some time. He was not exactly himself, and was thrown off his guard a little; for surely the Minister of Agriculture has been long enough in this House, and has had sufficient opportunity of judging the calibre of the hon. member for Carleton to know that a man, who would have no regard for his country at a time like this, would not be persuaded even for God's sake not to bring up a matter if there was any political capital to be made out of it.

In regard to the matter of shells and the profits on shells, however, I observe that there was one company which the hon. member for Carleton handled very lightly indeed. That was the company which bears the name of the Canada Foundry and Forgings Company, a company in which the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is very deeply interested. The hon. member for Carleton was not so anxious to have an inquiry regarding that company, not so anxious to know how it was that the stock of that company rose within ten days from 30 to 260, unquestionably making some person very wealthy. He passed very lightly over that and went on to make reckless statements regarding other companies.

In regard to the matter of exorbitant profits on war materials, I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I endorse the words of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin); and I will endorse the words of any hon. gentleman in this House who takes the position that at this time of stress and strain no man, or firm, should make large profits out of munitions or anything else that is being furnished for the prosecution of the war. The people of the Dominion of Canada have responded nobly to appeals in support of the Red Cross, the Patriotic Fund, the Belgian Relief and other funds, and I say that no greater shame could attach to any man in Canada after this war is over than to be pointed out as one who had made hundreds of thousands of dollars out of exorbitant profits on anything furnished for the prosecution of the war. That is the position I take; that is the position which I understand the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) took in his speech, which statement on his part I thoroughly endorse.

At present there are millions of poor Belgians who have been driven out of their own country, refugees who are being taken care of in foreign lands; there are others in that country huddling around the ruins of their shattered villages, waiting for their turn to get a meal that will keep them alive from one day to the next; women in tattered garments, with little children hanging to their skirts, standing in the snow waiting for the free meals; and I repeat that nothing could be more shameful than for any man in the Dominion of Canada to go through this war making excessive profits while those conditions obtain.

I believe that, since this great task was thrown upon its shoulders, the present Government has done everything in its power to try to prevent profiteering, if I may use that word. The burdens thrown upon this Government have been enormous. That fact has been recognized by many hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who have spoken. Mistakes have unquestionably been made, but I believe that if you put the question to the people in the Dominion of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, ninety-nine per cent. would say that, in its conduct of this war, the Borden Government has been actuated by the desire to do the best that Canada could possibly do, and by a desire to prevent any grafting or exorbitant profits. They have given ample evidence of that in the past, day after day, and month after month; and

the attacks which have been made by one or two hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, especially by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), are not to the credit of these gentlemen. It has been shown that these attacks were made recklessly, and without that due regard for the truth which ought to characterize the remarks of these hon. gentlemen, and of every other hon. gentleman in this House. I am quite confident that, when the proper time arrives, the people of this country will mete out to these hon. gentlemen the condemnation which they richly deserve.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) informed us that he had been asked to address a recruiting meeting in St. James Methodist church, Montreal. I am sure that the hon. member for Rouville has advertised that so thoroughly himself throughout the country that he will not object to a reference to it by myself. He should be very grateful to the Methodist church in general, and to St. James Methodist church in Montreal in particular for giving him the splendid opportunity of letting the world know his breadth of vision, how broad and loyal he is and how fearless. He told us that he addressed that meeting and that he was enabled to say that all churches should be recruiting tents. A so-called religious paper took him to task for making such a statement as that. I commend the hon. member for Rouville for his splendid courage, for we must suppose that he exhibited courage. He spoke himself as though he had, anyway. But I want to tell the hon. member for Rouville that in the province of Ontario we wonder at him mentioning the thing at all, because in Ontario every Protestant church since this war started has been thrown open as a recruiting tent, and every Protestant minister in Ontario—I do not speak for the other provinces, but I suppose it is the same—has been in the forefront of all movements for advancing the cause of Great Britain in connection with this war, as we would wish to see it, whether in connection with recruiting, getting money for patriotic funds, or for relief funds, or in connection with other such movements, and, to their honour be it said, that they have taken a very active part in this respect. The hon. member for Rouville, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) quoted some very noble utterances of certain of the higher clergy of their church. I have no fault to find with that; it is quite proper that they should take pride in their church and in what their church is saying, but if we were to quote the splendid and noble words which have fallen from the lips of Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians and members of other denominations in this country, I am afraid we would spend several days and take up needlessly a great many pages of Hansard. It is true that religious denominations will be judged in this war to a certain extent by what the adherents of these denominations have done in the way of recruiting; and it is true that a great deal of consideration will be given to the remarks of bishops, archbishops, and clergymen in general at the heads of these churches. That is as it should be. We expect, not only the clergy of the Protestant denominations, but we expect the priests of the Roman Catholic faith, and we expect the Pope himself, the head of that great body, to be on our side in this war. Why it is necessary to call particular attention to their utterances I fail to see inasmuch as certainly no person has made any charge to the contrary. No person has charged them with lack of loyalty or of zeal in this House or, as far as I have heard, in the country.

But after all, the men who are most deserving of our praise and admiration are not really the bishops and clergy who have expressed noble sentiments in Canada, but they are the hundreds of Roman Catholic priests and Protestant clergymen who today are sharing the trials and dangers of the men in the trenches in Flanders. They are the men to whom I take off my hat every time, and I ask not what denomination they belong to, but I pay them the highest tribute that it is possible to pay those men for their heroic self-sacrifice.

The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred briefly to conscription. He quoted from a paper published on the other side of the line to show that some of those Americans, who had come into the Northwest in hundreds of thousands, had, since this war started, gone back to the United States, and the right hon. gentleman deplored that. The only thing I have to say in regard to that is, "good riddance." If they left this country because they were afraid that they would have to fight for the country in which they lived and went back to the United States, I say: good riddance, let them go and stay away. This country has not lost

very much if they go there and stay there. The leader of the Opposition uttered this sentence which caught my eye: The only complete victory which has been won during this war has been won by the British navy. I think that statement is literally and absolutely correct. This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the British navy has been a guarantee of the liberties of the people of Europe. It is not the first time that the British navy has prevented some powerful European monarch from realizing his ambitious ends. Phillip of Spain, Louis XIV of France, and Napoleon, all were checked in their ambitions by the navy of Britain, and, as in the days gone by, the task is forced upon Britain to-day of preventing a tyrant from grinding democracy beneath the iron heel of militarism.

The fate of the democracies of the world rests upon the British sea power. It is not England alone whose existence is at stake. I make that statement because once in a while we hear some person say that this is "England's war." This is not England's war any more than it is Canada's war. It is not only the freedom and rights of the people of the British Islands, or of the British Empire, that is at stake, but it is the freedom and rights of the democracies of the world. When the curtain falls on the last act of this great war, it will disclose the faces,—the joyful faces—of those who are sure of their freedom; or it will disclose the solemn and sad faces of people who have been bereft of everything they hold most dear.

This is not merely a fight of England against Germany; it is a fight for supremacy between two irreconcilable principles—democracy on the one hand, as represented by England and France, and autocracy, or militarism, on the other hand, as represented by Germany and her allies. It is a struggle for freedom against slavery, and against a slavery worse than that which bound the negro to his master. This is a struggle to maintain democratic rights and true Christian principles against a country which has accepted the teachings of Treitsche and Bernhardi as being more infallible than the teachings of Christ, and which deifies and worships naval and military power as the most sublime of all religions. If it had not been for the British navy, France would, long ere this, have been crushed, Russia's power would have been broken, and the British Empire would have been shattered. The British fleet has swept the seas clear of German merchant vessels and has driven the German war vessels behind their line of forts for safety. It has adequately protected ten billion dollars of Empire trade and $160,000,000,000 of Empire wealth; it has kept free from invasion, over 14,000,000 square miles of British territory and it has kept free of fire and sword the homes of over 400,000,000 people within the British Empire.

The British navy has preserved Canadian homes from destruction, Canadian women from outrage, and Canadian children from mutilation. Canadian commerce has been safeguarded, and Canadian liberty guaranteed by the British navy, which has been assisted by Australia, by New Zealand, by Newfoundland, and by all the overseas dominions except Canada. The fault or blame for the fact that Canada has not also assisted that navy lies not with men on this side of the House, but with hon. gentlemen opposite, and their servile and subservient Senate across the way. It has been said that Canada's first line of defence is in Flanders, but Sir, Canada's last line of defence, Canada's bulwark, Canada's guarantee, is that mighty, silent, ever-watchful fleet in the North Sea, which hon. gentlemen opposite refused us the right to strengthen and make more effective. Those are the facts, and no one in this House can refute them. But these facts do not appeal to all men in this country. This protection of Canada's rights and of Canadian women and children does not appeal to the callous heart of Bourassa and Lavergne. It stirs their blackened blood to no quicker beat. Loyalty is not an abstract principle like truth, or honesty or charity; it depends upon the ideal, the motives by which one is actuated. The British idea of loyalty, for instance, forced King John to sign Magna Charta, took the head off Charles I, and replaced James II with William and Mary. The people of the United States in 1776 considered loyalty a crime and disloyalty the greatest of virtues. So it seems that loyalty is a virtue or a vice according to circumstance, and that a man may be a rebel or a patriot according as he backs a winning or a losing cause. But, by whatever standard you judge Bourassa and Lavergne there is nothing that can be said in their defence. The right hon. leader of the Opposition had occasion to refer to them in his speech the other day. While he did not mention them by name, I think he unquestionably was alluding to these men. He said:

> There has been a minority which has always protested against our attitude, and that minority

is the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, who took the position from the start that it was a crime for the Canadian people to participate in this war. Not only did they use that strong language, but again and again in the Nationalist press they have asserted, and still assert, that we have taken our present position simply because we are subject to the imperious dictation of the British authorities.

Further on he says, and I wish to place his words on Hansard:

There may be and often is servility to a master; there may be and there is servility to passion and prejudice. And if to-day there is servility anywhere it is not with those who have taken the attitude which we have maintained, and will maintain in this House, but it is with those who, blinded by passion and prejudice, would deny us the liberty of being humane and generous, would deny us the liberty of following the instincts and promptings of our minds, and our hearts, and our consciences; would deny us the liberty, when we see France threatened with dismantlement, when we see Belgium actually under the foot of the conqueror, of helping in the defence of France and of Belgium. It is not because they hate France, it is not because they hate Belgium, but because we cannot in this way help France or help Belgium without at the same time helping England. Sir, the case of France and the case of Belgium is the case of England. The case of England is the case of Belgium and France. Away with such sophistry. It is nothing but an attempt to conceal the hatred of empty minds. But, that is not all. These men also tell us that we may be fighting for an idea, as they say, and we may be fighting for the fate of the Empire, as they say, but that Canada has no direct or material interest in this war. And, every day we read in their press that if Germany were to triumph it would be of no material injury to Canada, that Canada would remain just in the position that Canada is in to-day.

Coming from a man who for fifteen years was prime minister of this country, a man from the province of Quebec, and who for practically his whole life has been the leader of a great party in this country, those words of his should give serious thought to every one of us in this House. He has made charges which are stronger than any that have ever been made against any party or sect in this country. A few years ago, I ventured to say from my place in this House that I believed there was ample evidence from the utterances of certain so-called leaders of the province of Quebec, to believe that there was in that province an anti-British or anti-Imperial sentiment, and I was taken very severely to task for that statement. I did not charge them, nor do I charge now, nor have I ever charged, the mass of the people of Québec with being disloyal. I made that as clear as words could make it, but I did charge that there were certain men who had assumed the positions of leaders in that province who had been guilty of disloyal utterances and of taking a course which was inimical not only to the best interests of the people of the province of Quebec, but to the best interests of the country as a whole. Within a few months after I made that statement a by-election took place in the province of Quebec and the Government candidate was defeated. When the House met again a bitter discussion took place between members on both sides of the House from the province of Quebec, and if I had wanted any corroboration of the charges I had made in the previous session, I got that corroboration from gentlemen on both sides of the House. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, who was then in the House, hurled charges against men on the opposite side of the House, accusing them of using disloyal language throughout the province of Quebec. Gentlemen on this side of the House charged the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite with using disloyal language, and quoted from their speeches in proof of it. When these hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House got through, one thing at least was clear; and that was that in the province of Quebec there was a certain number of men who thought that the best way to win an election in that province was to pound England and everything British, that the worse the things they said about England and everything British the more likely they were to get votes. But nothing that has been said in former sessions compares in severity with the language used by the right hon. leader of the Opposition the other day in regard to what are called the Nationalists in the province of Quebec, and I commend the right hon. gentleman for speaking out so openly in regard to these so-called leaders of a party. The right hon. gentleman stated—and he is a man whose words ought to receive more attention than mine, and that is why I quote them—that from day to day the Nationalist press in the province of Quebec is making use of language that is a disgrace to the press in general, and to the province of Quebec in particular. and, Sir, when a paper makes use of such disgraceful and disloyal language it should be suppressed. I take it that the duty of suppressing it falls upon the Postmaster General, although I may not be correct in that regard. I presume he has carefully looked over Le Devoir, which, I believe, is the most offending paper; and if what is

stated in regard to that paper is true, or if only a small portion of it is true, then it is the duty of the Postmaster General to suppress that paper. If it is right to deny the use of the mails of this country to certain publications from the other side of the line because they are pro-German, and I say it is right; then it cannot be right to allow the publication in our own country of language which should not be used here, particularly at this time. Before suppressing any paper the Postmaster General should consider the matter very carefully. We must be tolerant and very careful in taking action against any paper; but we are engaged in a struggle at the present time when every man is required, and if there is being published in the province of Quebec or elsewhere in this country, papers which tend to prevent the recruiting of that accumulation of men on which the very life of this country and this Empire may depend, then even while we may run the risk of being regarded as intolerant, there is a time when tolerance becomes cowardice.

I have not very much to say in regard to Mr. Bourassa. I would not mention his name at all were it not for the fact that at one time he occupied a seat in this House as a follower of the right hon. gentleman who at present leads the Opposition.

Mr. PARDEE: How was he last time?

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I was not in as close touch with him as the hon. member was, and I could not say, but I think there is pretty good evidence that he will be shaking hands with hon. gentlemen opposite in the next election.

Mr. MICHAUD: How do you like him now when he is supporting your party?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not aware that he is supporting our party. On the contrary, it seems to me that his opposition has been very pronounced against our party. He has done everything a man can possibly do against the successful conduct of this war. How, the hon. gentleman can draw on his imagination to such an extent to say that this man is a supporter of the present Government, I cannot understand.

Mr. LAMARCHE: He will probably have a seat in this House in the next Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: It may be that the gentleman to whom I refer will have a seat in this House in the next Parliament, but if that is the case, it will remain as an everlasting blot and disgrace on the constituency that gives him that seat in the next Parliament.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. GAUVREAU: He will not be any worse than the ministers you have got on your side now.

Mr. EDWARDS: Apparently supporters of this gentleman to whom I refer are not confined to this side of the House. My hon. friend across the way seems quite warm in his regard for this man who has published treason from one end of the country to the other.

There is another man to whom I wish to refer, who bears the name of
10 p.m. Armand Lavergne, and I would not refer to him, were it not for the fact that he had a seat in this House behind the present leader of the Opposition of whom he was a supporter. All that I have to say in regard to that gentleman is this: he holds, I understand, the rank of colonel in the militia of Canada, and I want to say, speaking for myself alone, that I regard it as a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada that a man of the stamp of Armand Lavergne should be allowed to retain his rank in the militia of Canada. I regard it not only as a disgrace to Canada, but as a distinct insult to every man who wears the King's uniform to-day, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, neither the gentlemen on this side of the House who apparently support Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne, nor the gentlemen on the other side whether they agree with me in that statement or not; but I am confident that most of the people of this country agree with me, and I would be very sorry to think that most of the people of the province of Quebec did not agree with me, because I have talked with many people from that province who, to their eternal credit be it said, resent the conduct and language of these two men just as strongly as I do. Mr. Armand Lavergne's uniform should be taken from him; he should not be allowed to disgrace it. No man should be allowed to wear the King's uniform who uses the language that he has used. He has stood up in the legislature of the province of Quebec and defied his King and country. That is a disgrace to this country; it should not be tolerated in this country, and I ask the Government why it is tolerated. Why is he allowed to wear his uniform?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Ask your minister.

Mr. EDWARDS: The only reason that I have thus far heard is this: Oh, if you take the uniform away from him, it is just what he wants; he wants to make a martyr of himself. Again I will express my

opinion—I am not presuming to express an opinion for others—that that excuse is nothing more nor less than an excuse of political cowardice. If he wants to be made a martyr of, then he should be made a martyr of. At all events he should not be allowed to disgrace the uniform which he has disgraced while holding the rank of colonel.

Although only a humble member on the Government side of the House, I will make this suggestion to the Government, that they open up negotiations with Germany through the mediation of the United States or China or some other neutral nations for an exchange. Let them propose to give Bourassa and Lavergne in exchange for Dr. Béland, and let them throw in one or two of the senators over the way, notably Senator Choquette. They can make the proposition to Germany.

But I tell you, Sir, that if the proposition were made in all seriousness to Germany to give Lavergne and Bourassa, with Choquette thrown in, in exchange for Dr. Béland, Germany, bad as she is, vile as she is, would indignantly refuse; because if there is one thing that Germany detests more than another, it is treachery to the country in which a man lives.

I wish to refer to some remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in his speech in this debate. The hon. gentleman quoted some words of Edward Blake. They were not the words of Edward Blake in regard to the unrestricted reciprocity campaign of 1891, but they had reference to another matter. The words quoted were to the effect that a majority in dealing with a minority should give measure full, heaped up and running over—that is the measure to be given by the strong to the weak. And the hon. member for Rouville, commenting on these words says "May we not expect that there will arise another Blake to protect the Ontario minority?" I fully endorse those words of Edward Blake, but I want to tell the hon. member for Rouville that there is no necessity for an Edward Blake in Ontario for the purpose indicated by him. If there is any portion of the people of Ontario who need some person to champion their cause it is not the minority but the majority.

The hon. member for Rouville on several occasions has referred somewhat sneeringly, or slightingly—perhaps "slightingly" is better than "sneeringly," not so harsh at least—to the Orangemen of this country. I want to say to the hon. member for Rouville that a gentleman who has occupied the position he has occupied in this country should be above such things. And I want to remind him of this fact—that there went in the first contingent from Valcartier more Orangemen than have been enlisted up to date in the province of Quebec, outside the city of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX Does the hon. gentleman refer to anything in my speech in this debate, or what expression of mine concerning Orangemen is it to which he refers?

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not quote the words of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where did I speak in that way about the Orangemen? Where did I say anything about them at all?

Mr. EDWARDS: On many occasions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let the hon. gentleman cite one.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, it was not a use of the word "Orangeman," but the other day, referring to events which took place in England on the 15th of July, when asked with regard to the date by a gentleman near him, the hon. gentleman turned, and with a queer smile, said: The Fifteenth of July, not the Twelfth of July.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that all?

Mr. EDWARDS: That is all in that particular case, but there are other cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are none. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) has stated that I have on several occasions referred in a sneering way to the Orangemen. I declare to the House that I never made any reference to the Orangemen either from my place in this House or elsewhere in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: After that declaration on the part of the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) I think it is the duty of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to accept the explanation.

Mr. EDWARDS: I cheerfully accept the hon. gentleman's explanation. I do not just know what reason he had for saying, "not the Twelfth of July" in the way he did. I have not at present under my hand words that he has used on former occasions, therefore I accept his statement.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You will never find them.

Mr. EDWARDS: We will see about that later on. At all events, in view of the statements that have been made in various parts of the country, I think I may be excused for pointing out that one-quarter of the recruits who went overseas with the first contingent from Valcartier were members of the Orange order, and, further, the members of that order, not only through their lodges, but in many other ways, have contributed funds and have been the means of raising funds for the relief of the Belgians and other good purposes; that thousands of them are to-day in Flanders fighting, and many of them have already laid down their lives fighting on behalf of a people whose religion is not their own.

There is another remark of the right hon. leader of the Opposition to which I wish to refer, a remark to the effect that in the matter of participation in the wars of the Empire there was a distinct line of cleavage between himself and the present Prime Minister. I am very sorry that the right hon. leader of the Opposition reiterated that statement of former years; I am sorry that he still thinks it politically advisable to occupy an equivocal position as regards the future of this country and its participation in the destinies of the Empire. I cannot refrain from asking if "the goal of independence" to which he has sometimes referred is still his great aspiration. What does he mean when he says that there is a great line of cleavage between himself and the Prime Minister in regard to Canada's participation in the wars of the Empire? If his words have any meaning they presuppose that Great Britain, or the Empire, may be engaged in a life and death struggle about something of which Canada might not approve. The minor troubles of Great Britain would not affect Canada, as the right hon. gentleman knows. If our assistance was required it could only be in some trouble which might pull the Empire down, and whether we wished it or not, Canada would stand or fall by the result.

The right hon. gentleman made it clear that his policy is still the policy of semi-detachment. There can be no other meaning to the words he has used. He would ask Parliament for its judgment in regard to our participation in any war in which the Empire might be engaged. What position would the right hon. gentleman be in if, in an emergency such as we have at present, he had behind him men like Bourassa and Lavergne who would, unquestionably, if they did as they have been doing outside of this House, do all they could to delay and prevent any measure which he might bring down providing for participation. Suppose he had in this House such men as Myers, Farrer, Goldwin Smith, and others, who formed the Continental Union Association in 1892, the object of which was to bring about continental union, union between Canada and the United States. If he had such men as those who were in this country in 1892, an association whose representatives in the province of Quebec as the firm of Mercier, Gouin, and Lemieux, carrying on that particular propaganda at that time, writing across the line to moneyed men there, as the head of that firm did, for funds to assist him in carrying on that work, I think he would find himself in very serious difficulty in carrying out the ideas to which he has given expression. Therefore, I say, that in this matter of cleavage between the right hon. leader of the Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I range myself alongside of the Premier who has given us to understand what his position is in regard to the Empire. I quote the words of the Prime Minister: :

> So long as Canada remains in the Empire, Canada is at war when the Empire is at war. So long as the English flag floats above Canada, Canada is at war when that flag is attacked. The moment a shot is fired or a blow is struck at that flag, Canada is at war with the nation or country which fires that shot or strikes that blow.

That is the position taken by the Prime Minister of this country, and I have only to say that if there is a line of cleavage, which I very greatly regret, I want it to be understood on which side of the line I stand. I believe our destiny is inseparably connected with the Mother Country, that if we are to work out what is in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada this country must remain a part of the British Empire.

I believe I am expressing the sentiments of the people of this country when I say that they are prepared in the future to throw in their lot and stand or fall with the Mother Country. It means a lot more to be a Canadian to-day than it did a year and a half ago, because of the position that Canada has taken in this war. All classes of the country have done their part well.

I want, in conclusion, to place in Hansard a few figures. I find that the male citizens of Canada between the ages of 18 and 45, as shown by the last census returns in

each province, and the enlistments up to December 31 from each province, were as follows:

	Eligible 18 to 45.	Enlisted to Dec. 31.	per cent.
Ontario..	565,397	81,752	14
Quebec	380,827	24,257	6
Maritime provinces...	178,497	20,765	11
Manitoba & Saskatchewan. ..	275,577	38,955	13
British Columbia	153,978	21,703	13
Alberta...	120,264	20,136	16
	1,674,540	207,568	

In this table it is assumed that all males between the ages mentioned are eligible for military service, which, of course, is an exaggeration, because we have to take into account the foreign element, and the mentally or physically defective. But the figures and the percentages I have given tell their own story. I was very glad, indeed, to hear the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) assure this House, as he did in his speech the other day, that within a very few months, when the people of his province were thoroughly educated as to the needs and requirements of this war, at once there would be a very much larger enlistment from that province than we have had up to the present time. I believe that is correct, and I want to say that we should give very careful consideration, before expressing very strong adverse criticism, of rural conditions, especially rural conditions in the eastern provinces. For instance, in Ontario, and in fact all of the eastern provinces except Quebec, the rural population is very much smaller now than it was ten years ago, and the addition in the province of Quebec is so very slight that we might almost say there has been no gain in the rural parts of that province. The only gains have been in the western provinces. In my own county, for instance, the population in 1911, as shown by the census, was 2,800 less than it was ten years before. There had been a loss in every township in my county, excepting one. To show you how this works out, I know, for instance, of one very small municipality so far as population goes, very rough country, where the land is very much broken. I know that at the present time eighteen men who were born in that municipality are enrolled, not one of whom enlisted from that municipality. They had joined the migration to the West, and every one of those men enlisted from the West. This should be taken into consideration when we are sizing up the matter of enlistment throughout the country. I wish to say this also, in defence of the rural municipalities. In my own province, and I think the same thing will apply also in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, this migration to the Northwest and to the cities means that, at the present time, the farmers of our rural districts are exceedingly short handed. To take, for instance, the figures showing enlistment from such and such a rural municipality, and to come to the conclusion from those figures that the county or township was not as loyal as it should be, would be to make a very grave error. Again, it is quite true that in the rural districts the people have not the same opportunities of becoming posted regarding the war as the people in the cities and towns, who every day pass to and fro along the streets, read the bulletins, and hear the war discussed. I was glad, therefore to hear the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) say that in the province of Quebec, which, according to the figures available, has not recruited in the same proportion as the other provinces, the heart of the people was with Britain and France in this war. That, I firmly believe, and endorse. I am very glad to concur in his statement that when the people in the outlying districts, who have not the same opportunities of being posted as the people in the cities and towns, become aware of what this war really means to this country, they will flock to the standard just as the men from the cities and towns have done. There is no question, and cannot be any question, as to their bravery. Those who have gone from Quebec have demonstrated their bravery on the battlefields in Flanders just as much as those who have gone from Manitoba, Alberta, Ontario, or any other part of the country. There has been no distinction, there can be no distinction, as regards creed or race, in that respect. We have nothing to be ashamed of in the record which has been made by the men who have gone to the front, no matter what church or race they belong to; as a Canadian, I am proud indeed of that record. I never felt so much right to be proud of being a Canadian as I do to-day.

Now, Sir, I just want to say a word or two regarding the Royal Military College, and I will ask your permission to place on Hansard a list of names without reading it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Will you allow me a question before you pass from that subject? Will the hon. gentleman send a copy of his speech to the newspapers in Ontario which are all the time attacking the French-Canadians in reference to the war?

Mr. EDWARDS: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman pays me the compliment of thinking that my feeble remarks would have some effect upon those newspapers? If so, and he gives me a list of the newspapers, I will be pleased to send them copies.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You have been fair enough to Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will also undertake to send copies to the papers in Quebec if he will give me a list of them. I cannot be fairer than that. I have no apologies to make for what I have said; the words I have uttered are my own. Many hon. members in this House may not feel like endorsing what I have said; I cannot help that. They have every right to their views, and I have a right to mine; and so long as I occupy a place in this House or on this terrestrial sphere, I intend to express my own views, and in that respect I do not think I am unlike many other hon. gentlemen in this House.

Last session I put on record a list of the students at the Royal Military College who had enlisted for war service, and I may be excused if I place on Hansard another list, because the Royal Military College happens to be situated in the county of Frontenac, which I represent, though its students are drawn from all parts of the Dominion. I am sure no one will object to my placing such a list on record.

2nd List.

Royal Military College of Canada.

Nominal roll of gentlemen cadets who have been granted Commissions between the period 1st January to 31st December, 1915.

Imperial Army (22).

Name and Regiment.

George Lennox Kezar, Royal Engineers.
George Duncan McTaggart, Royal Engineers.
James Reginald Stratton, Royal Engineers.
Donaldson Lizars Savage, Royal Engineers.
Reginald Gilbert Godson, Royal Engineers.
James Hargrave Drummond Ross, Royal Filed Artillery.
John Albon Chestnut, Royal Field Artillery.
Claude Ashburn McMurtry, Royal Field Artillery.
Eric Hutchinson McCall, Royal Field Artillery.
William Davenport Brown, Royal Filed Artillery.
Grainger Stewart Grant, Royal Field Artillery.
John Charles Hope, Royal Field Artillery.
Mainwaring Cato Ensor Sharp, Cavalry.
Colin Macpherson Dobell, Infantry.
John Bucan Freeland, Infantry.
William Edward Harper Talbot, Indian Army.
Herbert Vero Shaw Page, Indian Army.
Arthur Stanford Matthewman, Indian Army.
Gerald Beverly Matthewman, Indian Army.
Gordon Reed, Army Service Corps.
William Wallace Turnbull, Army Service Corps.
George Copland Temple Hadrill, Army Service Corps.

Canadian Permanent Force (39).

Name and Regiment.

William Fraser Hadley, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Lindsay Drummond, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Edson Louis Millard Burns, Royal Canadian Engineers.
William Wallace Davis, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Charles Edgar Tench, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Charles Ramsey Stirling Stein, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Terence St. George Maunsell, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Richard Forrest Angus, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Matthew Howard Somers Penhale, Royal Canadian Artillery.
John Carl Murchie, Royal Canadian Engineers.
Ellice Alan Mackenzie, Royal Canadian Artillery.
George Power Morrison, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Herbert Downing Fripp, Royal Canadian Artillery.
William Errol Boyd Starr, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Horace Wilfred Beck, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Carden Cousens Thackray, Royal Canadian Artillery.
William Carson Thackray, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Alan Armand Magann, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Hugh Hutchinson Lawson, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Robert Wallace Leslie, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Edward Lionel Dodwell, Royal Canadian Artillery.
George Arnold McCarter, Royal Canadian Artillery.
William Stewart Hogg, Royal Canadian Artillery.
Donald Stodart Gwyn, Royal Canadian Dragoons.
Geoffrey Crosier Hilliard, Royal Canadian Dragoons.
Morris Hayne Austin Drury, Royal Canadian Dragoons.
James Kennedy Cassels, Royal Canadian Dragoons.
John McCreary Elliott, Lord Strathcona Horse.
Thomas Clemes Stewart, Lord Strathcona Horse.
Leonard Alfred Welsh, Lord Strathcona Horse.
Stansfield Tunstall Blaiklock, Lord Strathcona Horse.
James Parr Clinton Atwood, Lord Strathcona Horse.

Joseph Alfred Pope, Royal Canadian Regiment.
William Wyvyan Winter, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps.
George Egerton Stuart McLeod, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps.
Hubert Everton Hughes, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps.
Frederick George Farncomb, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps.
Donald Forbes Angus, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps.
Richard Nesbit Cyril Bishop, Canadian Ordnance Corps.

Canadian Overseas Contingent (26).

Name and Regiment.

Douglas Caparn Greey, Canadian Field Artillery.
Gordon Seymour Reade, Canadian Field Artillery.
James Murray Hazen, Canadian Field Artillery.
Miles Beresford Hamilton, Canadian Field Artillery.
Cyril Keith Aylen, Canadian Field Artillery.
Daniel Lionel Teed, Canadian Field Artillery.
Francis William Morris, Canadian Field Artillery.
Harold Percival Smith, Canadian Field Artillery.
John Leonard Whitney Harris, Canadian Field Artillery.
Elliott Dudley Stinson Thompson, Canadian Field Artillery.
Donald Graham Robertson, Canadian Field Artillery.
Frederick Garth Morse, Canadian Field Artillery.
Leslie Kirk Greene, Cavalry.
Hollis Hume Blake, Cavalry.
Eric Ian Henry Ings, Cavalry.
Donald Edward Allen Rispen, Infantry.
Ian Robert Reekie Macnaughton, Infantry.
Dongall Athony Kittermaster, Infantry.
William Geoffrey Hoffman Wurtele, Infantry.
George Alexander Strubbe, Infantry.
James Arthur Murphy, Infantry.
Francis Irving Carpenter, Infantry.
Herbert Lee Holland, Infantry.
Wilfred Heighington, Infantry.
Percival Elliott Biggar, Canadian Army Service Corps.
Hugh Joseph Ryan, Canadian Army Service Corps.

Grand total, 87.

The list I placed on record last year was for 1914; that which I place on record now is for 1915. Colonel C. N. Perreau, the acting Commandant of the college, writes me:

> Every cadet here at present is taking a commission in the near future, so you see the fine spirit is still flourishing as much as ever.

The students of the Royal Military College have brought very great credit to that institution and to all parts of the Dominion, inasmuch as they come from all parts of Canada. In 1914 the number of commissions taken in the Imperial army by the gentlemen cadets of the college was 50; in 1915 it was 22. In the Canadian Permanent Forces 29 commissions were taken in 1914, and 39 in 1915. In the Canadian Overseas contingents, 24 commissions were taken in 1914 and 26 in 1915; or a total in 1914 of 103, and in 1915 of 87; or a grand total of 190. These figures represent the totals for a period of 16 months, and the percentage of cadets taking commissions for that period works out at 98 per cent of those available. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a record of which this country may well be proud, for I repeat that these students are drawn from every province in the Dominion. They have brought honour to every province, and their record at the front is certainly one of which we may well be proud.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, in this debate. I am very sorry indeed if any words of mine in regard to the two men to whom I referred have hurt the feelings of any person in this House. If it had not been for the fact that they occupied at one time seats in this House, that they are unquestionably prominent men in the country to-day, and men to whom the right hon. leader of the Opposition gives credit for having at least some influence, or who are trying to exert some influence in their province, I would not have referred to them at all. But I am impressed by the fact that this is a time when every nerve and sinew of the Empire is being strained, when we are up against a crisis which means either liberty or slavery; that this is a testing time for our country, not only for the men who have been recruited from the various parts of the country, but for the men who have been placed by the people in the positions which we occupy to-day. It is our business as public men to draw lessons and inferences from what we see happening around us, so that we can take our stand as public men and express our disapproval of language of an unpatriotic or disloyal character uttered in any part of this country, no matter by whom the words are uttered.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I hope that I shall be very brief in the remarks which I have to offer to the House. My hon. friend from Frontenac has made some very strong statements, with some of which, I must say, I fully agree. The burden of his speech had to do more or less with a certain group in the province of Quebec known as the Nationalist party. We were told by the hon. member that the leaders of that party—Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne—at one time had seats in this Parliament and were followers of the right hon. gentleman.

who now leads the Opposition in this House. He stopped there, however. He did not tell us where these gentlemen had been located since the summer of 1908, who their leader was, and where they were attempting to carry this country. May I remind the hon. member for Frontenac and this House that, somewhere around 1908, these men transferred partially, if not totally, their allegiance from my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to the right hon. gentleman who is now the Premier of this country. The first indication I had personally of the transference of that allegiance was during the Drummond-Arthabaska campaign. If evidences are wanting, there are many to be found in the general campaign of 1911, because these two gentlemen went up and down the province of Quebec and supported to the full the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government and the party who are behind him in this House. May I be permitted to recall something more to the House which the hon. member for Frontenac forgot—I hope not willingly or purposely—that both of these gentlemen have made the boast that when the Prime Minister was forming his Government in 1911 they were offered portfolios in the Cabinet. I have not seen the assertion of either of these gentlemen contradicted, either by the Prime Minister, or by any gentleman authoritatively for him.

Mr. BURNHAM: The Prime Minister contradicted it absolutely.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, nothing of the kind.

Mr. CARROLL: I want to say that my hon. friend in the corner (Mr. Burnham) is absolutely wrong. He had a splendid opportunity only four or five days ago in this House to contradict that statement, because, the day before he rose in his place to reply to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lavergne proclaimed to the province of Quebec, to the Dominion of Canada, to the world, that the Premier of this country had offered him a portfolio.

Mr. ROGERS: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) is incorrect in his statement. I do not believe that Mr. Lavergne ever made the statement that my hon. friend credits him with.

Mr. CARROLL: There are people in this country who can read and there are people who can understand as well as the Minister of Public Works can. I submit that if Mr. Lavergne was wrong in the statement he made in the Legislature of Quebec, a few days before the Prime Minister made his last announcement in this House, it was the duty of the Prime Minister to contradict that statement.

Mr. BURNHAM: I say that the Prime Minister did contradict it.

Mr. CARROLL: My hon. friend does bob up very often. Where and when did the Prime Minister contradict the statement of Mr. Lavergne?

Mr. BURNHAM: Some months ago.

Mr. CARROLL: Where?

Mr. BURNHAM: It ill-becomes the Prime Minister to run around contradicting all the little brats in the country, but, he has contradicted this.

Mr. CARROLL: Where?

Mr. BURNHAM: In the press.

Mr. CARROLL: In what press?

Mr. BURNHAM: I cannot tell that exactly.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. gentleman cannot tell me in what paper that has appeared, nor can he tell me when. I read the papers of this country just as intelligently as the hon. member for Peterborough—I admire him in a good many ways and he knows it—and I have yet to see, and I believe there is no man in this House who has seen, where the Premier contradicted that statement. If there was a time, and if there was a place, where the right hon. the Prime Minister should have made that contradiction, it was in his speech on the floor of this House some three or four days ago. I am not finding fault at present in this connection with Mr. Lavergne or Mr. Bourassa although I do not see eye to eye with them. The hon. member for Frontenac has left the House, but I would like to say that there are other things he did not tell us. Does he remember the other evening, when my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was making his speech, that he read a resolution which was moved in the provincial Legislature of Quebec a few years ago protesting against Canada taking any part in the Empire's war, and is he aware of the fact that the seconder of that resolution, and a gentleman who made a very strong speech in the legislature in favour of it, now occupies the portfolio in this Cabinet of Minister of Inland Revenue? These are some of the things that the hon. member for Frontenac failed to tell this

House in regard to the political history and traditions of Lavergne and Bourassa.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was he called to the Cabinet after he made that speech?

Mr. CARROLL: He was called to the Cabinet a few months ago and this speech was delivered two years ago. It was moved by a gentleman who has since passed away, and seconded by the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Patenaude). My hon. friend from Frontenac is perfectly right no doubt, in calling upon the powers that be to strip this man, Armand Lavergne, of the King's uniform. I agree with him in that to a certain extent. When we have a man in Canada who will stand up in a public place, especially in one of our legislatures, and say that Canada should not participate in this war, above all wars, and that we have no right or authority to participate in it, and when that man happens to wear the King's uniform, the uniform of a colonel in the Canadian militia, I believe there should be some steps taken to remove his name from the roll of Canadian colonels and also to strip him of his uniform. Who gave Mr. Armand Lavergne the name of colonel? Was it one of those nasty, disreputable, disloyal Liberals? No, Mr. Speaker, I understand that Mr. Armand Lavergne was appointed a colonel in the Canadian militia by the present hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). I understand that he was offered a command some time ago by the same gentleman. Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Armand Lavergne has gone up and down this country uttering loud protestations against Canada going into this war, notwithstanding the fact that he has gone up and down the province of Quebec since the year 1909 hurling loud and vicious abuse against British institutions, the Minister of Militia, in this loyal Government, has decorated him as a Canadian colonel and offered him a command to go overseas.

These are some of the things that the hon. member for Frontenac did not tell in connection with the propaganda of these two gentlemen in Quebec. He did not tell us some things that he might have told us. But he tried to insinuate in various ways, although he was rather broadminded in the winding up of his speech, that there were men on this side of the House, including our revered leader, who were not just as loyal to the cause as he considered himself to be and he mentioned some words of our leader in connection with his speech the other day. But is it not one of the ironies of fate that the only persons who hope and believe that this man whom he was speaking about—(Bourassa)—will take a seat in this House in the next Parliament, are the friends of the hon. member for Frontenac. It would seem to me that if there are any adherents of Bourassa and Lavergne in this House, they have seats on the other side.

Many of the followers of Bourassa and Lavergne have been gathered to the bosoms of their fathers, or, should I say, to the bosoms of their friends, and the friends to whose bosoms they have been taken are the friends of the hon. member for Frontenac.

I do not find fault with them for that. I am glad to see them converted, even if it brings them within the Conservative fold. So much for the Nationalists, Bourassa and Lavergne.

I am one of those who believe that the manhood and womanhood of Canada have their hearts in this struggle, hoping and praying for the success of the allied arms. The other day the Postmaster General made a very nice and loyal speech in this House, but it struck me that it contained an apologetic note for the French race in this country. As the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has said, I believe the heart of Quebec is sound in this cause. I do not make that statement because of anything that has transpired in this war. As a student of Canadian history, I am bound to say that the French people of this country have time and again given every indication, every proof, if proof were needed, that their hearts are British, that they love the British flag, British traditions, British institutions, and the justice they get under the Union Jack. If proof were necessary, I should only have to turn back the pages of history to the American Revolution. In those days a standing offer was made to the French people along the St. Lawrence in the province of Quebec to join the American revolutionists. The French people spurned that offer. They remained true to the British flag, under which they have received more freedom than they could ever get under the flag of old France. If further proof were necessary, I could recall the other wars in which Canada has been engaged. I might refer to the war of 1812. Where, during that war, could you find throughout the length and breadth of Canada men more loyal to the cause of Britain than those French people who inhabited the banks of the St. Lawrence, Quebec. It is unneces-

sary for me to mention any names or regiments. I am not here championing the cause of Quebec, or apologizing for the French-Canadian people; for they need no apologists.

It is not necessary to prove that they are loyal either to this war or in any other. Their hearts are sound, as are the hearts of all English-speaking Canadians, and they are for the cause of the Allies and will stay with that cause. And people of all creeds, people of all denominations, and of all classes in this country are giving and will give this Government every reason to believe that it will get all the support that is necessary in so far as Canada's participation in this world war is concerned.

I admit freely that this Government is doing well as regards recruiting in this country. They are doing well because the hearts of young and old Canadians are with the Government in sending overseas every available man and every man who will be necessary in order to win this war. Canadians, young and old, are with this Government in voting every cent and every dollar which is necessary for this purpose. While that is a fact, I deem it the duty of this Opposition to find fault with the Government if they think the Government has erred, or made mistakes in judgment, or anything else. I do not believe in abusing, or in criticising from personal motives, any hon. gentleman who occupies a portfolio in this Government, but I do say, in all sincerity, as a man who represents one of the largest constituencies of working men in this country, that it is incumbent on hon. members of this House, whether they sit behind the Premier, or behind the leader of the Opposition, to criticise where criticism is necessary. We are engaged in a world struggle. We are engaged in a war that has caused more devastation in the few months it has been going on than any other war in history. We are engaged in a struggle the end of which no man knows, and in which every available man and every available dollar may have to be used to bring it to a successful completion. That being the case, I say that we should conserve in all possible ways not only the health of the recruits we are sending overseas and those stationed in Canada, but every possible dollar as well; and we should see that every dollar that is voted in this House finds its way into the proper channel. If members of the Opposition have reason to believe that the people's money is being diverted from the proper channels, if they believe that some of the $150,000,000 which this Parliament voted in the last two sessions is not being properly expended, if they believe they have some proof that the Government of this country is placing the expenditure of money in the hands of improper parties, if they believe that this money which was voted for the war is being given to contractors as rewards for political allegiance, then I say it is the duty of this Opposition to criticise and bring this state of affars to the attention of Parliament and the country.

In the course of his speech the other day the Solicitor General dealt somewhat severely with members on this side of the House who dared to rise in their place and say that the Shell Committee in this country had in their opinion done wrong, that certain of its transactions would not stand the light of day, and who demanded an investigation into its dealings. I take it that the Shell Committee spent the money which they had in their hands honestly or dishonestly, whether the money belonged to the Imperial Government or, as was pointed out by the Minister of Finance the other day, to the Government of this country. If the shell Committee spent that money honestly, what fear has this Government of an investigation into the transactions of the Committee? If the Government does not wish the Shell Committee to be investigated, am I to believe that that committee spent the money dishonestly?

Hon. gentlemen opposite have protested loud and long against the charges which have been made against the Shell Committee. If the Government has no connection with the Shell Committee, if the Shell Committee is not responsible to this Government, not being its creature, if the committee was not bound to report to the Minister of Militia holding a portfolio in this Government, why then does the Government attempt to defend them? On the other hand, I think it has been fully demonstrated that the Shell Committee—I am not speaking of the Imperial Munitions Commission which is at present doing business in this country—was appointed by a member of this Government; that three of its members are in the Militia Department and representing that department, and that before the Imperial authorities knew there was such a thing as the Canadian Shell Committee, one of the members of that

committee went over to England in order to show to the English people what we were capable of doing in this country. If my hon. friend the Solicitor General is right in his contention that the Shell Committee has done no wrong, it is a fair proposition for the Government to show to Parliament and to the country that this committee is all right. But what are the facts? Hon. gentlemen opposite protest loud and long that the Shell Committee has been honest in its administration of public funds. Last year charges were made by hon. members on this side of the House alleging that there was corruption and jobbery in connection with military purchases in this country. Then we heard protestations of honesty as loud and as long from the hon. gentlemen opposite who were interested, shall I say, in those transactions, as we hear to-day. The Government appointed an investigating committee, and the men who made those charges followed them up in the Public Accounts Committee. I do not want to be personal nor to mention the name of any man who had a seat in this House and who was unfortunate enough not to know to the full what his duties were as a member of this House, but hon. members know the result. Now, to-day is it or is it not the duty of this Government to investigate the charges that have been made? I do not say they are true; but, surely, hon. gentlemen who not only occupy prominent positions in the Liberal party but who have occupied prominent positions in the government of this country, are not going to make charges in Parliament without having some foundation for them, and it is a duty that the Government owe to themselves to grant a commission, and to show either that the Shell Committee has handled its funds properly or that it has not done so, and if the members of that committee have not administered properly the public funds of this country and those of the Imperial authorities that were placed in their hands, then it is the duty of this Government to investigate further and to prosecute them if there was wrong doing—I do not care who the members of the Shell Committee were. I have not the proof that the Shell Committee did wrong nor that there was corruption or jobbery in connection with it, but it strikes me as strangely peculiar that after Mr. Thomas, representing Lloyd George, the Minister of Munitions, had come over to this country and had spent a few weeks here, the members of that committee were removed from office. If they were spending properly the money entrusted to them to spend for England and for Canada, why should they have been removed at that time? I hope, Sir, for the honour of Canada, for the honour of this Parliament, and for the honour of these gentlemen who occupy these positions in the Government of to-day, that an investigation will be granted. If there was no wrong doing, no harm is done; if there was wrong doing, it will be corrected and righted, and the people of this country will see that the public men on both sides of this House are willing to do right and not to shield the wrongdoer, be he Conservative or be he Liberal.

11 p.m.

I have said that this Government has done well in the matter of getting our young Canadians to join the standard and to go overseas to fight the battles of the Empire. If we take the words of the hon. Minister of Militia—and he should know—we have enlisted 250,000 men in this country to join the military forces of Great Britain; that 60,000 of those men are in or near the trenches in Flanders; that 60,000 are making preparations in England, and that the balance of 130,000 are in Canada training. A call has gone forth for an additional 250,000 men, making in all 500,000. I believe that our young Canadians will be recruited and that in less than a year that call for 500,000 men will be filled. Credit is due to the Government for having recruited these 250,000 men, and more credit will be given them if they succeed in recruiting the other 250,000 men. Let the Government be sure that they have the fullest co-operation of the Liberal party—at least of Liberals in the portion of the country from which I come, and that is the only part for which I desire to speak—in getting those recruits, as they have had ever since this war began. But while I am willing to make that statement, I am not willing to admit that the ministers of the Crown in this Government have done all that could be done in the matter of giving aid to the Mother Land and our Allies in this life and death struggle in which she is engaged. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) the other evening pointed out that all the other overseas dominions, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa had contributed to the military forces of England not only as many men proportionately as Canada had done, but that they had also contributed thousands upon thousands of their young and best manhood to fill up the gaps in the British navy. My hon. friend the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this evening commented on this fact, and by some curious device, by some

sort of devilish sophistry, may I say, or by some sort of magnificent logic, came to the conclusion that the fact that this country was not represented by young Canadians in the navy of Great Britain, was to be placed at the door of the Liberal party. Let us follow that up.

This Government had a policy in naval affairs a few years ago. It was a policy of contribution—they proposed to contribute $35,000,000 to build three dreadnoughts for Great Britain. But has any member of the Government or any of its supporters ever said that the Canadian people were to contribute men as well as money to that navy? Such a policy was never enunciated. But the Liberal policy—we need not go into that in detail at this time—was to contribute ships for home defence and to participate in the wars of the Empire when necessary. These were not to be empty ships, but were to be commanded, manned and maintained by young Canadians. What has the Government done to contribute to the naval defence of Canada since this war began? Much was said a few years ago about the Niobe and the Rainbow; they were described as a "tinpot navy" by hon. gentlemen of Conservative persuasion. There was on the statute book of this country an Act known as a Naval Service Act, commonly known as the Laurier Navy Act. That Act, contrary to the views expressed by hon. gentleman opposite and contrary to the policy propounded by this Government, is still on the statute book and is still in full force and effect. Under that Act we had when the war broke out, and had had for some time previously, two war ships, one on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic. Those ships were allowed to go into disuse and disrepair. But immediately on the outbreak of the war the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) undertook to put these ships into commission, and we had it from him last session, that these ships, the Rainbow and the Niobe, were doing splendid work in coastal defence and in the transportation of soldiers and supplies. I would like to ask the Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Hazen), if he was right last year in so expressing his opinion of the Niobe and the Rainbow, why it is that the Niobe is dismantled and lying idle to-day in Halifax harbour? Why has not the minister sent out a call to the men of our seacoasts to fill up the gaps that have been caused in the British navy? I think the answer is that members of the Cabinet and their supporters told us a few years ago in this House that we could not get any such recruits in this country, and they do not want to be given the lie. Because we can get such recruits in this country if we call for them. We can certainly get as many in Nova Scotia as were contributed by the little colony of Newfoundland; we can get as many on the Pacific coast as were contributed by Cape Colony in South Africa. But it was not the policy of these hon. gentlemen opposite, and they do not want it to be thought that they knew nothing of the temper of the people in Canada who go down to the sea in ships, whether for fishing or for other purposes, on the Atlantic seaboard or on the Pacific coast. Much discredit, I am sorry to say, might be thrown upon the hon. gentleman who has charge of naval affairs, but I am not going into that just now. In our part of the country the state of affairs is rather too disgraceful to be dwelt upon in this House. But when the Minister of the Naval Service brings down his estimates we shall have something to say with regard to the vessels he sent out from certain ports in Nova Scotia to do patrol service along our coast—motor boats from ten to fifteen feet long sent down to the island of Newfoundland at a cost to this country of some $75 a day, to scare off German invaders who might come across in their armoured ships or submarines. For the present, we will let that matter rest.

The Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) yesterday tried to make this House believe that his department was absolutely divorced, since the war began, from any political affiliation and would so remain during the war. Perhaps the hon. minister does not know all that is going on in his own department. He may be able, I will not say to mislead the House, but to make the House believe this, but he is certainly not going to make the people in the county and province from which I come believe it, for they have too much evidence to the contrary. I will submit that perhaps most of the plums in this crisis—if there are plums to give—under our system of Government would naturally go to the friends of the party in power—

Mr. BURNHAM: Not during war time.

Mr. CARROLL: —that is, when conditions are equal and the applicants on either side of politics are equally qualified to fill the positions—perhaps that will suit my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham). But when the Minister of Militia says that there are no

politics in the Department of Militia, I believe that every person in the province of Nova Scotia who reads that statement, both his own political friends and those who are not his political friends, will blush for very shame. They will smile at the ignorance—if I may be permitted that word —of the Minister of Militia in connection with the doings in his department. I do not say there were not some eminent acts of independence by the Minister of Militia. I do not say that some Grits did not find their way into commissions and into fairly good positions in the Militia; but what I do say that in the county from which I come the Militia Department is being used by the Conservative party as an addition to the party, as a caucus room, and that wherever recruiting stations are held in the county of Cape Breton there appears the agent of the Conservative candidate in that county. There was a time— I am glad to say it has gone by now—when recruits were not accepted in that county until they had received the imprimatur of certain Conservative politicians in that county.

Mr. ROGERS: Give us some names.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes, I shall give names. The Minister of Public Works is strong on names, I shall give him names. Mr. Speaker, there is in our town a gentleman named Wm. McKinley. The very first man who enlisted from that county, and who is now in the trenches in Flanders, and has been since the first Canadian expeditionary force went overseas, was the only son of this gentleman, Wm. McKinley. There is in the town of Glace Bay what is known as the Marconi tower. Around that tower, since the outbreak of war there have been congregated 120 or 150 of Canada's militia. This man, Wm. McKinley, had a contract for supplying the Canadian militia at Marconi tower in Glace Bay with certain refreshments, mineral waters, tobacco, cigars and cigarettes. For some time he supplied these as cheaply as any other man in the town of Glace Bay could. You will be surprised to know that within a few weeks the captain in charge at Marconi tower was approached by a gentleman who holds a lucrative position in the Customs Department at Glace Bay, and told that if he did not cease to purchase from Wm. McKinley he would hear more about it; with the result that Mr. Wm. McKinley, whose only son is fighting and has been fighting in the trenches of Flanders ever since the first Canadian expeditionary force went across, was deprived of that simple, small way of helping to earn a livelihood. Does the minister want some more names?

Mr. ROGERS: You have not answered me at all yet. My hon. friend perhaps misunderstood what he said himself. He said that applicants would not be accepted unless they were Conservatives.

Mr. CARROLL: If there is any way of misunderstanding, you would misunderstand.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. member made a statement and said he would prove it.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes, I have made a statement,and I can prove it to the full.

Mr. ROGERS: Give us some names?

Mr. CARROLL: If my hon. friend wishes names I will give them to him but I will not give them to him here.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I would like to get them now.

Mr. CARROLL: You will not. I may reply as the Minister of Militia replied to a question I asked yesterday. I asked for the regiment from Nova Scotia which was captained and officered wholly by Liberals. He said: I will give them personally, but they are not the same regiment to which my hon. friend belongs. I will make the same answer to my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson).

In the town of Louisburg there is also a Marconi cable station, and around this station there are 100 or 150 soldiers. That town is some 14 miles from Glace bay. It happens that the only men engaged in the meat business in Lewisburg are Liberals, Peters Bros., I think the name is. They wanted to sell meat to the soldiers but they could not sell to the militia because they were Liberals; and all the meat eaten by the Canadian militia at Louisburg is carried all the way from Glace bay, some 14 miles distant, and the contract was not obtained by tender. In every little house that was made for the accommodation of the soldiers in the town of Glace bay and the surrounding districts there was not a nail driven, not a door put up, by any man who was ever suspected of voting Liberal. Yet the Minister of Militia tells me there is no politics in his department! Perhaps the minister does not know it. I take this opportunity of bringing it to his attention and

telling him that it is time he did know it and that it is time this sort of thing was remedied. I believe that the Minister of Militia would remedy it, and that he is the kind of man who would abolish such methods if he knew the facts of the case.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is my hon. friend not aware that the contract for supplying the troops quartered in Sydney was awarded to a very staunch Liberal, and that all supplies of food, meat, etc., are supplied by that Liberal contractor?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not know that such is the fact; I do know that the very contrary is the fact.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I can assure him that it is a fact and I can give the name.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member does not know as much about Sydney as I do, and I want to assure him that that is not the case in Sydney or elsewhere in the riding of South Cape Breton.

I believe that those things should be remedied. I bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia also the case of a young man who has been a lieutenant in our county in the Canadian militia for some nine years. When war broke out he wanted to enlist, and desired, of course, to keep the rank to which he was entitled. Notwithstanding the fact that since the war broke out until, I think, October, at least fifty men from Cape Breton were given commissions (men who had never carried a gun or donned the uniform of a Canadian militia man), after having taken some course in Halifax, and perhaps they are good men, but this young man was unable to obtain a commission. Why? I do not know of any other reason except that he would not bow down to the Conservative nabob in politics in Glace Bay and go and make his application through him. Hundreds of such cases exist, but I hope the time has come when the Militia Department will do away with this method of doing business and use better judgment and tactics.

There will come a time when the present European conflict will be declared ended. There will come a time when this war of blood and murder will be followed by a treaty of peace, which we all hope will be as enduring as any human institution is enduring, and our loftiest hope and highest ambition is that the end will be satisfactory to the Allies, and in accordance with the principles for which we battle. But this will be followed by another war, not of blood, not of murder, but a war of commerce, a war to capture some, at least, of the business of the countries against which we are fighting, a war for commercial supremacy. Business will be diverted to new channels, the fields of trade which Germany and her allies have been exploiting will be opened to the allied countries. What preparation is Canada making, what is the Canadian Ministry doing, in order to capture some of this business? It is true that the time of many of the hon. gentlemen who occupy cabinet positions is taken up by the war, but surely the Minister of Labour, for example, who tells us, through the medium of his paper, that there is nothing to do in his department, that there are practically no strikes to settle, and no labour difficulties, can give some little time to a question of this kind. This trade will not be captured by the Government putting up high tariff walls around Canada north, south, east and west. I believe it will be captured by the country whose resources are best fitted for the work, by the people whose technical training has not been overlooked in this time of stress. In the past German supremacy in certain trades, and in the manufacture of certain goods was due to the fact that the national revenues had been abundantly used in the establishment and maintenance of technical institutes, trade schools, and other institutions whose chief object was to keep the national industries supplied with an army of skilled artisans. Other countries did the same to a lesser extent; England did the same, and so did the United States and Switzerland.

Some years ago there was appointed in this country a commission to investigate technical education. This commission did splendid work, they investigated the conditions, not only in this country, but in the United States and Europe as well. Some two years ago they made a very voluminous report recommending certain things. For one thing they recommended that this Government and this Parliament should spend some three or four million dollars annually in assisting technical education in this country. During the session of 1914, in answer to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) the Minister of Labour said in connection with what the Government intended to do with that report:

> The Government while having given the matter some consideration have not reached a conclusion as to what course we shall take and will not be in a position to reach such a con-

clusion until we have heard from all the local governments in Canada.

That was in 1914. In 1915, on page 494 of Hansard, I asked a question about technical education. The answer of the Minister of Labour was:

When the skies are clear we can make satisfactory arrangements with the provincial governments to render material assistance in respect to technical education.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that when the skies are clear, it may be too late in this country to give the required assistance to technical education. When the skies are dark is the time to prepare, and if we wish to capture some of the trade which comes from the hands of expert artisans and labourers, it is absolutely necessary that this Government should at the very earliest possible moment take up the question of technical education and contribute towards the training of expert artisans in the various provinces.

Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Labour replied to a question concerning the jurisdiction of this Parliament in that matter. I do not see how the question of jurisdiction affects the matter at all. The Provincial Legislatures have, of course, control of education in the various provinces, but let me point out that they also have control of agriculture. Two years ago this Government granted a sum of $10,000,000 to be spent in encouraging agriculture in the various provinces, and if they had jurisdiction to do that—and I think they had; there is no doubt about the matter—if they had jurisdiction to contribute that sum of $10,000,000 to be used in agricultural colleges and schools, which are maintained out of the provincial revenues, they have the same authority to contribute to technical colleges in the various provinces. I bring this matter in all seriousness to the attention of the Government. They may tell us that our revenue is not very buoyant owing to the war, that they have not very much money to spare because we are giving millions of dollars to the cause of the Empire. May I point out, however, that of the $150,000,000 that have been voted for the cause of the Empire, not one dollar comes from the ordinary revenues of the country. Surely, therefore, the Government must be in a position, and is in a position now, to give the required assistance to technical education.

Then there is the question of the report of the commission—I think it was also a creature of the Minister of Labour—which was appointed some three years ago, I think, or two years ago at least, to investigate the high cost of living in this country. Last year I asked the Minister of Labour:

Has the Commission on the High Cost of Living made a report?

Before giving the minister's answer I wish to say that the stress and strain and hunger which prevail to-day in Canada, owing to the high cost of living, are more severe than they have ever been since the war began, and if ever there was a time in the history of this country when the Government, or somebody else, should investigate and try to ameliorate the conditions of the labour people, as regards the high cost of living, it is to-day. What did the minister say? He said:

They promised me a couple of weeks ago that their report would be ready before the end of the month, I think it is about ready now, and I think my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen will find it a very able report, and a very satisfactory one, especially the work in connection with it, which was done in my department, and of which I am very proud.

That was over a year ago, and would it surprise the House to know that that report has not yet come down, that it is not even ready, notwithstanding the fact that if there is any department of this Government whose time is not occupied by the duties of this war it is the Department of Labour, controlled by the Minister of Play. Last year, when the people of British Columbia were shivering with fright at the possibility of German warships approaching the coast, our Minister of Naval Affairs and his department were concerned in issuing a pamphlet to the people of this country showing them how to cook fish properly. Perhaps the Minister of Labour and his department have been busy for the past year or so, trying to prove to the people of Canada that three of the fish which the Naval Department taught us to cook properly would be sufficient to feed forty people. I do not see what else they could have been doing during that time. I think it is time that the Minister of Labour should exert himself and do something in regard to the matter of technical education, and also in regard to the report on the high cost of living, which he promised a year ago.

Now, Sir, the hour is getting late, and in conclusion I wish to say that while there are some pessimists in this country, as there are in England, who believe that the war is not being properly carried on; while there are some pessimists in this country

who are afraid of every little obstacle that comes in the way of our armies, and think that they mean disaster and obliteration, I believe that the grand old Union Jack, which has floated over this country for well nigh two centuries, the flag which has "braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze," will continue when the final issue has been settled in this war to wave over not only this country, but a larger Empire for a thousand more years to come.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Friday, January 28, 1916.

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

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Thursday, January 27.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (East Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House farther than to make a protest in the name of the young men of the country, and, if I may so presume, of the people generally, against the conduct of the members of this House who are endeavouring to stir up party acerbity, party hatred, and all the contemptible politics which attach themselves to the prejudices of party politicians, especially at this time. I am shocked, Mr. Speaker, indeed, I am terrified, to find this House being turned into a political shambles. I do not purpose to excite further controversy by saying which side is to blame; I leave it to an impartial public to judge when they have understood thoroughly how this debate was begun, and how it has been carried on. Some time ago I noticed that there was gradually arising in the party press a feeling of disturbance which boded no good to this young country at this crisis in this historic struggle. For a time such papers as the Globe maintained their mental equilibrium. They protested against the idea of an election, and everybody that I know joined them in the hue and cry to stop those people who would sacrifice the well-being of the country for the spoils of office, or even the remote prospect of them.

Now, however, I find the scene is transformed. I came to this House filled with the ardour of the men from the country who have been working with their political foes, shoulder to shoulder, in a united spirit, harmonious, strong. We had forgotten the question of politics; we were not thinking of politics; we were thinking of conquering the Germans, of standing true to Canada and to Canadian manhood now sacrificing itself so nobly in the trenches. We find the women of Canada working might and main. They have dropped their tea-tattle gossip for a time; they have ceased to transport even with the charm of dress; they have got down, if I may use the phrase, to their knitting, and are working hard, night and day, for the purpose of providing comforts for the men at the front. Speaking more particularaly for my own constituents and the district I represent, I was amazed, charmed, delighted and elevated in spirit by the unanimity of feeling and of thought prevalent in that district. I was more than charmed to find, not that it was rent in twain, not that it was being disturbed, not that it was being poisoned, but that it was growing in strength and beauty from day to day. I had to come to Ottawa to learn that the whole business was a fraud. I had to come to this House to find that the poison which would destroy the life of this country was being distilled in this very Chamber. I turned in amazement to look at the record, and I found the noble words of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), which should have given the keynote to the whole discussion and the future conduct of the members of this House. In that short war session which followed the declaration of hostilities he said:

> This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed, to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the Mother Country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her. Speaking for those who sit around me, speaking for the wide constituencies which we represent in this House, I hasten to say that to all these measures we are prepared to give immediate assent. If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done, or should be differently done, we raise no question, we take no exception, we offer no criticism, and we

shall offer no criticism so long as there is danger at the front.

That statement thrilled Canada. It also assured to the Government the steady and honest support, as one might reasonably suppose, of the Opposition. But whatever has got into them I am sure I do not know. It seems all to have turned to poison, and now even the journals at large are attacking the individual members of this House. Even the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), a man who, I believe, devotes himself heart and soul with a single mind to the advancement of this country, is treated like a common felon. On February 8, 1915, we find in Hansard these remarakable words of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition:

> Let me say at once that we who sit on this side of the House, and who represent His Majesty's loyal Opposition, took our course at the outset of hostilities when we declared that we would support the Government in their war policy.

Then, a little farther on:

> But whilst we are prepared to believe, as indeed we do believe, that mistakes have been made in the manner in which the money has been expended, that errors of judgment have been committed, of those mistakes and of those errors of judgment we are not disposed to be critical.
>
> It would be hardly possible to expect that in the case of the expenditures of some fifty million dollars no mistakes would arise; it is perhaps more than we can expect from human nature; but we cannot close our eyes to the fact that not only have mistakes been made, but frauds have been committed which have resulted in injury to the health of our troops, and impairment of their efficiency. These frauds have been regarded as so gross and so criminal that the Minister of Militia himself, not more than two or three weeks ago, stated, not once but three or four times at different places in the country, that if he knew the man who supplied the boots, which have been the cause of so much disease, and sickness, and suffering to our soldiers on the Plains of Salisbury, that man would deserve to be shot. The honour of the minister is at stake, and so is the credit of the country. It is not impossible to discover the responsible parties. Up to the present the minister is responsible, and it is for him to take the necessary measures to vindicate himself. We have been told that a commission of three members has been appointed by the Government to investigate this particular matter, and not later than ten or twelve days ago it was stated that the minister himself, not satisfied with this inquiry, had instituted a departmental investigation to ascertain the true facts. I do not know if this is all that is intended to be done by the Government; but let me say that the fullest light should be thrown upon this matter, so that the people of Canada may know where the responsibility lies. No member on this side of the House intends to be critical, and for my part I certainly have no such intention; but assuredly we are all gravely concerned that the health and comfort of those brave men who are risking their lives in the cause of the Empire shall have every protection that we can afford.

We have there the very best keynote to the proper conduct of an Opposition, or, indeed, to the conduct of the people of this country in general. But we have witnessed, during this past week, an extraordinary transformation. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), skilful and serene as he is, has not hesitated to lay a train that would destroy the Government by a terrible explosion if he could so arrange it. He has been followed by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), who in turn has marshalled all the vitriolic sarcasm and invective he could possibly think of, and has blown it, like the German gas, at the Government side, in order, if possible, to asphyxiate them before they could arise in in their own defence. Then, we have a Daniel come to judgment in the person of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), who, with all due respect, Sir, did himself little credit in an hour's speech that really would not have done credit to a child in the nursery. I listened patiently for one solitary noble thought, and really it was an extraordinary performance when you think of it. He said:

> I realize that in rising in my turn to address the House I am taking a great responsibility, although that responsibility may not be of my seeking.

Who, then, is responsible? Certainly he did not sound as if he were at all responsible. But when I quote his words I ask: Who, then, is to be considered responsible? The leader of the Opposition had turned in his seat and was listening to him and looking at him with amazement. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman contrived to say things that in no way could be considered as decent, let alone conciliatory.

> But I do charge,—

he says,

> —in the presence of the Prime Minister, who is a Nova Scotian of whom we are proud, that in the county of Halifax, where I hold him responsible for the patronage, the vilest sort of partisans are put at the head of battalions, in the highest positions that they can be given.

No proof is offered, and what time, pray, is this for proof? Is this not a debate on the Address in reply to the gracious speech from the Throne? Every suggestion is connected with an investigation. Who has denied that there may be an investigation? Who has pretended that he will set aside the rules of the House and that whatever

may be done, or may have been done, shall not be referred to the committees that are constituted for the purpose of investigating? Nobody. Not a single soul has said: If there are frauds or shortcomings, if there has been misspent money, the thing shall not be investigated. That is not denied at all. No one pretends for a moment that these things will not be investigated. The cold fact is that for some reason, that used to be occult but that is no longer so, the Opposition are bound to get this stuff before the country. What their purpose is the country is beginning to divine; and the Lord help them when the country gets hold of them! Then this Daniel come to judgment says further on:

But the government of which he is a member,—

He refers to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), a man who surely has borne the burden and heat of the day, a man who has been able to gather together nearly 250,000 Canadians who hardly knew the meaning of war before, who has despatched them to the front, who has provided them with such materials of war that, come what may, bad as some of it may have been, they nevertheless have been able with it to do themselves and the Empire the greatest possible credit. Is there, in these speeches, one word of commendation from beginning to end? None. These gentlemen are not large-hearted enough to give a member of the Government credit for one single good act. Are we to understand that all that has been done is as nothing, and that some little trifling charge, which may or may not be true, and which yet, in the words of the leader of the Opposition, may, in the weakness of human nature, be to some extent true, is to be a ground for condemnation? Is it possible that the Minister of Militia and Defence, that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), that the balance-wheel of this Dominion, the right hon. Prime Minister himself (Sir Robert Borden) are not to be given any credit whatever? It seems almost as if jealousy, envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness have taken possession of the back benches of the Opposition to the exclusion of the last ray of common sense or pity. You will not find throughout the country any such spirit. Why, then, pray, should it be found here? I am terrified that the people in the constituencies, thinking that some colossal crime has been committed by the Government, may turn their attention, not to the things of war, to which they are devoting their thoughts at the present time, but against each other, and that Canada will be irretrievably ruined. If this ruin should befall her, who is there who will deny that the cause will lie at the door of a recreant Opposition?

But the Government of which he is a member,—

says the hon. member for North Cape Breton, referring to the Minister of Militia—

himself and the whole outfit,—

That is a patriotic reference, surely!

—if I may use the expression, will learn, not many days hence, that there is a people in this country and that it is the people that speak.

Why these promiscuous and repeated threats of an appeal to the people? For what purpose are we to be threatened with an election in the very midst of a war which gives no sign of a settlement, and which will strain our resources and energies to their utmost? This conduct is without parallel on this earth. In no other country will you meet people so utterly devoid of patriotism as to seek to make political party capital at the expense of the good name of their country. A little further on this gentleman says:

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I was going to put to you, in the form of a few questions, certain propositions that came before the Minister of Militia and Defence in regard to the running of his department. After he had received the warning which I read a moment ago he was asked by his party heelers: "Can we send the soldiers to the trenches with improperly made shoes, practically with paper shoes, and with bare feet?" The answer was: "So far as the department is concerned, yes if you can make money out of it, and can conceal it, I have no objection."

What could have induced any respectable man to utter such a sentiment as that in this House of Commons of Canada, where he is supposed to represent a portion of the people? Throughout what may, perhaps, in a spirit of extravagance, be dignified as that speech, we find the same thing from beginning to end. Not a word of commendation or a word of credit, but everything that is calculated to infuriate the Government side of the House and have the effect, if possible, of turning this House into a seething cauldron of riot and discontent, to be paralleled possibly only by the naval debate of a few years ago, when the people at large got the idea that we had suddenly turned this House into a raving lunatic asylum.

I wish to warn these gentlemen. The Grain Growers' Guide says:

> There are too many men in the front rank of the Liberal party of Canada to-day who have absolutely no conception of the true principles of liberalism and democracy.

For once I agree with a western man. Again, I find in glaring type on the front page of the Citizen this morning, "Election talk being revived." My heart sinks within me.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not wonder.

Mr. BURNHAM: Of course, you do not wonder, being like-minded with the rest. There is nothing surprising to hon. gentlemen opposite in the fact of election talk being revived, for they all expected it; but it is a surprise to the Government side of the House, and it certainly is to me. It is most deplorable. If there is one thing likely to minimize the value of our energies at this time in the carrying on of the war, it is the reviving of election talk. In the Free Press the other day I saw another complimentary reference to the Conservative party. It said, speaking of the caucus:

> The consensus of opinion on this point was that, while it might not look well to refuse an investigation, still if an investigation were allowed by the Committee on Public Accounts there might be disclosures which would be even more injurious to the interest of the Government.

There is your malicious innuendo. There is a lie in cold type. No one of us ever said or thought of any such thing. The truer spirit, to be found in the better part of the Opposition, is contained in the speech of the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) last night. He was trying to work himself up into a becoming fury, but he could not do it. His heart is too honest to vibrate responsively to any such appeal as is being made. He said:

> Now, to-day is it or is it not the duty of this Government to investigate the charges that have been made? I do not say they are true.

All the diatribes of the gentlemen about him had failed to convince him that there was a particle of truth in these charges, and I am sure I do not wonder at that. Further on he says:

> I hope, Sir, for the honour of Canada, for the honour of this Parliament, and for the honour of these gentlemen who occupy these positions in the Government of to-day, that an investigation will be granted. If there was no wrong-doing, no harm is done; if there was wrong-doing, it will be corrected and righted, and the people of this country will see that the public men on both sides of this House are willing to do right and not shield the wrong-doer, be he Conservative or be he Liberal.

Are we to understand that on such a flimsy excuse as this hon. gentlemen would hurry us in Canada to the brink of civil war? Would any man with a clear sense of duty presume to say that he was not committing a crime, let alone a wrong, in seeking to inflame the members of this House and the peole of this country? Whether there is anything in these charges or not, hon. gentlemen opposite want the Government to promise that the charges will be investigated before the extension measures come up. It is hardly likely that the Government will do such a thing as that, because if the life of Parliament is not extended they could not carry out such a promise; but if the term is extended they can and must, and certainly will do it. It is therefore the duty of the hon. gentlemen opposite to vote for the extension measure first, and after that will come the realization of their hopes. For my part I would be quite content to allow a few choice spirits of the Opposition to remain here for the rest of the year if they want to, taking note of all the graft, of which I regret to say my countrymen are sometimes capable. Let us agree on some margin of depravity. Let the margin be whatever you like, as the leader of the Opposition has said, but for God's sake let us set our faces towards the rising sun some time, and let us not always be turning our backs on every bright prospect, in order to glory in the ruin and depravity of our country. It is not that spirit which actuated the men who went to the front. They went there trusting we were fair and square and honourable men, who might be left to garrison this country and look after the base of supplies. They had no idea that the little game of politics was being played, and that on the very first measure, so to speak, brought before the House, there would be a prolonged debate of the most acrimonious kind. Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite say, in the words of their leader, that whatever faults or frauds may be committed they will suspend judgment till the proper time. Now is not the proper time to fight this matter out. Why do gentlemen opposite not lend us a hand? I do not say that the Government is infallible: they may have made mistakes: but I have yet to find any minister condoning in the slightest degree fraud or anything of that kind, or refusing to give any official record

and every explanation of any record asked for. I believe in my heart that this Government is absolutely honest. I am not prepared to say why, because I do not care to dig into the motives of any man. But, whether it be from a natural impulse or from necessity, I believe that it is absolutely honest and that everything done on its part has been correct. What representative of a constituency will say that he has not had some narrow escapes from even the rascals in his own party? What representative of a constituency can say that some of the things he has had to do or to leave undone might possibly require invidious explanations, if not worse, were it not for the fact that it is not within the power of men sometimes, limited as they are by the usages, the regulations, the customs of Parliament and parliamentary procedure, to rectify those wrongs? They have to grin and bear in silence, and thank fortune that they are not successfully pilloried in the outcome. But no margin or allowance is made for all that. Condemn "the whole outfit." A man who at one time I understood occupied a position on the bench of this country condemns this Government at the very height of this crisis as an "outfit," and he is not ashamed to use the word.

I want to warn hon. gentlemen against the very serious damage which they are doing to recruiting. When men go out and speak heart to heart with their countrymen upon the necessity of going to war, when they may be met by the statement: "You are a lot of political sinners; you are a lot of political rascals; the Opposition at Ottawa say so"—what hope is there for that union in which is strength? What hope is there for the carrying out of the magnificent scheme conceived and managed by the Minister of Militia? There is a danger in all this that is so imminent and so great that sometimes I feel as if it would be impossible for me to describe it. There is not this danger in Great Britain or in Australasia. The people of Australasia are bearing their burdens and some grievous disappointments with a dignity and a patience which do them so much honour that not only do we admire, but we wonder; and when we turn our gaze back upon Canada and find that we are at the mercy of a lot of political tricksters bawling for an election, really it makes my heart sick. The impression of all this upon recruiting will be bad; throwing the apple of discord amongst the people of Canada will be worse; but the impression made upon our enemies will be a thousand times more detrimental to us. Instead of a united and cheering House of Commons, ignoring the shortcomings, the depravities, if you like, of the members of the Government, we have men sulking in their tents who cannot find it in their hearts to force their tongues to utter one syllable of commendation. A boast was once made of a truce. Why, the truce has been torn to pieces long since. It was evidently initiated and concocted only as a pretense, and it has barely served that purpose. It has long since been thrown to one side. Has a member of the Opposition uttered the word "truce" this session? Not one. Truculent they are, but as for a truce, hon. gentlemen opposite do not want one.

The other evening, in listening to some of the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, which made me for a time low-spirited at the prospect before me of a disunited and a frenzied Canada, I thought, "can there be something else that is disturbing these gentlemen? Is it that the prohibition resolution is bothering them and they want to get to the country to avoid it for fear they may lose Quebec and irritate Ontario? And yet I said to myself, cold water could not have that effect. Possibly there may be prospects in that regard." But I will not transgress; I will stick rigidly to my text; I will not throw one particle of suspicion on the Opposition; I will not insinuate nor use innuendoes; if I have anything to say about the Opposition I will say it as straight and as clear as I know how. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot accuse me of doing otherwise. Last night the debate, if it may be so designated, ran into all sorts of channels, into the little byways, the eddies, up the little streamlets and into the foul waters. Amongst other things, the Prime Minister was charged with having agreed to give Mr. Armand Lavergne and Mr. Bourassa positions in the cabinet. These gentlemen opposite have pointed with pride, and reasonably so, to the success of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in harmonizing the discordant elements in Canada. Why should no credit be given to the present Prime Minister of Canada for gathering in Jew and Gentile, bond and free, Nationalist and Liberal, and anything else, and blending them into one harmonious whole? We read in the Scriptures that the stone that was once rejected has become the very greatest in the building. Repentance never should convict. There is no Nationalist in the Conservative party. If any man was a Nationalist at any time before he entered the Conservative party, when he entered that Conservative door he

left all Nationalism behind him. There is not one of them who does not deny that he is a Nationalist; they all say that they are Conservatives. Then I say: give the Prime Minister that which is his due, which you would certainly ascribe to the right hon. leader of the Opposition; give him credit that he has, with an iron hand, with a strong, firm grasp, with a dignity and a gentleness which blend so well, taken the erratic elements of our population and spanked them properly into line, put them where they belong, and where they are turning out to be some of our best citizens. When we have had another term of office, possibly there will not be a single Nationalist left in Quebec. Even the wildest and most disloyal of them will find that in the Conservative party there is not only strength and reason, but that patriotism which is an unction and a holy oil to all reasonable souls.

On December 4, 1912, in the session of 1912-13, the following question was put by Mr. Lemieux and answered by the Prime Minister:

Mr. Lemieux: 1. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister aware of the statement made by Mr. Armand Lavergne, ex-M.P., at a meeting held in the county of Quebec on the 1st of November ult., and reported as follows in the Montreal Star of November 2, 1912:

"Then Mr. Lavergne proceeded with his version of how the French-Canadian members of the Cabinet had been selected by the new Premier after his victory of last fall.

"The first names proposed," Mr. Lavergne said, "were those of Messrs. Monk, Tellier and myself. I declined this offer of a portfolio in the Cabinet, and at Mr. Pelletier's request, I did my best to make Mr. Monk accept him in my place. He objected at first. Mr. Forget at the same time was working in favour of Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, but I refused to agree to that choice.

"It seemed understood then with the Premier and Mr. Monk that Mr. Pelletier would be the Quebec representative in the Cabinet. Later I learned that Mr. Borden's intentions were to have only two French-Canadian ministers in his Government, and it was at this juncture that I went to Montreal on a special train, paid for by Mr. Cahan, to impress Mr. Borden with the necessity of following the tradition, giving three Franch-Canadian representatives in the federal Cabinet, which point we finally gained."

2. Is the above statement true?

Mr. Borden:

1. No.

On the same day the following question was put and answered by the Prime Minister, as reported at page 589 of Hansard of 1912:

Mr. Lemieux:

1. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister aware of a statement by Mr. Armand Lavergne, ex-M.P., at a meeting held in the county of Quebec of the 1st of November ult., and reported as follows in the Montreal Star of November 2, 1912:

"Mr. Lavergne made the affirmation that before entering the Conservative government Mr. Monk had received the assurance from Mr. Borden that a plebiscite would be taken before any kind of contribution to the British navy should be decided upon. The Prime Minister also promised his colleague that the Government would do something, Mr. Lavergne did not say what, for the Catholics of Manitoba and Keewatin. It was because Mr. Borden failed to carry out these pledges that the Hon. Mr. Monk sent him his resignation."

2. Is the above statement true?

Mr. Borden: No.

I trust, therefore, that those who created the little scene last night, trying at a late hour—it was half-past eleven—to cast on the Prime Minister in his absence the odium of having given way to Bourassa and Lavergne, will now repent it and acknowledge that when I said these statements had been contradicted by the Prime Minister, I was right.

Other questions were asked in connection with this matter and were answered, but it is unnecessary to go over these also; I have given only those that arose in the debate. I saw in the newspapers a short time ago what was, possibly, a reprint of these things, though I took it to be a report of an interview with the Prime Minister. But it is unnecessary to quote that; the questions and answers quoted from Hansard are sufficient. And I am glad indeed—if there is still anybody who doubts the stand taken by the Prime Minister—that this question has arisen, because the matter is so easily, so completely and, I may say so, opportunely, settled.

In conclusion, let me once more appeal to these gentlemen. If this agitation is for an election, say so and in God's name let us go to it and work it out before the country is ruined; if it is not for an election, drop it, and let us do what we can for the men at the front.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) opened his address with very strong words, but those words were fully justified by the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) last night. I have no fault to find with the tone of the remarks of my hon. friend from West Peterborough. Strong as those remarks were at times, they were certainly a great improvement on those of the hon. member for Frontenac. I hope to refer in a later part of my ad-

dress to some statements which the hon. member for West Peterborough has made.

I do not think I should have taken part in this debate, had it not been for one or two remarks made by my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) in the very able speech he delivered in this House on the 18th January. Some parts of that speech ought not to be left unanswered, and this duty is made still more imperative by editorials which have been published in the leading Conservative organ of the city and district of Quebec which is supposed to reflect the ideas and opinions of the Postmaster General. Those editorials threaten the members of this House and the electors of Canada with an immediate dissolution of this Parliament and a general election unless we, the representatives of the people, agree to sit still and content ourselves with registering the wishes of my hon. friend and of the Administration. To this I do not intend to submit, and never shall. The policy of the rulers of the country during a great national crisis is not their private property, and the people are entitled to discuss it and judge those who are responsible for it.

With that part of the speech from the Throne relating to the effective participation of Canada in the great war which Great Britain and her Allies are now waging, I heartily agree. All the measures that can be necessary to sustain the honour of Canada and protect the most sacred interests of our country, should be taken. It seems to me, however, that the figure of 500,000 men is rather large and will be very difficult to reach, though I would not like to use the language of the Toronto Saturday Night and say that it is a "somewhat hysterical figure."

With regard to the financial requirements, under the circumstances, our duty, difficult as it may appear, is to grant all the money that is asked for by those who are entrusted with the responsibility of national defence; but we must require, as we have done before, a proper, effective and honest use of the sums placed at their disposal. We owe that to our countrymen who have left their farms, offices and shops in answer to the call of the Government and the country. It is our duty to see that they are provided with the best military training, with the best military organization, with the best military equipment; and we should not be fulfilling our duty, were we to agree to a general conspiracy of silence and refuse to expose wrong-doing or to investigate the acts and omissions of those who are responsible to this Parliament for the military operations of the country. I believe that the interests of the Canadian people must be placed over and above the tranquility of the Government. Our share in the present conflict we must accept not only with a high sense of duty, but in a generous and cheerful spirit. It was said last week in the other Chamber, as an argument against our making further and larger sacrifices to help the Mother Country in this war, that Great Britain was somewhat responsible for the war, and was to be blamed for not having declared herself earlier in favour of the Allies. Quite naturally, those words were severely criticised, and Conservative newspapers like the Toronto News and the Toronto Telegram have tried to throw the responsibility of Senator Choquette's speech on the Liberal party. But Senator Choquette has always been opposed to the policy of the Liberal party with regard to naval defence and the participation of Canada in any war undertaken by the Empire. In 1911, his speech in the Canadian Senate against such a policy was circulated and distributed in every home in the constituency of Kamouraska, which I represent, and which is a part of the division which my hon. friend Senator Choquette represents in the Senate; and the Conservative party paid for that circulation. Sir, nothing could be more at variance with the facts than the statements of my hon. friend Senator Choquette, which I have mentioned. It is true that the British statesmen endeavoured strenuously to avoid a conflict and to preserve the peace of Europe. To the very last Sir Edward Grey tried everything that might call a halt. As late as July 31, 1914, Sir Edward Grey suggested to Germany that the four outside powers should unite in suggesting to Austria that they would undertake to see that she obtain a full satisfaction in her demands upon Serbia, provided that these demands would not impair Serbia's sovereignty and the integrity of Serbia's territory. Under date of August 1, he wrote to the German Ambassador as follows:

> I fully believe that it might be possible to secure peace if only a little respite in time can be gained before any great power begins war.

On July 30, Sir Edward Grey replied to the proposition from the German Government that England should remain neutral, under the condition that Germany should not annex any of the territory of continental France. I shall quote only the last part of that reply—and I commend these words

to the attention and admiration of the Canadian people, and more especiallly the people of my own province:

> It would be a disgrace for us to make this bargain with Germany at the expense of France—a disgrace from which the good name of this country would never recover.

On August 2, war broke out between Germany and France. On August 3, the German troops invaded Belgium, in defiance of the protests of the Belgian Government. The British Ambassador then demanded his passports, and on August 4, war was formally declared between Great Britain and Germany. In the face of these facts, how can any hon. gentleman say that Britain should be held responsible in any degree for this horrible war?

When, on July 30, it became apparent that France could not avoid a conflict with Germany, many people in my own province, especially those who could remember the dark and painful days of 1870, were watching with anxiety what Great Britain would do. During these days of expectation feelings of uneasiness were expressed in many quarters. Would England stand aside and let Germany crush Belgium and invade France? Finally, all efforts towards the securing of peace having failed, the voice of Britain was heard on the side of right and justice against might and tyranny. A feeling of relief was experienced everywhere; enthusiasm replaced anxiety, and from that day, Mr. Speaker, I have favoured and supported all measures that would help the Mother Country in this war. I have supported them as a national duty and as a profound expression of gratitude. I believe that if England had refused to declare herself in favour of the Allies and to unite her efforts with those of Belgium, France and Russia, many of

4 p.m.

those who now criticise our participation in the war would have raised indignant voices against the attitude of Great Britain.

I claim that under the circumstances, notwithstanding what has been said elsewhere, the province of Quebec has done her duty. Her people have contributed their full share, and they are still willing to contribute their full share. But there is a certain subject upon which I must speak frankly—though I should not like to hurt anybody's feelings. Our people resent very deeply the aspersions and the insulting remarks of a certain press. The hon. member for Frontenac, whom nobody in this country will accuse of being too broadminded, and who seems to be unable to deliver a speech in this House without directing a few mild and tender words to the unfortunate province of Quebec, was more prudent in his remarks yesterday, although there were some insinuations which he could not help indulging in. Certain articles which have appeared in Ontario newspapers have been a far greater obstacle to recruiting in Quebec than all the speeches of the gentlemen who are denounced and branded as traitors by the same press. Let those Ontario journalists apply themselves to their own shortcomings. I believe—and I am glad to see that my opinion is shared by such a newspaper as the Ottawa Citizen—that the field for reform in their own province is wide enough to require all their activity and to satisfy their eagerness to work for the common good. I do not object to some people having a very high estimate of themselves—there have been such people since the days of the Pharisees; but I protest against the unjust, inaccurate and odious comparisons which they are trying to make. Again I repeat that those charges and insinuations in the Tory press of Ontario have hindered the work of recruiting in Quebec to a far greater extent than all the speeches of the Nationalists who are opposed to Canada's participation in this war.

Having referred to the Nationalists, allow me to make a few comments on an incident which occurred recently. The people of this country have been aroused by certain words uttered by Mr. Armand Lavergne in the Legislature of Quebec. Only yesterday I read an article in a newspaper which demanded that poor Lavergne be court-martialled and shot with the least possible delay. I think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) went almost that far last night. Well, I am not here to defend Mr. Lavergne. His words should have been left unsaid, and it is to be regretted that in this Dominion such statements should have been made. But, Sir, to those who have been so highly scandalized over this matter, let me recall that, unfortunately, similar and even worse statements were made only four years ago by certain hon. gentlemen who were friends and associates of Mr. Lavergne, and who were subsequently rewarded by the present Administration. Some are occupying the highest positions at the disposal of the Government, in the judiciary and elsewhere, and at least two of them are on the Treasury benches,

members of the Government which is entrusted with the sacred duty of supervising the participation of Canada in this war. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the financial means for the carrying on of their nefarious campaign were supplied, and as my hon. friends from Quebec on this side of the House know only too well, abundantly supplied, from the treasury of the ultra-loyal party in Ontario. I have a right to say these things. You are assailing the Nationalists who are outside of the House; I wish to include in the reprobation those who are inside, and those who are members of the Government. Here let me state to the credit of my province that she did her duty nobly in spite of that violent and demagogic campaign. In spite of the money provided by the Tory loyalists of Ontario, she elected thirty-eight Liberal members, pledged to stand up in this Parliament and vote for a Canadian navy and for the voluntary acceptance by Canada of her share of the burden in time of danger, whenever the Mother Country should be called upon to fight for the rights of the oppressed and the liberties of the world.

The right hon. leader of the Government has called to his councils some of the leaders of the Nationalists. Mr. Lavergne has even stated that he was invited to accept a portfolio. Let me remark in answer to my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that the statement which Mr. Lavergne has made time and again is that he was offered a portfolio, not by the Prime Minister, but by the late Mr. Monk. That was the statement he made when the regretted Mr. Monk was not alive, and it has never been contradicted. We have had successively in the Government Messrs. Pelletier, Nantel, Coderre, and the present Secretary of State (Mr. Blondin), and the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Patenaude). Would you like to know, Mr. Speaker, what the relations of those gentlemen were with Mr. Lavergne? I will take the words of the most prominent of them, the former Postmaster General of this country, and for a time, too long a time, the high executioner of the Government. Here are the words he uttered at St. Gregoire on the 18th of September, 1911. I quote them from L'Evenement, the great Conservative journal of the city of Quebec. In order to be more accurate, I will read them first in French, and then translate them into English:

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Le peuple vous aime Lavergne, parce que vous l'avez aimé. Bourassa et vous avez écrit une page unique dans l'histoire de notre pays. Je me suis présenté parce que j'avais l'appui de M. Armand Lavergne, et le 21 septembre vous aurez à chanter la victoire de Pelletier et Lavergne....

The people love you, Lavergne, because you have loved them. Bourassa and yourself have written a page unparalleled in the history of our country. I have accepted nomination because I have the help of Mr. Armand Lavergne, and on the 21st of September you will be cheering the victory of Pelletier and Lavergne.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Who said that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hon. L. P. Pelletier. I think the House is well acquainted with the words uttered formerly by my hon. friend the Secretary of State. Those of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue are not so well known in this House. I would like to supplement the information given the other night, and I will read a few extracts from an article signed by Mr. Bourassa in Le Devoir of October 15, 1915, after the appointment of my hon. friend. The article is entitled: "Is Mr. Borden again becoming a Nationalist?" and Mr. Bourassa says—I will read it first in French and then in English:

M. Borden redevient-il nationaliste?

M. Patenaude était plus nationaliste que tous nous autres. A l'assemblée de Saint-Rémi, organisée par ses soins, il s'écriait le 4 septembre 1910:

"Nous sommes à l'aise aujourd'hui pour discuter cette politique, parce que nous sommes détachés des deux grands partis... Mais j'ai encore confiance dans la population canadienne française, car je crois qu'elle est encore plus loyale au Canada qu'à l'Angleterre, aux traditions de la province qu'aux désirs d'un gouverneur général ou d'un premier ministre....

"Il existe une autre voix: celle des honneurs et des titres. C'est celle qui a perdu Laurier et Borden, qui a perdu le Gouvernement canadien et les députés moutons qui en sont la grande majorité."

Et M. Bourassa, après avoir constaté que le premier ministre choisissait tous ses ministres de gauche dans les rangs nationalistes, à part M. Casgrain, écrivait:

"Au lendemain de 1911 ce choix s'appliquait. M. Borden savait bien qu'il devait son succès à l'agitation contre la loi navale, menée par M. Monk, avec l'appui des nationalistes. Il avait alors résolu de faire abroger la loi navale. Mais aujourd'hui? M. Borden songe-t-il à revenir bientôt à la politique nationaliste? Compte-t-il sur M. Blondin pour faire de nouveaux accrocs au drapeau anglais? Garde-t-il M. Patenaude en réserve pour une nouvelle élection de Drummond-Arthabaska?"

Mr. Patenaude was more Nationalist than any one of us. At the meeting of St. Rémi, organized by himself, he said, on the 4th of September, 1910:

"We feel at ease to-day to discuss that policy stand, as we are free from the two great parties.... But I still have confidence in the French-Canadian people, because I believe that they are more loyal to Canada than to England, and to the traditions of the province than to the wishes of a Governor General or a Prime Minister.... There exists another voice—that of honours and titles. It is this that has been the doom of Laurier and Borden, the doom of the Canadian Government and the sheep-like members who form the great majority."

It is interesting to know the opinion the minister had of the members of this House before he became one of them. Mr. Bourassa, after finding that the Prime Minister had selected all his Quebec ministers from the Nationalist ranks, except Mr. Casgrain, said:

"On the morrow of 1911 that choice could be explained. Mr. Borden knew well that he owed his success to the agitation against the Naval Bill, led by Mr. Monk, with the aid of the Nationalists. He then decided to have the Naval Bill repealed. But to-day does Mr. Borden intend very soon to adopt the Nationalist policy? Does he rely on Mr. Blondin to tear new rents in the British flag? Does he keep Mr. Patenaude in reserve for a new election in Drummond-Arthabaska?"

Much can be done by the distribution of patronage, but the Prime Minister seems to have forgotten that leaders and generals lose their usefulness and worth as soon as they abandon their army. However, the prodigal sons have come back, and the thanksgiving banquet is still going on under the eyes and with the participation of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). Personal ambitions have been satisfied, but we are sure that opinions and convictions have been changed? Have these gentlemen retracted, or withdrawn, or repudiated, one of the statements which are still ringing in the ears of the electors of that province? I am not aware that they have and until they do so, and until they apologize to the people whom they deceived in 1911, their appeals for enlistment cannot be very effective and cannot carry much weight. I protest as strongly as I can against my hon. friend the Postmaster General mentioning the names of his two ex-Nationalistic colleagues and asking the people of the other provinces to judge my province and my countrymen by the actions and expressions of these ministers. I believe in political morality. The loyalty of my hon. friend to his colleagues deserve admiration, but the respect he owes to his province and to the people he represents should have been more binding upon him than ministerial loyalty.

I shall now refer to another part of the Postmaster General's speech. He said that he and his colleagues have refrained from all political activity in the province of Quebec, and have devoted all their time and energy to recruiting and addressing patriotic meetings.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That is not what I said. I did not say that we had not devoted any of our activities to political life.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understood my hon. friend to say that they had not indulged in political activities.

Mr. CASGRAIN: No, I did not say that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, I accept the statement of my hon. friend.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Read my statement in Hansard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will look up Hansard again. That is the impression that was left on the minds of those who listened to the speech of my hon. friend. Then, my hon. friend said—and I would not have taken the trouble to contradict him if he had not said it—that some Liberal members at least had not followed the example of their leader and had indulged in the discussion of political questions. He even stated—my hon. friend will find it in Hansard—that on a later occasion—I think he said on a less dignified occasion—he would perhaps discuss that matter. Does my hon. friend remember that?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes, and I will keep my promise.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before my hon. friend keeps his promise I will give him some material. Of course, I will keep some in store for the occasion when my hon. friend will come back. I do not know to whom my hon. friend referred, but I purpose to say to this House that if any hon. members on this side did discuss political questions, they had to do so to protect themselves or their party against the attacks and political speeches of the ministers of the Crown in the province of Quebec since the last session of Parliament. Let us look at some of these thoroughly patriotic utterances of the members of the Government.

"A tout seigneur, tout honneur"—I begin with the master, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). The Minister

of Public Works came to Montreal—and here, I am afraid, I am going to scandalize my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). The Minister of Public Works came to Montreal and delivered a speech on May 3, 1915. Here are some extracts which I take from the report of the Montreal Gazette of the Minister's speech, so that the House may be made aware of the patriotic declarations uttered by that hon. gentleman on that occasion. He speaks of the Prime Minister and says:

But the fact that he has so honestly and so honourably discharged these great responsibilities apparently means nothing to a certain horde of designing Grit grafters and simpletons—grafters that are strong and powerful by reason of the wide scope given them in their field of operations during the fifteen years of Liberal reign. For example, who will deny the strength of the press of Canada to-day that represents Grit graft, Grit loot, and Grit plunder? A press that in its desperation descends to the very lowest possible level; and when I make this statement I frankly acknowledge I am thinking of the Montreal Herald, the Toronto Globe and the Winnipeg Free Press—all papers that have prospered in one form or another by the purchase and sale of influence with Liberal leaders, by the purchase and sale of Liberal principles, or by pure and unadulterated graft during the reign of the late Administration.

Allow me to make the remark that when that hon. gentleman was speaking so loudly and so earnestly about graft, he was exchanging telegrams with his friends in Manitoba and telling them that he was looking around Eastern Canada to get the best counsel available to send to the rescue of the grafters of Manitoba. He proceeds:

It is true, for a time they were temporarily silent, nursing in shame their remorse of conscience for their conduct of the year previous, through which they were obliged to witness their own most ignominious downfall in the eyes of every good Canadian, and for months and months they were treated by the Government and by the people generally with the reverence and respect that is always due to a political corpse.

I might read his reference to the ministers of religion in the country, but I do not think it is necesary for me to do so. A few weeks later another minister—he was not a minister at that time; he was Solicitor General; but he is now a member of the Cabinet. The Solicitor General came to Montreal and made a patriotic speech. I take the report from the Montreal Gazette of June 11, 1915:

A strong fighting speech was made last night by the Hon. Arthur Meighen, Solicitor General, before the Westmount Conservative Association, at Victoria Hall.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Here are some extracts:

"Can you call that anything but party trickery?" asked Mr. Meighen. . . . "The Liberals showed they were blind to the facts on the naval issue, as they now show themselves blind. Do you think that, knowing what the leader of the late Government has done and what has been achieved by the present Government, the people of Canada would wish to restore Laurier to power?" It was there, as a monument over his political remains. . . . There will be immense deficits without a doubt.

I will now quote from a speech delivered by the Minister of Finance at Durham, and reported in the Montreal Gazette of June 19, 1915:

The Liberal leaders had acted like a lot of bad children, rather than responsible statesmen seized of the gravity of the crisis.

Further on he says:

It was true that public expenditure had been increasing. In a country like Canada it always will increase, but by far the greater part of the increase in recent years has been due to the policy of wasteful extravagance of the late Government in enterprises such as the National Transcontinental.

Further on he says:

In all their actions they have displayed a wilful and perverse blindness which has resulted greatly to the detriment of the Empire in the day of trial.

I now come to my own province. My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Blondin) made a speech at Louiseville, in Maskinongé county, on July 12. That speech was reported in La Patrie on July 13, and I will quote the following extracts:

Sir Wilfrid has received everything from the province which has bestowed all things upon him—confidence, power, and a halo of glory. Why has he accomplished so little for her? The Conservatives have but twenty seats in the House of Commons, and yet more than under any previous administration they have acquired the recognition of the rights of the French language. The future looks forward to a great many efforts. But give us your help, grant us your confidence. One can hardly explain the reason why certain Liberals, the Hon. J. E. Caron especially, so persistently criticise new taxes at the creation of which the Liberals have unanimously applauded. That small boot scandal has fallen through. These boots had been manufactured by Canadian firms. The inquiry has been closed. Why have the members of the Opposition discontinued to push it forth after they had obtained so little out of it? The evidence was that one fourth of one per cent of these boots had been found defective. The sole conclusion is this: Praise be given to the Canadian manufacturers! Praise be to the Government! Following all the financial disasters, wheat shall be the essential wealth, and that of prime value. The Government has been far-sighted and has established a protective tariff which will prove efficient.

Mr. BLONDIN: Will my hon. friend admit that this is a very incomplete report of my speech?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps it is, but I have read the report as published in La Patrie, which represents Conservative views, and so far as I know the report has never been repudiated.

Mr. BLONDIN: I am not repudiating it. I say it is incomplete.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend did not respect the truth in this speech of his.

Mr. BLONDIN: I was answering the Hon. Mr. Caron, and my hon. friend will not deny that Mr. Caron was attacking us at the time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my hon. friend state in this House that the Liberals voted with the Government on the new tariff brought down by the Minister of Finance last year? He will say so at Louiseville, but he will not repeat the statement in this House. Mr. Cousineau, leader of the Opposition in the province of Quebec, was on the same platform with the Secretary of State, and spoke a few words about the Dominion subsidy:

Since the Conservative Government is in power in Ottawa it is very difficult to reach an effective understanding between the federal and local governments. Should the Conservatives acquire the confidence of the majority in the province of Quebec, the re-adjustment of the federal subsidy will be an easy problem to solve.

I now come to the Postmaster General, and I regret to do so, because I have the greatest personal regard for him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is not a bad fellow.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Unfortunately, even saints have weaknesses, and the Postmaster General is not above reproach. At one of his so-called patriotic meetings my hon. friend said at Notre-Dame du Lac:

I am told that there is here a large Conservative majority. I congratulate you, gentlemen, and I hope that you will increase it further, in order to send to us in the House of Commons a Conservative member upon whom we shall always be able to rely.

I am quoting from l'Evenement of October 11, 1915. My hon. friend the Postmaster General will have to admit that he was trying to recruit Conservatives as well as soldiers. The following day the Postmaster General spoke at a Fraserville meeting, and l'Evenement of October 12, 1915, in reporting this speech, says:

Dubé Hall proved too small to contain all the good Conservatives who flocked in yesterday to hear the speech of the Hon. Mr. Casgrain, Postmaster General in the Borden cabinet.

Really, his speech was a patriotic one on the whole. The only statement which I did not like was this one:

Compare the line of conduct followed by both governments in the inquiries held regarding the scandals. Whilst the Liberals endeavoured to conceal everything, the Conservatives have established complete light and chastized the guilty parties. This is proven by the act of Sir Robert Borden in expelling from the party Garland and Foster, found guilty of theft and graft.

My friends from Nova Scotia will be able to use that speech of my hon. friend. My hon. friend complained that those meetings were described as political meetings. If he has been wrongly interpreted he has been so interpreted by those who participated in the meetings and even by the organizers. Every hon. member knows that Mr. Charles Beaubien, of Montreal, was appointed to the Senate in December. Mr. Beaubien is a clever and highly estimable gentleman, and as long as a Conservative has to be appointed his appointment deserves approval. My friend Mr. Beaubien was known, if not as the principal, as one of the principal, organizers of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec. After his appointment he gave an interview, which was published in the Montreal Gazette of December 3, 1915. Here is what he said:

He especially wanted to say that in his opinion the war policy of the present Administration is endorsed by 95 per cent of the people of this province. Neither did he think that the political situation could be called anything but hopeful in Quebec. Hard work would, of course, be necessary—

I believe that.

—on the part of the ministers and their followers—

Here is the sentence to which I call the attention of my friend:

—and he thought that the activity they had displayed during the past few weeks was a safe promise for the future.

I have some more extracts, but I will keep them in store for that happy occasion when my hon. friend discusses that matter, as he has announced his intention of doing.

The right hon. the Prime Minister, speaking in this House on the last day of the last session of Parliament and referring to the appropriations voted for the war, said:

It will be the duty of the Government to see that not one single dollar of it shall be lost

or wasted, so that we may be enabled at another session of Parliament to give an account of our stewardship.

We now ask the right hon. gentleman and the Government to give that account to us and to the people of Canada. From one end of the country to the other there are rumours and charges of wrong-doing against men for whom the Government is responsible, more especially the Shell Committee, which was the creature of the Government. Specific instances have been mentioned by hon. gentlemen in the course of this debate. That Shell Committee, under the eyes of the Government, and certain departments of the Government, seem to have allowed and encouraged combinations in which patriotism and financial cupidity are amalgamated in very discernible doses. The interest of Canada and Britain seems to have been mixed up with the interests of a few rings of selfish financiers. It is up to the Government to clear the atmosphere. I regret to say that since the speech of my hon. friend the Solicitor General the Government of Canada stands in a humiliating position before the country. By their hesitation, their quibbling, their resorting to technicalities for the purpose of avoiding investigation, the members of the Government are assuming the part of the accused instead of being the accusers. They should have been willing and anxious to grant an immediate and thorough investigation in order that those unworthy speculators who are trying to enrich themselves unduly out of the blood of our soldiers and the misfortunes of our country should be discovered and dealt with most severely. The honour of the Government and this Parliament is at stake; the honour of the people of Canada is at stake; and on behalf of those whom I have the honour to represent in this Parliament, I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister of my country to do full justice, and not to allow himself to be carried away by the sentiments which seem to animate some of his followers and his colleagues. The noble actions of the sons of Canada in the battlefields of Europe have covered the name of this country with glory. They have written with their blood one of the finest pages of Canadian history. We owe it to them to leave intact and untarnished this great page which they have written, and we can do so by divorcing it from the unfortunate condition which has been shown during the last few days to exist in our internal affairs. We owe it to those who have died for their King and country; we owe it to those who are still upholding the honour and interest of Canada; we owe it to those who will come after us. This is the wish which I sincerely hope may be realized, and by such an achievement we shall leave unblemished the glorious history of our national participation in this great war.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, may I add to the general expression my felicitation that so worthy a representative of my native county has attained the dignity of presiding officer of this House. It is always a pleasure to me to associate myself with felicitations of any kind connected with the province of Quebec, just as it is a matter of perennial regret that long absence has dissociated me from the picturesque politics of the province which to my Irish instincts are attractive in the proportion that they are strenuous.

The outstanding feature of the sessional programme as indicated in the speech now under discussion, is a request for authorization of the increase of the Canadian Expeditionary Force to 500,000 men, an enrollment calling for the serious attention of every member of this House whether with regard to his personal interests or with regard to his influence upon his own constituency. That from this call the members of this House do not consider themselves exempt is abundantly evident from the fact of the many places vacant by attendance of members at the front or in serious training, and also by the presence here of so many officers in the King's uniform whose participation in the affairs of Parliament is yet made possible because their enlistment is only in the earlier stages. For myself, it is a matter of pride that I have been granted a command in the draft called for a few months ago to bring our first enlistment up to two hundred and fifty thousand. And, as in the thirty-seven years since I first had the privilege of assuming the Queen's uniform, I have passed through all the stages from private and gunner to the rank of commanding officer, I trust it will not be imputed to me as it has been imputed to others connected with the public life of this country that I secured the privilege of commanding an overseas regiment for any political reason or for any reason other than that it was the position naturally coming to me because of my rank in the militia and the only one for which my years make me eligible.

I desire to pay a tribute to the splendid executive courage of the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) in the conduct of Canada's share in this war. Criticism is inevitable, and so far as that criticism is based on truth or on honest belief, it seems to me that it should not be resented. Irregularities are to be expected in the conduct of affairs on so huge a scale and eternal vigilance is necessary to prevent these irregularities developing into scandal. But, the business of the present hour being the prosecution of the war, the minor consideration of dealing adequately with those who seek to traffic indecently in the country's difficulties may very well be put in the background for the present. It is my hope, however, that at the proper time the searchlight will be turned on all questions connected with the commercial side of this campaign; and I have no apprehension that the Conservatitve party or any one in authority in it will be found shielding in any degree any person to whom censure or penalty should be accorded. In my opinion, however, the duty of the hour is not investigation or recrimination, but rather the exercise of every possible means to supply the men necessary—first to encourage and then to reinforce our advance guard at the front, and to supply to them promptly and adequately the munitions without which the personal bravery of our soldiers must end only in sacrifice.

Fortunately, the splendid spirit of the Canadian people makes it unnecessary to discuss seriously in this Dominion how our legions may be secured, and it is a matter for regret in my opinion that the bogie of the word "conscription" has been introduced to cause discord in the minds of free citizens to whom any form of compulsion is distasteful. It seems to me that the word "conscription" is most unfortunately chosen to represent the idea involved, and that since the temper of the Canadian people is to regard service for the Empire as a privilege to be coveted rather than as a duty irksome and only to be assumed of necessity, the work of selection might well be presented as the drawing of a prize rather than as a penalty. In that sense, I am heartily in favour of a ballot for positions in the military service to award to each citizen in proper turn in time of emergency the rank for which he has fitted himself in time of peace. Under such circumstances no man of self-respect, in my opinion, would wish to assert the chief privilege of citizenship, the franchise, while opposing or shirking the duty of serving; and the manhood of the country, making, on enlistment, personal sacrifices which in many cases bear severely on their dependents, would be freed from the worry of the thought that the gratification of their desire for service had left their mothers and sisters, or their wives and children, under conditions less favourable than those of their acquaintance who disregarded the call of duty when it came to them. I would give opportunity to those who had not the privilege of personal service to compensate themselves by making the most generous provision possible for the dependents of soldiers serving in the field or who have answered the last roll-call, as well as those who return to us unfitted for ordinary pursuits. I am pleased that the subject of more adequate pensions has been introduced, since, though the Canadian scale is comparatively liberal, it was not made for conditions such as those of this war, where the magnitude of the numbers engaged makes it idle to expect that the ordinary offices of philanthrophy in the several communities can provide for any deficiency in the scale for the dependents of disabled or returned invalided soldiers. So that the mind of the volunteers should be set at ease, I think it most advisable that authoritative announcement that steps to increase the pension scale should be made as early as possible.

In following Imperial example and seeking an extension of the life of Parliament, in my opinion the Government interpret properly the will of the Canadian people. How can we be united in the preparation for warfare and in every patriotic endeavour at home while the desire to secure party supremacy is allowed sway; and when, an election being supposed to be imminent, our citizens are armed to the teeth politically, each watching with jealousy the movements of every rival? But of what avail is an armistice in the matter of an actual ballot if the campaign is not interrupted? That is the German idea, as I see it, of an armistice to bury the dead, used for the purpose of placing the big guns in better positions.

Observations of some hon. gentlemen opposite while this debate has been in progress make the situation well capable of illustration by picturing the members of this House as invited to an entertainment, say to promote recruiting or to enlarge the Patriotic Fund, to which some of the members who addressed this House recently would pro-

ceed in a spirit anything but philanthropic. For example, there is the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie), who, I am sorry to see is not in his seat. I can very well picture him on the approach to this gathering arguing that the motor cars bearing the guests were not coming along what he considered the proper road, and as resenting this I can conceive him strewing tacks along the way of these erring motors. Then, take the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley), and I have in my mind's eye his progress along the pavement from the street to the meeting place, having distributed along the walk a collection of banana peels, and then standing at the door and watching the downfall of the unwary guests, but offering an urbane welcome to those who had escaped the pitfalls. Then there is the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who also is absent. After listening carefully to his address the other night, I saw in my mind's eye his early and furtive entry into the tea-room and his carefully anointing with vinegar the jugs of cream. I pictured next another absent critic of the Administration, the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) whose role, it seems to me, would be having asked permission to dry a small bundle of hay in one of the stoves on the premises, to mix with the hay a noxious perfume in order that he might make his influence felt on the olfactory nerves of his audience, if he could not impress them by any other means. It seems to me that the result of the various performances of these absent critics would do anything but make for the peace and harmony of a patriotic gathering. Under these circumstances the threat, if it were threat—the promise, or sinister suggestion, whichever it was—of the hon. member for Carleton, that Canadians, because of his criticism and the criticism of those like him, should refrain either from enlisting or from subscribing to the Patriotic Fund, would be very likely to receive some attention.

The cream of the present campaign undoubtedly had been the efficiency and the overwhelming superiority of the navy. Yet the hon. member for Pictou puts this to the acid touch of his complaint that Canada has neglected to gild the refined gold in that she has not offered what he thinks should have been the proper assistance to the Imperial Navy in the shape of strengthening their naval brigade. I will deal with his remarks practically in so far only as they affect conditions on the Pacific Coast, although he had a good deal to say about conditions at Halifax also. Take first the steamship Rainbow, the protection bequeathed to us by the late Government. The hon. gentleman informed this House that that ship was dismantled and useless at the beginning of the campaign. But on the contrary, so reckless was the hon. gentleman in his assertions and so little care did he take to have ground for the criticism that he levelled against the Government, that the fact is quite the opposite. At the opening of the war the Rainbow was in full commission. In the spring of 1914, Canada had undertaken to send a ship to the Behring Sea Patrol to replace the Algerine and the Shearwater of the Imperial Navy, which were detained on the Mexican coast by the trouble arising in that country. The Rainbow was fitted for this service, and was prepared to leave when war broke out. The ship was immediately placed at the disposal of the Admiralty, and has been at such disposal ever since. The complement of the Rainbow was completed by the addition of a number of Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve ratings who had been training at Esquimalt, and the ship put to sea immediately to protect the Canadian coasts. A report in British Columbia at the time which caused great apprehension, was to the effect that the German ships Leipzig and Nurnberg were off the American coast. The Rainbow went south to meet these ships, and, by so doing, enabled the little Imperial ships Shearwater and Algerine to regain Esquimalt in safety; and also deterred the German vessels from entering the Canadian harbours without at least a serious conflict.

The hon. gentleman also complains of inattention on the part of this Government to requests from British Columbia for the formation locally of a branch of the Royal Naval Reserve. In this case also he is mistaken. During the year before the war the question of the organization of naval reserves was taken up by the Department of the Naval Service. In the fall of 1913, authority was given to organize a company in Victoria, B.C., in a preliminary manner, and facilities were given for drilling in the Esquimalt dockyard, the direction of the movement being undertaken by the naval officers at that station. During the winter of 1913-14, a scheme for organization was drawn up, which was put into effect by Order in Council. In the spring

of 1914 arrangements were made with the Admiralty to obtain officers for the training of a corps of volunteers to be distributed throughout the country.

5 p.m. A company was organized in Victoria and another in Vancouver, and the organization was being perfected when war broke out. The Admiralty stated that they were unable to send out the officers who were to have undertaken the training of these bodies. It was, therefore, necessary to postpone the projected organization, but the measures which were authorized were utilized for the purpose of enlisting volunteers to serve for the period of the war on the Niobe and Rainbow, to man patrol vessels and to take part in other defensive measures on the coasts of Canada. These men have been extremely useful and have done good service—service which has been recognized by the Imperial officers who have been associated with those two vessels since the outbreak of the war. While the German vessels were patrolling the Pacific, some 450 men were enlisted in the province of British Columbia and were divided into various patrol services along the coast. After Admiral Sturdee's victory at the Falkland islands, it was no longer necessary to keep such a large number of the volunteers on service, and all men wishing to join overseas forces were allowed to resign, and a number of other men who wished to rejoin their families were also allowed to leave the force. A number of these volunteers are still serving on the Rainbow, the Shearwater and the submarines, and employed on patrol and other duties as well.

The hon. member for Pictou seems to be under a misapprehension as to the requirements, if not the functions, of the Royal naval brigade. At the beginning of the war the Admiralty called out the Royal naval reserves, composed of men engaged in mercantile marine, but trained to a certain extent in the Royal Navy. When these men responded to the call, the Admiralty found themselves with a large body of trained seamen, from which they manned the ships ready to put to sea, and still had a considerable number of men over. The naval brigade. thus organized, while formed of reserve seamen, was partly officered by naval officers and partly by army officers. The men were trained as a military unit and given the uniform of the land forces; they were armed and equipped in exactly the same way as the infantry regiments, and took their places in the trenches alongside of the latter. The point of this is that as Canada was already sending land forces in quite as large number as the Imperial Government could handle, it made no difference to that Government whether we sent those forces under the name of a naval brigade, as the hon. member for Pictou suggests we should have done, or whether we enrolled them as infantry and sent them over under the name, as well as to perform the duties, of land forces.

A feature of the early part of this debate was the submarine warfare of the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley) who, when taken to task from this side of the House, excused himself on the ground that his periscope was the press of Vancouver and Victoria. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not present, because I would have liked in his presence to remove from him the last vestige of protection or excuse for having, with the product of the peculiar state of mental exaltation in which he must have been on his visit to the coast, given so inadequate and distorted a report of what he learned from his perusal of the press of Victoria and Vancouver. Since the hon. gentleman spoke in this House, I have been looking up the press of Victoria and Vancouver to which he had access, and which, he says, he carefully perused. I find that that press contradicts him in every particular, that there is no manner of complaint that he has alleged here and that is dealt with by the evidence as read by the Solicitor General, which was not adequately covered by the press of Victoria and Vancouver at that time; and that there are no facts which, to a man with any interest in the subject, would not have been disclosed by the perusal of that evidence. I find a statement by the hon. gentleman, for instance, that there was no explanation of the division of the submarine money into three drafts. On the contrary, we read in the newspapers an exact explanation, first by the manager of the bank as to the nature and amounts of the drafts; next by Mr. Paterson, the agent of the Company, as to why those divisions were made, and as to what disposition was made of each draft. Further, I find that the receipts from the recipients of those drafts, showing the purpose of them, were produced before the Commission, and are on file with the other documents.

I find in the statement made by the hon. member for St. John the reiteration that he was justified in supposing that Captain Logan should have known something about

the price of the submarines by reason of the fact that, as shown by his bill which forms part of the record presented to this House last session, he was engaged for fifteen days in this business. On reading the Victoria press for my own information, I find that that is most carefully and thoroughly dealt with, that Captain Logan's evidence was to the effect that his first connection with the submarine business was on Sunday, August 2, the declaration of war being on the 4th, and that the greater part of the fifteen days, for which he has put in a bill to the Government, was taken up, not by negotiations for the sale of those submarines, as the remarks of the hon. member for St. John would lead this House to believe, but, as plainly stated by Captain Logan himself, in the endeavour to secure torpedoes and other supplies for the craft after their purchase and delivery to Esquimalt dockyard. So, Mr. Speaker, we have an addition to our cause for amazement that an hon. gentleman should have attempted to inform this House as to the facts of an incident, facts which he said reflected severely, not only upon the politicians whom he connected with the transaction, but upon a most esteemed retired member of the judiciary engaged as a Royal Commissioner, and that he should have presumed to cast reflections, with no warrant at all in fact, so far as his own statements as to where he procured these facts admit of investigation of his allegations to this House.

Then, again, Mr. Speaker, so far as the participation of counsel for the Liberal party in British Columbia is concerned, I would like to add something to what has gone upon record, something which, when I was perusing the press of the Coast for the purposes intended, I saw very fully set forth. I find that when Commissioner Davidson refused the counsel for the Liberal party the right to appear as such, on the ground that one party could not be represented without the other, at the same time he extended to him a most cordial invitation to attend at the sessions of the Commission, and to give Mr. Thompson, the official counsel, all the assistance in his power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the counsel for the Liberal party stay?

Mr. TAYLOR: No, I regret to answer that the newspaper records set forth that counsel thereupon left the meeting place of the commission. I find also that Sir Richard McBride, who was present, personally urged on the commissioner that he had no objection to the attendance of counsel representing the Liberal party. In fact, it was only a sense of duty on the part of the commissioner, his sense of what was regular in the proceedings, and his conviction that it would be irregular that he refused, even when requested by the accused, for Sir Richard McBride was virtually in that position, to allow the Liberal counsel to appear.

I find, in addition, that not only did the commissioner at the outset of the investigation issue the most comprehensive invitation to every person concerned to attend and give evidence, but that this invitation was emphasized at the close by a leading editorial in the Victoria Colonist, which called attention to the fact that, the commission having been sitting for three days and being about to adjourn, no persons from Victoria had volunteered to give evidence. There had been a great deal of rumour in Liberal political circles in Victoria, and the local Liberal newspaper had been the vent of these rumours, and the editorials in the newspaper indicated that the editor of the paper believed he had warrant for the insinuations which had been printed. The Colonist pointed out the advisability of any person having any information of that kind at his disposal attending before the commissioner, or suggesting to him the names of some persons who should attend. To all these invitations there was no response, a fact which it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, can lead to no other conclusion than that there never was any ground for the insinuations of any graft in connection with the purchase of the submarines which, so far as British Columbia was concerned, would have been cheap at many times the price paid for them, which saved us treasure, if not lives, and which would not have been secured but for the outstanding enterprise of the Government of British Columbia. I am indebted to my hon. friend the Solicitor General for the suggestion that the commission not yet having been dissolved and the commissioner not having made his report, the invitation is open to any person, from the hon. member for St. John down, who knows anything, or has any ground for suspicion, to appear before the commissioner, state the ground and have it investigated.

Before closing, I wish to refer to only one other incident of this debate. I wish to allude to the following remarks of the hon.

member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), to be found at page 321 of Hansard:

> I need not tell you, Sir, what has happened in the province of British Columbia. You know that the people there are rising in their might to have clean government and clean administration and to have back again the condition of things which we brought to them when we put the Conservatives out of house and home before, and the time will come when our old grand chieftain will once more give clean government to the people of this country, and when we shall all rally around him and the old conditions will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, for the province of British Columbia, I wish to say that there is not the first atom of foundation for any of the insinuations contained in that paragraph. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman is not present, after having made so foul an accusation against the government of my province, and I regret that he should not have remained in the House until some representative from that province had had an opportunity of asking him the source of his information, what details he had, and if he had any sense of responsibility as a member of this House when he has no ground for so base an insinuation as that which he has put before it. I am proud to say that graft is not indigenous to the soil or climate of British Columbia, that political scandals are an exception, and that, in so far as the Provincial Government is concerned, during the twelve years in which it has been in office, there has been no scandal in connection with it, or the slightest insinuation that one cent of public money has been diverted in the way of graft. I am proud to say also that, as far as my information goes—and I am pretty well informed as to Federal affairs in British Columbia—I know of no beginning even of graft in connection with the Federal Administration in that province since the change of Government.

I dislike recalling the acrimonious events of the closing years of the late Government; but when you find an hon. member, such as the hon. member for North Cape Breton, who is thoroughly familiar with the record of his party, who heard British Columbia affairs discussed at length in this House in the last Parliament, and scandal after scandal promoted by his party ventilated here, it seems to me that patience ceases to be a virtue, and that we, the representatives of British Columbia, would be justified in opening up to a very large extent the sordid chapter of the closing years of the Federal Liberal Administration there, in face of baseless insinuations such as those which have been put forward by the hon. gentleman.

I may say that if any of these hon. gentlemen, who have gone so far afield as to traverse the entire continent for matters for comment against this Administration, had been in their seats at the present time, I would have had some further criticism with regard to the matter to offer to them; but when hon. members make accusations of this kind and fly the coop, as these hon. gentlemen have done, what is the use of beating the air?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that is hardly fair. There are no hon. gentlemen who stay in the House as steadily as one of the hon. gentlemen to who my hon. friend is referring. This is Friday, some of these gentlemen may have been called away, and we do not know why members cannot be in the House. My hon. friend may be a sinner in that respect himself at times.

Mr. TAYLOR: I grant I am very often out of the House, but I would feel it my duty to remain if I had gone so far afield as to make accusations against a province with which I had no personal concern. Had I made such accusations, had I dragged in affairs so extraneous to my own personal duty, I would have felt some responsibility to attend while an opportunity was given for the answers to be delivered.

Mr. GRAHAM: He stayed long enough for the answers to be given, but they were not given.

Mr. TAYLOR: Two of these hon. gentlemen were present when I commenced my remarks; so that, as to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), their absence from the House at this moment is purely voluntary and is not occasioned by any circumstances over which they have no control.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words in this debate, I wish to join with previous speakers in extending to you, Sir, my most hearty congratulations upon your promotion to the high office which you now occupy. I feel satisfied that I am only expressing the sentiments of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when I say that I feel confident that you will discharge the duties of this high and honourable position with that ability and impar-

tiality which have characterized your distinguished predecessors.

I regretted very much to hear some of my hon. friends on this side of the House make the complaint that in the selection of regimental officers, and other officials of the Militia Department, in their respective constituencies, discrimination was shown against those of their friends who might be of the Liberal persuasion. I am glad to say that in the county of Kent, a portion of which I have the honour to represent in this House, appointments such as have been described have not been made. When companies were formed by the Militia Department, the officers were selected from the very best men regardless of their political opinions.

I am proud to say that when the first contingent left Canada we sent a couple of companies from the county of Kent, and the man in charge was Major George Smith, a Liberal in politics. He fought at the front with his men behind him on many occasions, and I am sorry to inform the House that in the last great battle in which he was engaged he was killed while attacking a third trench after he and his men had already captured two. I wish to extend to the Prime Minister of this country and to the Minister of Militia the most sincere thanks of my constituents, as well as my own, for the kind letters of condolence that they extended to Major Smith's wife and orphan son. I am glad to inform the House that since that time many of the brightest young men in the county of Kent have left for the front to do battle in defence of their country—not only men in the humbler walks of life, but sons of our wealthiest families in the city of Chatham, and in the municipalities and in the whole county. I am also glad to say that the ladies of Kent county have at all times endeavoured to do their duty. Whether in connection with the Red Cross Society, the Daughters of the Empire, or some other patriotic association, the ladies of my county, like the many ladies we see at different times in the galleries of this building, are providing comforts for those who have gone to the front, working from the time they get up in the morning till they go to bed at night. The ladies in the country districts in the county of Kent went so far last harvest as to can hundreds and hundreds of quarts of peaches and forwarded them to the front, and the boys at the front have expressed their appreciation not only for the fruit that has been sent them, but for the many other acts of kindness which have been extended to them by the industrious women of Kent. The fund which was provided to look after the boys at the front from the county has, I am glad to say, on no occasion been exhausted. I see by the Patriotic Bulletin, issued under the direction of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), that Kent county raised $85,000 in three days for the Patriotic Fund. Furthermore, Mr. Harry Collins, the local treasurer of the fund, has assured Sir Herbert Ames that the city of Chatham and county promised $150,000 for the year 1916. I think we all admire Sir Herbert Ames. He has given much of his time and attention to the Patriotic Fund, and as its secretary enjoys the confidence, I believe, of all members of this House and of the people as a whole. When he visited Chatham he was received there in the most unpartisan way imaginable, and he said that the county had contributed even more generously than the figures showed, as they had previously spent the sum of $15,000 for the use of the wives and dependents of the soldiers who had enlisted at an earlier date.

I am also glad to inform the House that the Minister of Militia has given instructions to form a Kent battalion, known as the 186th, for overseas service, and they have already obtained some three or four hundred splendid fellows. The man at the head of that battalion is Lt. Colonel Neil Smith, a Liberal. The Minister of Militia appointed him because he knew that he was the best man that could be found for the position, not only in the county of Kent, but possibly in the whole of Ontario. The Minister of Militia knew him personally. Lt. Colonel Neil Smith is such an expert marksman that he was chosen for the Bisley team which went to England some years ago, and he did honour to the county of Kent while he was there, for he carried off some of the highest prizes. He was selected to go with the Bisley team on another occasion, and I am proud to say that in competition with the greatest marksmen in the Empire he was second in the competition for the highest prize awarded. He not only brought honour on himself, and on the Minister of Militia who appointed him, but upon the Dominion of Canada, the county of Kent, and will say, also, on the new battalion which is now being formed. When the day comes for this battalion to leave Canada, Lt. Colonel

Smith will have associated with him as officers some of the brightest young men that ever breathed the breath of life, Liberals and Conservatives, and I doubt whether a finer fighting force will be found than the 186th Kent Battalion. When the occasion presents itself at the front I know that the 186th will do themselves proud, and do the Empire proud. I say this in all seriousness; in the county of Kent we fight elections as keenly as in any other section of Canada, but when the elections are over politics are forgotten, and we work for the very best interests of the county. As far as great industries in the city of Chatham are concerned, if the Prime Minister were in his seat he would bear me out in saying that Chatham has the very best industries of any city of its size in the whole Dominion. I remember well the Premier paying us a visit during the elections of 1911. On that occasion I had the privilege of hearing the right hon. gentleman address one of the largest meetings ever held in the county, and he paid one of the highest compliments to our industries that has ever been paid by any statesman or leader of any great political party. I do not remember his words exactly, but he was so impressed with our industries and the agricultural district surrounding the city of Chatham that when he came back to headquarters in Ottawa he insisted upon the Minister of Finance paying us a visit, also the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Justice, and, as regards members on the back benches, the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong), the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith), and the hon. Mr. Goodeve, who represented Kootenay at that time, but has since been promoted. All these gentlemen came to see the splendid industries established in the city of Chatham and the splendid agricultural sections surrounding it. After they had done their part in paying compliments to our splendid city and county, we also had a visit from Sir Clifford Sifton and Mr. Arthur Hawkes, who also paid their respects to the people of the county of Kent, and I am sure that all these hon. gentlemen will bear me out when I say that no honest Government could conscientiously, if they considered for a moment the industries in the county of Kent, let contracts as they have done by the hundreds of millions of dollars and overlook that county and city of which they said they were so proud, when they paid us those complimentary visits at that particular time. Contracts for shells and boxes have been let not only in the city of St. Thomas, which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has the honour of representing, but in the city of London, in the town of Ingersoll; but when the Shell Committee came down the Grand Trunk line, they missed the city of Chatham, jumped over to the town of Walkerville, and gave that town a big contract. As we had some industries that were lying idle, that could manufacture shells or other goods required by the Militia Department for the carrying on of this war, we sent deputation after deputation of the very best citizens of the city of Chatham to wait on the different members of the Government and on other men connected with it who, we thought, might persuade the Government to give our manufacturers some work, because a number of our factories were closing down and a number of men capable of doing work along this particular line were anxious for employment. As proud, however, as all these ministers of the Government and their colleagues were of the city of Chatham, not one dollar's worth of shells or boxes was given to that beautiful city. Seeing that they had visited the city, I thought that it would be well for me to write the Minister of Labour, believing that he would have the patronage of the south-western part of Ontario. I received from that hon. gentleman a very kind letter in which he asked me to write to Colonel Bertram. I took advantage of his suggestion and wrote to Colonel Bertram, and I received a reply from the colonel assuring me that the contracts were all awarded for the shells that were needed at that particular time, but that he would not overlook Chatham at the very earliest opportunity when there were any shell contracts to be let, and that our manufacturers could be sure that they would get their share. While at that time we were in need of work for our labouring men, who are as good a class of mechanics and labourers as are to be found in the province of Ontario, we were unable to get work for them, and all I have to say is this, that thanks to the progressive board of trade and the council and certain intelligent citizens of the city of Chatham, those factories which at that time were in need of contracts to make shells and boxes are going to be working full blast, and our labouring men will be employed without any thanks to the present Administration. We enjoy to-day the proud distinction of being one of

the cities that have not gone back at this time of financial stress and trouble, and our city is going to go ahead. In the near future a large sugar plant will be erected which will mean the expenditure of about a million dollars, and other industries are being established at the present time. And I simply want to assure this Government that as far as the city of Chatham is concerned, even if they cannot see their way clear to give us any contracts or any work, the labouring men as well as the manufacturers throughout the county will do everything in their power to put up money and to send men to assist this Government in bringing to a successful conclusion the war which is now raging.

I was particularly pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Militia the other afternoon when he addressed this House make the following statement, as reported on page 304 of Hansard:

> Let us take up next the Militia appointments. Two divisional commanders out of three are good staunch Liberals. I refer to General Currie, of Victoria, and to General Turner, of Quebec, two of the finest fellows who ever stood inside jackets, and two of the best men to be found in the Dominion.
>
> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Hear, hear.
>
> Sir Sam Hughes: Not a solitary Conservative in the Whole Dominion objected when I nominated these men for brigadiers long ago. The other one is General Mercer. As regards the politics of the brigadiers, I understand they are about half and half. I do not know what my own son's politics may be, but I know he will vote straight anyway. As regards the lower commanders, I am told by those who have looked up the matter—I have not looked up myself, it would make no difference anyway—that three-fourths of them are Liberal and one-fourth Tory.

It is gratifying to me as one of the younger members of this House to hear the Minister of Militia give not only to the members of this House but to the people throughout the length and breadth of Canada, the assurance that the Liberal party is doing its share in sending men and officers to assist in this great struggle. There are some who make invidious comparisons, men who we sometimes say belong to the flag-waving party. These men, in the face of this announcement, will never again dare to say that the Liberal party in this great struggle is not doing its duty in the way of supplying officers, when we already have three out of four commanding the different companies and regiments.

On this and on other occasions there have come up matters to which almost every speaker has referred, and there is one which is certainly very amusing.

Speakers on the opposite side, and on this side, are all referring, Sir, to two gentlemen from your native province, Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne, and they all seem to be trying to drop them like two hot coals. In the constituency which I represent, one of the great points made during the campaign at the last general election was that all that the Conservatives needed was to win twenty-two seats. In the Conservative paper of my city, on the night when the hon. Minister of Finance addressed the electors in my riding, there was quite a long article saying that twenty-two seats would win the election for Sir Robert Borden, and in the report of that meeting in the paper there was given a summary of how it could be accomplished; that is, that Mr. Bourassa would carry many seats in Quebec, because the fight was not on the reciprocity issue, but the great issue was that the people of Quebec were opposed to Laurier and his navy. This was the argument they were putting up—that they would carry so many seats in Ontario, so many seats in the Maritime Provinces and the West, and Bourassa would carry so many seats in Quebec, and this would put the Conservatitve party into power. Let me assure hon. gentlemen that, so far as the county of Kent is concerned, on patriotic lines we are a united people, and will do everything possible to assist this Government in carrying on our share of the war.

Many references have been made to the speech of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), especially in the speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), whom I am glad to see in his place. I feel that I speak for every hon. member on this side of the House when I assure the hon. minister that so far as he is personally concerned we regard him as one of the finest gentlemen we have in this House at this time. I believe the member for Carleton rendered a great service not only to this Parliament but also to the agriculturists of Canada in placing before this House the charges he made with regard to the contracts in his own province. It is greatly to the credit of the hon. member for Carleton that he at last woke up the Minister of Agriculture to deliver a speech with the fire and vim that the minister displayed. If the minister would only follow up his great agitation of a year ago for "Patriotism and Production" with the same force and energy that he displayed

in his abuse of the hon. member for Carleton, it would be a great blessing for the agriculturists of Canada. What has the hon. minister been doing the last two or three sessions? I put that question to the respected colleagues of the hon. minister. The charge is made that a contract has been entered into for 15,000 tons of hay at $23 a ton. I cannot understand why the members on the Conservative side of the House, particularly those from the province of Ontario, elected by the agriculturists of that province, will sit in their places and pound their desks when the minister announces a contract of this kind, when there are tons upon tons of hay in the province of Ontario for which we cannot get more than $12 or $13 a ton. No person knows better than I do that if one cannot get a market for his products it is mighty little use to grow them. But if the minister wished to contract for 15,000 tons of hay—I put this to hon. gentlemen on the other side who are interested in agriculture—would it not have been better to divide that up into two or three contracts of moderate size and give to the farmers of Ontario—of whom we are so proud at election times particularly, and to whom we always appeal for support—an opportunity to supply the requirements? In the southwestern part of Ontario we have the best hay-producing section in this whole dominion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Except Rouville.

Mr. McCOIG: Out of respect to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), I will revise that, and say that we can produce hay equally good and in equally large quantities with any other section of the Dominion. But if we can not sell our hay to the Government or to the people of our own large cities, then, if we see a market across the line, we want the privilege of sending our hay to that market. But what has happened? This contract is let at $23 a ton to friends of the Government—that is not denied by the minister—and the very minute that contract is let an embargo is put upon hay so that it can not be sent out of this country. That simply means that the Minister of Agriculture was neglecting the men whom he is alleged to represent in this House.

In the same way, on the first day of May last, a very similar thing was done by this Government when it passed an order in council placing an embargo on wool. The Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. WILCOX: Will the hon. gentleman allow me—

Mr. McCOIG: I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker—you have been one of my old friends on the ball ground. The hon. member for North Essex had his innings the other day, and I think the House will allow me my innings to-day. I say that on the first day of May last an embargo was placed upon wool, and I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture if that is not so. This was in the warm season when the farmers were shearing their sheep—at any rate that was the case in my own constituency. Now, naturally, farmers in humble circumstances do not know the minds of this Government and of the Minister of Agriculture. They naturally thought that this embargo was put on for keeps. They would not suppose that it was done for a joke. These farmers assumed that this was a business act by business men. And so they went on and sold their wool. At the time the embargo was put on the price of wool was 30 cents a pound. On 8th May it was 20-25 cents; on 15th May it was down to 20 cents, and the same on 22nd May. But the agricultural papers of the province of Ontario put up such a fight that the minister could not stand it, and so he put the embargo off. Immediately the price went back to 25 cents, and by 25th June it was 35 cents. The difference in price between this date and the time when the embargo was on was 15 cents a pound, and who was the loser? The loser was the man in humble circumstances, wherever he may live throughout the length and breadth of Canada, who was engaged in the sheep industry. The loss of the average man in this matter was enough to have paid his hired man for the season.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 3, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 4, respecting The Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 5, respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 6, to confirm certain agreements made between The Canadian Northern

Ontario Railway Company, The Canadian Northern Railway Company and The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Farnham and Granby Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Railway Company. —Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 9, respecting The Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate Les Sœurs de l'Assomption de la Sainte-Vierge.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill No. 11, respecting British America Nickel Corporation Limited.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 12, respecting The Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 13, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 14, respecting The Central Western Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 15, respecting The Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 16, respecting The Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. McCOIG: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was endeavouring to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture some of the reasons why I felt that he should look into many parts of his department and try to make some alterations which would be greatly to the benefit of the farmers whom he represents in this House. I had finished my references to the question of placing an embargo on wool. There is now another matter which I should like to draw to the attention of the House, and that is the tobacco industry.

We have in the county of Kent, and also in the adjoining counties, a great number of farmers who have been encouraged to go into the tobacco industry, and who have spent large sums of money on the advice of the Government of this country. About two years ago, after the farmers had invested large sums of money in that industry, and had endeavoured to put it on a paying basis, and give employment to a large number of labouring men who were looking for work in the different counties, I drew the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that the farmers, who had grown the tobacco, had been unable to dispose of it and that they felt that the purchasing of that particular crop had been left too much in the hands of one buyer. In fact, it was alleged by these producers that there was a combine, so far as the purchasing of tobacco was concerned, in the different southwestern counties of the province of Ontario. I drew the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the matter, feeling that he would be interested, or at all events should be interested, in the different agricultural industries which are carried on in all parts of the Dominion, and that he should endeavour to do something to assist the farmers in that particular industry.

The reply I received from the minister, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, was very cold consolation for the farmers to whom I referred. If I remember rightly, his letter referred me to the Minister of Labour, and told me that if there was a combine, the farmers could take the matter up under the Combines Act and possibly get some redress from that source. Whether the Department of Agriculture could do anything or not, it certainly did very little at that particular time in trying to assist the farmers who were engaged in the tobacco industry, or in endeavouring to find markets for the crops which they could not dispose of in that particular section of the country.

Time went on, things grew worse, and the farmers, feeling that they could not possibly continue in that industry unless something was done, made up their minds to come to Ottawa. They came to Ottawa and were received by hon. ministers of the Government. The Minister of Agriculture was absent, possibly unavoidably, at any rate he was not present, but I have never heard that he got any information from the ministers who received that delegation, or that he took any steps to assist them in the work in which they were interested. I can assure you, Sir, that on that occasion the deputation, which numbered between 200 and 300, and the members of which had paid their own fares from extreme points in the province of Ontario to Ottawa, and included many from the province of Quebec, went away after their courteous recep-

tion feeling that they would have some assistance from the Government of this country.

I remember the arguments that were advanced. They asked if the Government would change the excise duty to a customs duty. It was contended by the Minister of Finance, and by the other gentlemen who spoke on that occasion, that there was practically no difference so far as that was concerned. They asked for other concessions. I remember well that some of the farmers argued that there was a great difference between an excise duty and a customs duty, and that if the Government said that their request would be granted they would go home perfectly satisfied, feeling that they had accomplished something as a result of their trip to the capital of the Dominion.

Shortly afterwards I remember the Minister of Finance summoned some manufacturers of this country to meet him. The manufacturers, who numbered possibly four or five, had an interview with the minister, but the Government has done practically nothing since; certainly, nothing has been heard so far as assisting the tobacco growers is concerned.

After their visit to Ottawa the Ontario producers met Quebec consumers, and were able, by their own efforts, to dispose of a portion of their crop which they had in their barns at that particular time. The position is this: If the farmers cannot depend upon the Minister of Agriculture taking an interest in the crops which his department encourages the farmers to produce, to whom are the farmers to go for assistance in important matters of that kind? I understand that the people who are interested in this great industry are coming back to Ottawa to wait upon the Government again, and to see if there is not some possible way of assisting them. I hope that when they do return the Minister of Agriculture will be able to join his colleagues in receiving such an important body of men, and will see his way to give not only encouragement but some substantial assistance.

There is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the Government, particularly the Minister of Agriculture. There are many matters of importance connected with his department in which he seems to take very little interest. A year ago the farmers, not only of my county, but of other counties in the province of Ontario, were threatened with an epidemic of hog cholera, which threatened to wipe out the hog industry. At that time the farmers connected with one of the farmers' institutes in my county wrote to the minister and asked him to come and wait upon them and discuss the situation with the view of suggesting measures which would save those interested in the hog industry from great financial loss. What happened on that occasion? The Minister of Agriculture replied to those farmers that he was too busy to come and meet them. He was too busy at that time to go to the county of Kent and discuss that important question which was causing financial loss, but he was not too busy a short time before that to go and address a Conservative convention in the city of Chatham. The farmers took the matter up and one of the veterinaries came to the city of Chatham and heard the arguments of the farmers, and he left with an entirely different view of the situation from that he had formerly held. When the matter was brought up in this House, the Prime Minister made a note of the matter, and I believe he insisted upon the Minister of Agriculture taking steps to assist the hog industry. I repeat if you cannot depend on the Minister of Agriculture to look after the industries connected with his department, whom can we depend upon? A year ago the minister and his department, recommended the farmers to go in for wheat extensively. A few weeks ago I read in one of the Toronto papers an interview in which the deputy minister advised them not to go into wheat-growing extensively, but to curtail their wheat crops and go into cattle raising extensively. The result is that to-day in the province of Ontario, and particularly in the section I come from, we have not one-half the acreage in wheat which we had twelve months ago. What followed? The farmers curtailed their crops, and when the market opened they were receiving $1 a bushel for their wheat. A few farmers at that time disposed of it. I was one of the few who were fortunate enough to do so, and I got a dollar a bushel for a thousand bushels of wheat. But after that wheat began to drop; it went down from $1 to 95 cents, then 85 cents, then 80 cents, and finally as low as 75 cents a bushel. The men who were in humble circumstances in the province of Ontario had to dispose of their wheat at the smaller price. On the 24th November this Government commandeered 15,000,000 bushels of wheat. If my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has the confidence of his col-

leagues he should have known that this wheat was going to be commandeered in November. The minute that announcement was made by the Government the price of wheat began to go up until to-day we see that May wheat is quoted at $1.35 a bushel. The farmers who, after threshing, were forced to sell their wheat to pay their taxes, their rent, the interest on their mortgages, the notes that they had given for the things which it was necessary for them to procure to enable them to conduct their business, and generally to meet their liabilities, had to dispose of their wheat, and these men who were unable to hold it for the reasons I have enumerated, had to take a smaller price than that which the wealthy farmers, millers and elevator men were able to demand for the wheat which they had in store. We had a larger acreage of wheat in the province than usual, largely because of the campaign which had been carried on in 1914. The farmers should have been advised that there would be this demand for wheat by the Minister of Agriculture, whose duty it is to give information to the people who are depending upon him. I was glad that my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) woke up the Minister of Agriculture the other day to new life and vigour in this House, and I hope that an equal energy will characterize his administration of the department over which he presides.

Not only did the farmers in humble circumstances sustain a loss by the disposal of their wheat at this particular time, but the farmer has even a greater grievance against the Government than this. I refer to the scandals which have arisen in different parts of the country in connection with the purchase of horses for military purposes. The question of the purchase of horses by the Government was brought prominently before the House twelve months ago. After the late member for Kings, N.S., had been read out of the party by the right hon. the Prime Minister, we expected that we would hear no more about members or supporters of the Government taking a prominent part in the purchasing of horses. A year or two ago, when a great many horses of an inferior quality were thrown upon the market, it was advertised in the press of the country that this was the class of horses that was being shipped from Canada for war purposes. As far as the purchase of horses is concerned, we care not how much was made by certain men down in Kings county, N.S., but we do complain that, as a consequence of these men throwing an inferior class of horses upon the market, in order to make a few dollars, the reputation of Canadian horses has, to a certain extent, been ruined, to the great injury of our legitimate farmers, who, for many years, on the advice not only of the present Government, but of previous governments, have been endeavouring to make the horse industry one of the most important in this Dominion. But what do we find? We find that the same practices which occurred in Nova Scotia were repeated in Ontario. Considering the high regard that we all have for the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency we would scarcely expect that a similar ambition would manifest itself there; but in the constituency of the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Peel (Mr. Blain) we find that the Conservative member of the Provincial Legislature gets a contract and goes into the horse-buying business also.

Now, let us see what the press of the country says about these particular transactions. First, I shall read from the Toronto World, a good Conservative paper, which, I am sure, my hon. friends opposite will not object to me quoting. The World says:

> Tells Sir Charles Davidson, Royal Commissioner, of Sale of Horses for Army—Some Rejected Sold—Albert Kee, Brampton Liveryman, Says Horses Turned Down, Accepted After.
>
> Brampton, Dec. 1.—As a result of rumours that have been in circulation here for some time, an investigation regarding the buying of army horses in Peel county, dating back to August, 1914, was opened before Sir Charles Davidson, Royal Commissioner, here yesterday afternoon, John Thompson, K.C., of Ottawa, conducted the examination.
>
> The first witness called was E. J. Jones, a horse dealer of Brampton. He had, in partnership with James E. Fallis, also of Brampton, sold 360 horses in August, 1914, to the government agents, Col. Hall and Capt. McDonald. Fallis financed the business and received two-thirds of the profits, one-third being his share.
>
> To Mr. Thompson's inquiry as to the profits out of this sale of horses, Jones replied:
>
> "About $3,200. I received $1,000 and my partner about $2,000."

This Mr. Fallis was a member of the Legislature, and he received $2,000 and his partner $1,000. That is where the trouble began again.

What did the Toronto News say about the investigation? I will just read the headlines. As every hon. member of this House knows, this is one of the leading Conservative papers in the province:

Fifteen-Year-Old Horse sold at Brampton for the Army—Sir Charles Davidson continues investigation into Purchases—Deny Payments of Commission—One horse said to have been "fixed up" by Shoes.

I have another from the Toronto Star:

Davidson Probe at Brampton Wednesday—Too many Middlemen in the Horse Purchases for Government—A man who "helped"—Evidence not sensational, but "influence" was apparently a Requisite.

Then follows the report, which states that:

Twelve others were rejected. Some of these had been sold for war purposes later.

Witness declared that an inspector named Hall had first rejected and later purchased some of the horses.

Four or five of the rejected horses—possibly the whole 12—had been sold through Fallis.

Asked if he had paid any commission to anyone, he said he had given $110 in cash to E. J. Jones, a previous witness. This was after the rejected horses were purchased.

Here is another heading from the Toronto Star:

Jack-Spavined horse sound "in a sense"—Sold as Four Years Old, Although Age couldn't be estimated—Another was lazy—Would Balk when Heavily loaded—Royal Commission Investigates Purchases.

The Mail and Empire states practically the same thing:

Albert Kee, of Brampton, said that he had purchased 22 horses, but had only been able to dispose of eight of them at the outset to the Government. Subsequently five or six of the animals which had been at first rejected were accepted and sent to the Union Stock Yards in Toronto. He admitted that he had given E. J. Jones $110 after the inspection was over. Pressed for his reason for making the payment, he said that he thought Jones "had earned it."

"How had he earned it?" he was asked, and he replied, "He helped get the inspectors to our stables."

The Toronto Star again has a large headline:

Peel County War Horses not up to Standard—Local Veterinary says many could not stand up to the Work—Were bought by J. R. Fallis, M.P.P.—Conflicting evidence given as to Price asked by a Bolton Vendor.

I have a long editorial from the Toronto Globe. It is headed: "A Disgrace in Public Life." Many hon. members of this House have no doubt read this article. I have also a few clippings from the Conservative press which it would be in order to read to the members of the House. But I find that the Globe, on December 11, 1915, says:

J. R. Fallis, M.P.P., for Peel, confers with Premier.

What is to be done about Mr. J. R. Fallis, M.P.P., for Peel, who made handsome profits buying horses and selling them to the Government for military purposes? The question is taking up some of the time of Premier Hearst. Mr. Fallis had a lengthy conference with the Premier yesterday. Mr. Richard Blain, M.P., for Peel, was the third party in the conference, and was there presumably to assist Mr. Fallis in presenting his case.

Mr. Fallis greeted the newspapermen amiably, but said, holding up his hand, "I have nothing for you," and left with Mr. Blain. "I have nothing at all to say regarding the conference," said the Premier. No other member of the Cabinet was present with the Premier.

The Toronto Telegram of December 6, 1915, also has a strong editorial demanding the resignation of Mr. Fallis from the Provincial Legislature. The Toronto News strongly condemns the action of this gentleman. I could go on reading clippings to the same effect from leading newspapers throughout the country, but it is hardly necessary. I should just like to call attention to the following from the Toronto World of July 28, 1915:

Shipment of Horses on way to the War.

Two Grand Trunk railway trains loaded with army horses passed through Toronto yesterday en route from Chicago to Montreal. One of these trains had 50 cars, and the other 19, so that in all there were about 1,400 horses. At West Toronto the cars were unloaded the chargers to be exercised and watered, and horsemen who saw them were surprised at the quality of the selection. The horses were bought by the British military authorities in Chicago, and were rounded up in all the Western States.

A Grand Trunk railway official stated that since the declaration of war more than 80,000 horses have been shipped through Toronto on their way to the front.

Since that date many thousands more horses must have passed through this country from American points. The farmers of this country have a right to expect the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister to help them dispose of the large surplus of horses we have in this country, particularly in Ontario. But what do we find? Instead of helping the farmer, the Government imposes an embargo which prohibits the farmers of Ontario from shipping their horses just over the line to the State of Michigan, where, after paying $10 duty, they could dispose of these horses to the army buyers in the States. The Government did nothing to help the farmer until practically the very day before Parliament met, when an order in council was passed removing the embargo. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country are discouraged, and it is incumbent on the Minister of Agriculture or some other member of the Government to an-

nounce to this House and the country whether they intend to give any assistance to this great industry, or are going to follow the same unfortunate policy they have pursued in the past. Unless the horse industry is stimulated and encouraged, and the Government finds some way of disposing of the surplus horses we have on hand, the farmers will not raise so many horses in 1916 as they did in 1915. I think I have shown that the Government is neglecting this great industry.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that we were told some time ago the Cockshutt Plow Company were not going to raise their prices on agricultural implements because they were too patriotic. In conversation with a farmer the other day who had endeavoured to purchase a Cockshutt machine, I learned that he had been told by one of the Cockshutt agents that their prices had gone up all along the line. This hon. gentleman, who was so patriotic a year ago that he was complimented by the Prime Minister on his stand, has fallen from grace and is raising the price of agricultural implements to the farmers of this country. It is now rumored that there will be another increase in the tax on agricultural implements. I hope this will not take place. I appeal to the Government to be satisfied with the taxes they are already levying upon the farmers of this country, and in this connection let me quote from a speech made by the Minister of Labour in the city of Chatham during the Reciprocity campaign of 1911. I am quoting from the Chatham Daily Planet of July 31, 1911. The minister said:

> If the farmers went down (to Ottawa) they would get the same answer as the fruit growers got. The duty will remain on binders though. In other words, the duty will remain on everything the farmer buys, because Sir Wilfred says the duty will remain on manufactured goods. The duty—in other words, the taxes—will be removed in all things you produce and left on all things you have to buy. Is that fair taxation? Why, this agreement is directly in favour of the manufacturer instead of the farmer!

If the question of raising the duty comes up again, I hope the Minister of Labour will practice the same thing that he preached before the Conservative convention at Chatham on that day.

We have been told by different gentlemen in this House that questions of a contentious nature should not be brought up in the House at the present time. I contend that the matters I have had the privilege of bringing before the House are not contentious in any sense of the word. I have brought these matters to the attention of the ministers of the different departments, because if they give them their serious attention, it will be of great benefit to the farmers of my county and of Canada as a whole, and will greatly assist the manufacturers of my city, and labour generally. We shall then be in a better position to bear our share in the great war that is now going on. I appeal to the Government to give these matters their earnest consideration, and I feel satisfied that if they do so it will greatly assist us in doing what we are all interested in, that is to carry this war through to a successful conclusion.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate, and should not have done so had it not been for an unfair and, to my mind, most unwarranted attack made by an hon. member of this House upon an officer in His Majesty's service.

As you can understand, the people of the province which has given to public life in Canada a Howe, a Tupper, a Thompson and a Borden, are jealous of the reputation and standing of their public men. They rejoice when these public men achieve distinction, and are disappointed when they fail to measure up to the full stature of a man in public affairs. It was, therefore, with extreme regret that I heard from the lips of an hon. gentleman representing a Nova Scotia constituency such remarks as on Wednesday were made by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie.) And I venture to say that his unseemly attack will similarly bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of those of his own political friends in the province of Nova Scotia and outside of it who are concerned in the effective prosecution of the war.

When the war broke out one of the very first to volunteer from the province of Nova Scotia, and to place his services unqualifiedly at the disposal of his King, was Major Muirhead. He had served for many years as an officer in the active militia. He had spared neither time nor effort to secure military instruction, and on the outbreak of war he was well fitted to render military service to his King and country. He possesses a long and honourable record in the active militia; and, holding at that time the rank of major, so anxious was he to participate in the war that he offered his services in any capacity, and was willing

to go as a private, if necessary, in order that he might have an opportunity of reaching the front and confronting the enemy.

For nine months Major Muirhead has been in the trenches, and for the last four months of that period he has been a member and in charge of a bombing party, which you know, Sir, is the most dangerous branch of the service. Because of the gallant character of his services at the front and by reason of merit alone he has been appointed major in the 112th regiment now being mobilized in Nova Scotia. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) says that Major Muirhead has been promoted. A major he was in the active militia, a major he is in the overseas force. I will agree with the hon. member that a transfer from the active militia force to the overseas force is promotion, but of a different character perhaps from that which my hon. friend had in his mind. Muirhead still retains the rank of major which he had before.

It is this soldier with this sort of a record that my hon. friend shows the extreme patriotism and courtesy to attack, sheltered as he is by the privileges of this House and with the safe distance of 800 miles intervening between him and the object of his spleen.

As the House may have surmised, this matter is connected with an election trial, which took place in Victoria county, N.S. Unfortunately it would appear that irregularities were practised in this contest on both sides. Unfortunately some friends of the Conservative candidate thought it necessary to fight fire with fire, and were led to combat the political methods with which the friends of my hon. friend had so well familiarized the constituency with practices of a similar character. With that canniness which so eminently characterizes my hon. friend from North Cape Breton, legal proceedings were not pressed by his friends until the time had elapsed during which, under the Nova Scotia Act, personal actions for bribery might be brought against Liberal workers, who, I may say, were under the direction of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman was himself present at this election trial in question; in fact, he acted as one of the counsel. He had every facility for being correctly advised on the matters with which he attempted to deal when he attempted to speak on Wednesday. It would be unparliamentary for me to say that the hon. member deliberately and maliciously misled the House in respect to the matters to which he referred. I am, however, bound to assert that notwithstanding the facilities for knowledge of the facts which he had at his disposal, the statements which he made to the House are absolutely and patently incorrect and untrue.

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman states that I made statements which were absolutely and patently untrue. Will he please repeat what I stated and what he says is untrue?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the point of order is well taken, and I would like the hon. member to withdraw the expression "untrue."

Mr. McCURDY: The hon. member for North Cape Breton has asked me to state in what regard his statements are absolutely and patently incorrect and untrue, and with your permission, Sir, I shall have pleasure in doing so. On page 316 of the Unrevised Hansard, we have the following statement by the hon. member for North Cape Breton:

> If the Prime Minister, or anybody else who cares to look the matter up, will turn to the files of the Halifax Herald—the organ of the right hon. gentleman—of a few days ago, they will find on the front page the picture of a distinguished gentlemen who some time ago fled the country on the pretext that he was going to the war. He will find that this gentleman is back in Nova Scotia with the title of major, and that he is going to be given a battalion in the province of Nova Scotia and sent back to the front. Why was he sent away? Why did he leave the country? He left the country, Sir, because the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was entering upon a trial at that time, in which trial he has been found guilty of forgery; in which, in not less than eight cases, he has been found guilty of being an accessory before and after the fact to perjury. He was blacklisted and disqualified by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and under that cloud he left the country.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is all true.

Mr. McCURDY (reading):

> But he came back—he came back promoted to the position of major, and he is to-day honoured and petted and advanced in the county of Halifax, where the patronage belongs to the Prime Minister, and with the knowledge that the records of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia prove to the hilt everything that I say in respect of him.

Was it fair, was it honourable, was it truthful, for the hon. gentleman to assert that Major Muirhead fled the country on the pretext that he was going to the war? The hon. gentleman cannot deny that when Major Muirhead enlisted for service at the front, there was no charge against him of any kind, and that it was only after he

had been gone for months that his name incidentally figured in an election trial begun many weeks after he had gone overseas. What does the hon. gentleman mean when he says:

> Major Muirhead fled the country on the pretext that he was going to the war.

Does he wish to intimate that Major Muirhead has not actually participated in the war? Will he deny that the major has for the last eight months faced death in every form in the defence of the rights and privileges which my hon. friend to-day enjoys in ease and without privation? When the hon. gentleman says:

> Major Muirhead left the country, because the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was entering upon a trial at that time, in which trial he has been found guilty of forgery; and in which, in not less than eight cases, he has been found guilty of being an accessory before and after the fact to perjury.

The hon. gentleman says something which he has every facility for ascertaining is absolutely and patently untrue.

Mr. McKENZIE: As a member of this House I have a right to protect myself. I was quoting a matter of record of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and I consider that the record is open to my hon. friend, and the record will show that I was not wrong at all.

Mr. McCURDY: I have not the honour of being as familiar with the practices of that court as is my hon. friend. I have not had the privilege of being a practicing barrister before the courts of Nova Scotia, nor of being a judge of the County Court of Nova Scotia, but I do affirm and my hon. friend cannot controvert my statement that the record of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia gives no warrant for my hon. friend's assertion that Major Muirhead was ever disqualified by that Supreme Court. Furthermore, at that trial Major Muirhead was not found guilty of perjury; he was not even charged with perjury; he had no notice before he enlisted, nor before he went overseas that he would figure in any way in the trial, and consequently he had not the slightest opportunity of rebutting references to him which were disclosed as the trial proceeded. I have the personal assurance of the major himself that had he been present he could have absolutely absolved himself from any blame in connection with the election in question in any way whatever, and I accept his statement without the slightest reserve.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton has also deemed it his duty to attack an officer of the 85th Battalion now quartered at Halifax, Dr. Joseph Hayes. He states that Dr. Hayes was made a colonel by the present Minister of Militia. Once again the hon. gentleman's statements are at absolute variance with the facts. He has not even taken the trouble to look up the militia list which is available to every member of this House and to every citizen of this country. Like some other members on the opposite side of the House, he satisfies himself with making assertions although the proof that these assertions are unfounded is open to any person who will take the trouble to seek it. Dr. Hayes received his commission as colonel while the Liberal Minister of Militia was in office six or seven years before 1911. Does the hon. member for North Cape Breton question the truth of that statement? Furthermore, Colonel Hayes received his appointment with the 85th Regiment, with which he is now connected, on the recommendation of the officer now commanding that regiment. The name of that officer was mentioned in the House the other day by the Minister of Militia. It is no secret that this officer stated that in the election of 1911 he went from Ottawa to Halifax and personally marshalled the members of the force there to vote against the present Prime Minister of this country. Colonel Borden has himself stated that he, and he alone, was responsible for the appointment of that officer. Furthermore, Colonel Borden has assured me within the past two weeks that he would not know where to look for a more efficient officer than Colonel Hayes. He says that no more satisfactory and capable officer could possibly be found.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton criticises Dr. Hayes' appointment as medical officer of the 85th Regiment on the ground that he is a Tory. Why did he not criticise the appointment of Dr. J. A. Sponagle as medical officer of the 25th Battalion on the ground that he is a Grit?

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to be able to state that no Conservative member in this Parliament, and I believe no Conservative in the country, has ever been guilty of attacking Colonel Sponagle or any of the numerous other Liberal officers who have received just recognition and promotion on the ground of

9 p.m.

their party affiliations. It remained for statesmen of the stature of my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) the hon member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) to introduce a discordant and unprovoked element into a branch of the service, which, of all others, should be immune from such attacks.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton states that in the county of Halifax, to quote his own words, "the vilest sort of partisans are put at the head of battalions in the highest positions that they can be given." Who are these "vile partisans" of whom he complains? The last battalion to complete mobilization in the province of Nova Scotia is the 85th. Colonel Allison H. Borden, to whom I have already referred, is the first in command of that regiment. Who is the second in command? Colonel N. H. Parsons, one of the strongest and most active Liberal workers in the county of Kings, a gentleman who quite recently has been addressing Liberal clubs in the Annapolis valley. As to Paymaster Morrison, who, I think, comes from the hon. gentleman's own part of the country, is he to be branded a "vile partisan"? The third officer in command of this battalion is Major Day, whose residence in the United States has removed him from close connection with party associations in this country. He is a splendid type of the expatriated Canadian who in this great emergency have returned to Canada to offer their lives and their all to defend the land of their birth and to ensure the triumph of the cause of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the sturdy soldiers who compose that regiment, particularly those from the county which the hon. member represents, would say to the hon. gentleman, who would state, on his responsibility as a member of this House, that the officers in command of this regiment—Colonel Borden, Colonel Parsons, Major Day, Paymaster Morrison and the other officers of this popular and efficient staff—are "the vilest sort of partisans." I take the responsibility, in their absence and on their behalf, of publicly branding that statement as one absolutely untruthful, unfortunate, and regrettable, one that should not have been made either in this House or out of this House.

Mr. McKENZIE: I never made the statement at all.

Mr. McCURDY: I will refer to the hon. gentleman's statement as reported at page 316 of the unrevised Hansard:

> But I do charge, in the presence of the Prime Minister, who is a Nova Scotian of whom we are proud, that in the county of Halifax, where I hold him responsible for the patronage, the vilest sort of partisans are put at the head of battalions in the highest possible positions that they can be given.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is absolutely true.

Mr. McCURDY: The highest position in the battalion is that of colonel. The latest battalion mobilized in Nova Scotia is the 85th, of which Colonel Borden is the respected, efficient, and honoured commanding officer.

Mr. McKENZIE: I had no reference to Colonel Borden.

Mr. McCURDY: If the hon. member for North Cape Breton does not refer to Colonel Borden, I would ask him to whom he does refer. There are only two regiments quartered in Halifax—

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman wants to know, I had two men in mind, two men blacklisted and condemned by the Supreme Court,—Muirhead and Hayes. These are the only two I had in mind, and I have the record of the Supreme Court to back me up.

Mr. McCURDY: I would suggest to my hon. friend from North Cape Breton, in view of his confession at this time, that he can properly be more particular in the statements he makes in this House. It is not too much to expect that hon. gentlemen who make statements in this House reflecting upon the character of others should be most particular as to what they say. But apparently my hon. friend has imbibed the spirit which has been characteristic of some hon. gentlemen opposite during the course of this debate—that of being ready to make charges and assertions without having the proofs to back them up. The language which my hon. friend used was most explicit. He said that those who hold the highest commissions in these regiments are the vilest sort of partisans. That narrows the case down to the highest officers of the regiment, and, necessarily, so far as I can see, includes the colonels of the 85th and 64th regiments.

I think it is extremely unfortunate and most regrettable that any reference should be made to the politics of the men who are fighting for their country at

the present time. I believe, furthermore, that the references that have been made in this connection are most repugnant to them and most repugnant to the people of the country at large. If there is to be no truce in this Parliament, if there is to be no truce upon the hustings, hon. gentlemen opposite should at least afford to declare a truce with regard to the army itself. Surely men may be allowed to go to the discharge of their duties without being attacked for political affiliations one way or the other.

I can fully appreciate the fact that the provincial by-election, which so emphatically pronounced against Grit methods in the province of Nova Scotia, should be a point of extreme soreness on the part of my hon. friend. More than once has this House listened to the lamentations of this modern Jeremiah, who quotes so glibly from Holy Writ. There is a reason for the hon. gentleman's woe. Victoria county is a part of his own constituency, and in the election referred to a Liberal majority of 500 was converted into a substantial Conservative majority. It would appear, therefore, that this election points with unmistakable finger to the goal of political oblivion to which my hon. friend is fast hastening.

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall be glad to meet the hon. gentleman if he wants a test in Victoria county.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McCURDY: My hon. friend would be glad to meet me or some one else there; my opinion is that he will have sufficient opposition without me.

In his speech the hon. gentleman pretended to see indications that the country was returning to the Liberal faith. But I noticed that he had to go a long way from home for consolation. Why does he go so far afield? Why does he not pay attention to his own county of Victoria? Why should he look to the politics of British Columbia, of Manitoba, of even Prince Edward Island, or New Brunswick, for consolation? Why does he not cast his practised eye on the political situation in the province of Nova Scotia? Since the last general election in that province four local contests have been held in counties which have been looked on as having strong Liberal proclivities; to quote the classic language of my hon. friend, they are known as "Grit hives." In every one of these cases—Liberals had represented three of the four of them previous to the by-elections—the electors pronounced strongly and unmistakably against the party to which my hon. friend belongs.

The political mentor of my hon. friend in the province of Nova Scotia, the Hon. George H. Murray, years ago had a slogan: "Trust the people." The result of the elections to which I have referred has evidently convinced him that he is not altogether safe when he trusts the people. In fact, they say in Nova Scotia that he has changed his motto from "Trust the people" to "Safety first." Would it surprise you, Mr. Speaker, to know that the riding of Victoria has been vacant over a year; that my hon. friend's own constituents were denied the privilege of representation in the last session of the Provincial Legislature, and will be denied that privilege in the coming session, because, forsooth, acting possibly on the advice of the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria, the Premier of that province feels that it is unsafe to trust the people to fill the long existing vacancy in the local House for the county of Cape Breton.

With a splendid show of public spirit the hon. gentleman pretended to take great pride in the fact that "from the start to the finish of the present war the yeomanry of Canada were ready to sacrifice their lives and property and everything near and dear to them for the general advancement of our country, and to lay everything within their reach upon the altar of our country." I would respectfully commend to my hon. friend the advisability of his profiting by this splendid example set by the yeomanry of Canada. But while this attitude is being assumed by our yeomanry, what is to be said of those who from their position should be regarded as leaders in this country? It is to be said that, while the yeomanry of Canada are making such splendid and heroic sacrifices for the liberties that we enjoy, the only people to refuse to make sacrifices are those to whom the people ought to be able to look for leadership in Canada? While the yeomanry of Canada, as my hon. friend says, are sacrificing their all for their country, and brave soldiers like Major Muirhead are holding life itself cheap that the interests of the country may be advanced, a small critic gives us the spectacle of being unwilling to forego the opportunity of venting his personal spite and spleen for one moment in the interests of unity and national strength.

Mr. ARTHUR B. COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, since the opening of this, the third war session of this Parliament a great many admirable addresses have been delivered by gentlemen on both sides of the House, addresses which, I am sure, as showing the strong feeling of loyalty and patriotism with which members of this House are imbued, must appeal to the country as a whole. I am sure, Sir, that no one could listen to or read those addresses without feeling that every member of this House, on which ever side of the Speaker he may sit, is prepared, as he has been prepared since the beginning of the war, to do his part to bring this world conflict, which is shaking the British Empire to her very foundations, to a successful and triumphant conclusion.

My hon. friends opposite have, at least to a certain degree, questioned the right of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to offer criticism, or to make charges in regard to the administration of the affairs of this country, offering as a reason for taking this course that, because the country is at war, we should not offer criticism and thus embarrass the Government. Now, I am sure that the hon. member who has just left the chamber, and who addressed the House a few moments ago (Mr. F. B. McCurdy) will pardon me if I do not attempt to answer anything personal he has said in regard to my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). That is a matter in which I do not care to join, even if I had the facts to discuss it intelligently, which I have not, as it is a matter apparently of veracity between the members who represent Nova Scotia on the other side of the House and the hon. members who represent that province on this side.

But I would like to refer to one remark which my hon. friend made. He said it was an unfortunate thing that reference should be made to the politics of men who were engaged in this war. I agree with the sentiment expressed by my hon. friend, but I would remind him, and other hon. gentlemen opposite, that it can be no greater crime to refer to the politics of men who are engaged in this war than it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to select men because of their politics to fill places in the army service during the war.

My hon. friend spent some minutes in discussing the recent elections in the province of Nova Scotia. Is it possible that my hon. friend has a nightmare in regard to elections in Nova Scotia or elsewhere at the present moment? Nothing has been said in the debate on the address about elections in the province of Nova Scotia, or in the Dominion of Canada, so far as I have heard, and when the hon. member takes up the time of this House to tell us what has happened in the province of Nova Scotia I should just like to point out that my hon. friend's friends in that province and elsewhere have proved very poor prophets indeed in the past.

I wish to refer for a moment or two to the question of our right to criticise the actions of the Government in regard to what we consider questions of great public importance. I lay down the proposition that fair criticism is in order and proper at all times. My hon. friends opposite say that we are offering unfair criticism, and thus embarrassing the Government. My hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) this afternoon, and other hon. gentlemen opposite during the progress of this debate have said, Cannot you find something of which you can say some words of commendation in regard to the Government? Why do you always find fault? Surely some little thing may be said to encourage the Government in regard to public matters on which they are occupied at the present time. Well, Sir, I would not for one moment detract from any member of the Government; but surely the hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches at the present time should be satisfied with the congratulations showered upon them by their hon. friends who sit behind them, and not expect so much congratulation from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I am bound to say, Sir, that in many respects the Government have conducted the affairs of this war in an energetic way, and they are entitled to all the credit which their actions may bring to them. But I desire to say to my hon. friends opposite, who claim that we on this side of the House are showering upon them unfair criticism, that it is just as incumbent upon them to put up a fair defence to their actions as that we should criticise fairly, which we hope to do.

When the other day my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in the few quiet, well considered remarks which he made to this House, offered the suggestion that some things had not been right, and that the business of this country under the control of the present Administration had not been properly conducted, a terrible wave of disturbance affected our hon.

friends opposite. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) went so far as to say that the hon. member for St. John had isolated himself. He did not say from whom he had isolated himself—whether he had isolated himself from the affections of hon. gentlemen opposite or from the public. But let me say to my hon. friend that the remarks and suggestions offered by the hon. member for St. John in regard to the administration of the public affairs of this country were made fearlessly and straightforwardly from his place in this House, and hon. gentlemen opposite have not yet answered the charges he made; they have never attempted to answer them. What was the reply of my hon. friend the Solicitor General to the hon. member for St. John in regard to the manufacturing of shells in this country? He said: "I am not here to defend the Shell Committee; I am not here to say anything good, bad or indifferent in regard to the Shell Committee; they were a creature of the Imperial Government; they are answerable for their actions to the Imperial Government, and this Government has nothing at all to do with them." Well, Mr. Speaker, I take issue with my hon. friend in regard to that matter, to which I will refer a little later.

Meantime, I wish to refer to the unfair defence made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). When my hon friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) spoke the other day, I was not surprised to hear him read from Hansard some of the remarks that fell from the lips of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition during the war session of Parliament in August, 1914. I was not surprised to hear him quote the statement of the right hon leader of the Opposition that he was not here to oppose, not even to criticise, the actions of the Government in regard to this war. I was not even surprised to hear my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) make a similar reference this afternoon; but I was surprised at the manner in which my hon. friends the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a man from my own province, and having the experience he has had in the Parliament of New Brunswick and for a time here, dealt with that speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, a speech that will remain in the memory of the people of Canada for all time as a loyal and patriotic utterance. I say that when the hon. gentleman made these remarks he blazed a trail that those who come after him will follow for many years all over this great Dominion, and it will be a very good example for them to follow. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries attempted to make this House and the country believe that my right hon. friend had announced that, irrespective of how long this war lasted, and, irrespective of how many sessions of this Parliament might have passed away, our mouths would be at all times closed and criticism would be forced back even if we saw that wrong was being done by the Government in regard to this war. That is the stand I take before the House in regard to this matter. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made other arguments in support of the defence which he attempted to put forward in answer to my hon. friend in regard to other matters to which I will refer later.

Now, I will take a few moments to refer to the war. The war question has been uppermost in the minds of the people and the members of this House since this Parliament opened. To enable us to do our part in this war there are certain general requirements that are absolutely necessary: First, we must have money; second, we must have men; third, we must have proper munitions and equipment; and fourth, we must have proper control and direction of the men on the field of battle. I now propose to discuss the subjects in regard to the war which I have placed under these four headings.

First, in regard to the money. I would like to lay down this proposition, that under our Constitution, Parliament is responsible for providing the money required for this or any other public purpose, and the Government must be responsible to Parliament and the people for the proper expenditure of the money provided and the manner in which it is expended. I think that is a fair proposition, and I believe it is one that every hon. member will agree with. I want to ask any hon. gentleman in this House or any man in this country, where he can place his finger upon any question, any objection, any criticism, that any hon. member on this side of the House has raised in regard to the voting of money that the Government required for the carrying on of the war? Not one word of opposition has been spoken. Every dollar of the money that the Government have asked for has been voted freely and cheerfully for this purpose.

The next question that naturally follows,

after you have the money provided, is that of the proper expenditure of this money. I contend that it is not only the privilege but the duty of every hon. member of this House to see to it that the money is properly expended; and, if he believes that a mistake has been made, it is his duty, his bounden duty, to bring it to the attention of Parliament and the country.

I feel it to be my duty, under these conditions, to refer to some expenditures that have been made and to the way that the business has been carried on in regard to the war. The first question that I shall discuss briefly is the question of the Shell Committee. My hon. friends opposite say that they had no connection with, and no responsibility for, the Shell Committee. This Shell Committee was appointed by the Government, they claim, at the request of the Imperial Government. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) claims that the Government was in no way responsible for what that Committee did. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) took the opposite ground, and when he found that the Shell Committee had been divorced by the Solicitor General, and after my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had reminded the House that it was a baby left on somebody's doorstep, the Minister of Militia stepped in and claimed the honour of the parentage of the Shell Committee, and said that he would stand behind the committee to the last button on its jacket. There are many good reasons for the Minister of Militia being loyal to the Shell Committee, as it was he who organized it, it was his creation. But the other members of the Government are not so anxious to stand behind the Shell Committee. They are prepared to throw it aside. They say: we have no further use for it; the Government has divorced it. The statement of the Solicitor General that he had divorced the Shell Committee from the Government is an admission that they have been very closely allied at some time during their existence, or there would be no reason for a divorce one from the other. So it seems to me that this Government must be held absolutely and solely responsible for the actions of the Shell Committee in regard to giving contracts for the manufacture of munitions of war during the time that it was in charge of these operations.

My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) the other day mentioned many of the manufacturers to whom contracts were given for the manufacture of shells by the Shell Committee, travelling almost from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I want to refer to a few in my own province of New Brunswick, and I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the unfair way in which he attempted to defend the Government in regard to the giving of contracts for shells in that province. He referred to the McAvity firm, which had received a contract, and, when my hon. friend from St. John was addressing this House the other day, the minister threw across the floor the statement that the Liberal party had no right to offer criticisms in regard to the giving of contracts to Messrs. McAvity because, forsooth, they were Liberals.

I am not here to enter into a personal discussion. There is no business house in the province of New Brunswick that I would sooner see get a contract than Messrs. McAvity, because the Government may depend upon it that they will deliver the goods in a workmanlike manner. But I take issue at once with hon. gentlemen opposite who say that we must not criticise because a certain Liberal got such and such a contract. I care not one jot whether the man who gets the contract is a Liberal or a Conservative. If he has been paid too much, the Government or the Shell Committee are to blame, and not the man himself. If the price paid has been excessive, this Government is to blame, because the Shell Committee is of its own creation, and this Government has to bear the responsability.

My hon. friend in the course of his remarks, travelled to my county, and you will remember with what a smile he looked across at me when he spoke of the contracts let in the county of Westmorland. He mentioned that the Record Foundry and Machine Company got a contract. He told us that Clifford Robinson was president of that company, and F. E. Dennison, treasurer, and then he almost whispered that the hon. Governor Wood was also a large stockholder. But he did not tell the House that Mr. F. W. Sumner was also a large shareholder, or that when the president of the company went to meet the Shell Committee in Montreal last spring he took Mr. Sumner with him to help secure the contract. If my hon. friend would have this country believe that the contract was given to that company because Mr. Robinson was a Liberal, and that therefore we on this side of the House

must keep our mouths closed, let me say that if there is any man in the province of New Brunswick to whom my hon. friend owes allegiance, it is Governor Josiah Wood, who is also a very large stockholder in this concern. It was through that gentleman's resigning his position in the Red Chamber here to accept a more lucrative position that my hon. friend was given easy entrance into this House. Would it not have been better if my hon. friend had frankly told the House the names of all the persons interested in that Record Foundry and Machine Company? That company was promised a contract of 20,000 shells at the price of the first contract, but when they had prepared their plant they were given a contract for only 10,000 shells. Was that because Mr. Robinson or some other gentleman in the company was a Liberal? It is well that we should know the whole facts of the case.

I now come to the Charles Fawcett Manufacturing Company in my own town. While these gentlemen are political opponents of mine, and always have been, there is no concern in the whole province of New Brunswick or even further afield that is better equipped to carry out a contract than this firm. The Minister of Militia has told us that he had great difficulty in getting manufacturers to embark in this business of manufacturing shells—that the Government had almost to go to the banks to get them to finance the manufacturers. That may have been true of some shell-makers, but on behalf of this organization, let me say that they did not need anybody to finance them, as they were well able to do it themselves. They have been turning out shells now for some considerable time. I am glad that the Fawcett Manufacturing Company got that order. My objection is that no one has a right to get a contract for making shells at a higher price than is reasonable.

I have a short statement which shows that in the province of New Brunswick the following firms had contracts for shells: Cornwall and York Cotton Mills, St. John, N.B., 25,000 shrapnel shells, at $3.80 each; Charles Fawcett Company, 20,000 4.5 howitzer shells at $6; James Fleming, St. John, N.B.,—— 4.5 howitzer shells at $6; Maritime Foundry and Machine Company, Chatham, N.B., 20,000 howitzer shells at $6; T. McAvity and Sons, St. John, N.B., 10,000 4.5 howitzer shells at $6.70, and 20,000 at $6; the Smith Foundry Company, Fredericton, N.B., 20,000 4.5 howitzer shells at $6. The Cornwall and York Cotton Mills got $3.80 apiece for machining and assembling these shells. About the same time another firm, the Electric Steel and Metals Company, of Welland, which I understand is largely controlled by Mr. Carnegie, a member of the Shell Committee, got an order for 25,000 shells at $5 apiece; that is an advance of $1.20 over the other firm. The Canadian Car and Foundry Company of Montreal, of which I believe Senator Curry is president and one of the largest owners of stock, also got an order at the same time for making shells at $5.15 apiece. I should like to know why all these firms were not paid the same price for manufacturing shells. At Sackville the Charles Fawcett Company got a contract for 20,000 4.5 howitzer shells at $6 apiece. The Canadian Car and Foundry Company got an order for 50,000 shells at $6.70. Why the increased price? I claim that that is absolute evidence that there was some influence somewhere that caused the Shell Committee to give these contracts out at these different prices. We go a little further and we find that the James Flemming concern of St. John, N.B., got a contract for shells at $6 the same prices as the Fawcett Company received. The Montreal Locomotive Company of Montreal, Que., got orders for 10,000 shells at $6.70 and 150,000 at $6 per shell. The Maritime Foundry and Machine Company of Chatham got a contract for 20,000 shells at $6. The Macdonald Thresher Company of Stratford got a contract for 16,000 shells at $6. We find Messrs. McAvity and Sons of St. John, N.B., supplying 10,000 of the same size of shell to which I have referred at $6.70 and 20,000 at $6, and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company of New Glasgow, owned by a member of the Shell Committee, got their first contract for 25,000 shells at $6.70, and a second for 25,000 at $6.50 at practically the same time that these other concerns were being paid $6. I draw the attention of the House to these facts, and with these facts before us we naturally expect explanations why different prices have been paid to different manufacturers of shells getting contracts at the same time.

Mr. RHODES: Can the hon. member tell us whether the delivery points in all cases were the same? Does not that fact account for the difference in price?

Mr. COPP: I do not know. I have the facts before me that these were the contract prices.

Mr. RHODES: Quite so.

Mr. COPP: The freight charges are not added on to the prices.

Mr. RHODES: You should have the delivery points.

Mr. COPP: I have not the delivery points. Does my hon. friend say from his knowledge in regard to this Shell Committee, that the difference in the delivery points explains the difference in the prices?

Mr. RHODES: I have not particular knowledge of the shell contracts to which the hon. member refers; but I have information, not from the Shell Committee, but from those who have contracts for shells, that prices vary according to the circumstances.

Mr. COPP: Will my hon. friend tell me where these different shipments are to be delivered for shipment to the Old Country?

Mr. RHODES: I do not know.

Mr. COPP: Then my hon. friend does not know much more than I do about this subject in regard to point of delivery.

Mr. RHODES: I am not discussing it; you are. I want to know how much you know about the matter.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend asked me a question. There is enough Scotch in me to ask him one in return. I shall be very glad if my hon. friend can give me some good reason why the delivery points should make the difference in the price.

Mr. ROGERS: Were the contracts all entered into at the same time?

Mr. COPP: Practically at the same time.

Mr. RHODES: It would cost more to tranship shells from Sackville to New York than from Montreal to New York.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Shells could be sent around the world for seventy cents.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend says that it would cost more to pay the freight on a shell from Sackville to New York than from Montreal to New York.

Mr. RHODES: There is the cost of transportation of steel, and there are many other considerations which cause variations in the prices.

Mr. COPP: I grant there are many considerations, and there were many considerations in regard to the letting of these contracts by the Shell Committee. The Fawcett Company is at Sackville, which is a small place, and it is not so closely in touch with the Shell Committee as the Canadian Car and Foundry Company, of which Senator Curry is president. If we get down to brass tacks, that is the condition, and that is why these gentlemen are getting more for their contracts than are the people in Sackville, St. John, Chatham and Fredericton.

My hon. friend the Minister of Militia attempted yesterday, in a very cordial, genial, and pleasant way, to explain the condition of affairs in regard to matters that are being looked after by himself, or by his adopted child, as he calls the Shell Committee. I do not intend to follow all the arguments made by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. He glossed over, very creditably indeed to himself, many things, and he kept the House in good humour, to say the least, while he was giving as little information as he possibly could in regard to this Shell Committee. For one thing, Sir, you will note that he spent a considerable amount of time in telling this Parliament and the people of this country that, irrespective of the fact that this is a Conservative Administration, or, to be more correct, a Conservative-Nationalist Administration, it apparently selected seventy-five or eighty per cent. of Liberals to do its work throughout this country. Did my hon. friend seriously expect—I do not wonder that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) laughs—this House to believe that that has been the case during the past three years? Not at all. It has been just the reverse. I am not here to criticise hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to that point, nor to say anything in regard to the political affiliations of the men whom they appoint to do their work if they will only do it well; but there has been a great deal of discussion and many extracts have been placed upon Hansard during this debate in regard to this matter. My hon. friends opposite took refuge behind an editorial in the Ottawa Free Press, in which an attack was made on the hon. member for the city of St. John because of his attitude towards the Shell Committee, and submarines, and other things in which this Government and this country is interested. I have no quarrel with the Free Press in regard to its

attitude in matters of this kind. It is absolutely free to discuss public questions as it sees fit. But I was surprised to find that hon. gentlemen were prepared to accept the dictum and the doctrine of the Free Press in order to prove their statements in regard to matters brought up in this House. I do not think that I can make a better answer to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia than to read a short editorial which appeared in a journal published in the city of Montreal under date of Friday, the 28th day of January. It is the last word in regard to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite will not complain when I tell them that I am reading from the Montreal Daily Mail, which is not a paper supporting the Opposition:

Sir Sam Hughes' statement in Parliament, that the jamming of the Ross rifles was due to the ammunition—in which the Lee-Enfield share—and that the rifles were changed in bore in consequence is a remarkable one. It is reminiscent of the boy who bought a bridle and then asked his father to get for him a horse which fitted that part of the harness.

It is a fair question to ask why Sir Sam did not place before Parliament, in its entirety, the official British War Office report dealing with this point? He, or the Government, is alleged to have that report in hand.

If that is correct—and we are bound to take it with some degree of assurance, because a public newspaper of the reputation of the Montreal Daily Mail must have information, as it is close to the Government in regard to these matters—the hon. gentleman did not give us all the information he had. (Reading):

Sir Sam's excuses for the Ross rifle at the present stage of its existence are not quite so strenuous, but we believe quite as illogical and unworthy of acceptance, as were his apologetics when Mark I and II of the Arm were being financed by the Dominion Treasury and concurrently discarded for cause. The Ross rifle scrap heap, and the maimed users of that arm, in contrast to his declarations in its early stages, are too monumental to easily be forgotten.

Will not Sir Sam tell us where the defective ammunition was made? Whose the responsibility? We are much concerned.

The people of Canada are much concerned to know who made this defective ammunition.

It is not so long since that Sir Sam launched an attack, of the stereotyped Hughes quality, at the head of Mr. D. A. Thomas for the reason that the latter gentleman questioned the economic and other capabilities of the old Shell Committee. Sir Sam then asserted in his vigorous, cock-sure manner, that all was well and no change was required or would be tolerated.

[Mr. Copp.]

But a change has been made, a reduction in price was brought about, and an increased production was thus secured. And now Sir Sam quotes this right-about-face as a justification of his wisdom or initiative.

Like "Julia," in "Don Juan," Sir Sam vowing he'd ne'er consent consented.

General Hughes' comparison of shell prices in Canada and those in the United States, like a great many other statements made in his speech on the Address, are based upon information, the source of bona fides of which he does not establish or reveal.

If these statements are in keeping with the General's allegations as to the politics of some of the so-called "mushroom" manufacturers of shells in Canada, they are not worth considering. We are in a position to say that he has named exceedingly good Conservatives in the "mushroom" business and styled them Liberals.

There is the direct statement that the hon. gentleman has set down as Liberals a number of men who are Conservatives in an attempt to convince the people that he was absolutely fair in the administration of his office.

We believe that General Sir Sam Hughes has rendered his party and the Government of Canada a real service by reason of the nature of his latest statements.

It would be unfortunate for both his party and the Government, when a formal investigation into the operations of the old Shell Committee is asked for—and there is no good reason for a refusal of that inquiry—if General Sir Sam Hughes' speech in reply to the address would be quoted, as against possible probable or even existent evidence now in the hands of those who demand that the truth shall be known in the public interest.

If the statement of the Minister of Militia falls on deaf ears so far as one of the strongest newspaper supporters of the Administration is concerned, how can any one wonder that it is received with a certain degree of incredulity if not suspicion by hon. members on this side of the House and by the people as a whole?

Now I come to the subject of recruiting. I am at one with the Government in believing that everything possible should be done to raise the large number of men that we have undertaken to raise by the statement made by the minister at the opening of the year. But, as my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) stated, we are undertaking a very difficult job. In the province of New Brunswick and in the county of Westmorland we have raised what we consider a very large number of recruits in comparison with the number of men we have to draw upon, and recruiting is still going on. I want to put myself on record as saying that I care not if the Minister of Militia chooses Conservative colonels, majors, lieutenants or any-

10 p.m.

thing else, that is not going in any way to interfere with me, or with the Liberal party in the county of Westmorland, doing everything possible to carry on the work of recruiting.

My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) brought to the attention of the Government a very important matter, and I trust that the Government will take it into early and favourable consideration, that is, the matter of pensions. I had intended to quote a few lines from the pamphlet which has already been referred to in this debate, but I find that it is not among my notes. But I believe that that pamphlet gives to this Government and to the country a great many valuable suggestions on a very important subject. I do not strongly object if the Government decide that an officer of high rank is entitled to a much higher pension than the private soldier. That is a matter for them to consider. But, on behalf of the ordinary soldier—and I may say that a very large proportion of the men who have gone from my county belong to the poorer class, the workingmen—if a private soldier returns to this country disabled so that he cannot carry on his ordinary work to earn a livelihood for his wife and family, the Government should afford him a pension somewhat commensurate with the sacrifice that he has made for the country. My contention is that the present pension list shows too great a difference between the allowance made to the private soldier and that made to the officer of high rank. But when a man returns disabled, be he private soldier or be he an officer, the Government should see to it that a sufficient pension is given to keep him in comfortable circumstances for the rest of his life. And should a man be killed in defence of the country's cause, his widow should be maintained in like manner. The pension allowed to the common soldier, I believe, is less than $300. That is not sufficient, and I sincerely trust that the Government will give this matter attention during the present session.

As to recruiting, I have here a record which I should be glad to put on Hansard were it possible to do so. Hon. members who have spoken in this debate have expressed pride in their several localities for the number of men who have recruited. The suggestion was made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I believe, that the province of Quebec had not done as well as the other provinces. I suppose the only conclusion we can come to is that the hon. gentleman thinks that it may be claimed that the French-Canadians are not so loyal or so anxious to go to the front as the English-speaking people. Now, I represent a constituency composed of about one-third French Acadian people. I hold in my hand a photograph of a family of eight sons of Acadian parents in my own town of Sackville. Six of the eight sons of this modest man, who worked in a factory in that town, have enlisted and five have gone to the front and in training one failed to pass the medical test. This speaks well for the patriotism of the Acadian people in that portion of my county. The other two sons are too young to enlist, but I understand that one of them got away from his mother the other day, went to the recruiting office and wanted to enlist and make the seventh. I am sure that the record of this French Acadian family is one of which any family should be proud, and I am very glad to put that record before the people of the country.

In referring the other evening to the contracts which he had given in his own town, the hon. Minister of Militia referred to a gentleman named Mr. Tiers, of Fenelon Falls. The hon. minister said that this man, who was a bad Grit, had a planing mill, and got an order for boxes. He might have gone a little further and told the House the whole facts of the case. When Mr. Tiers first came to the committee he could not obtain the contract; subsequently Mr. Burgoyne, a prominent Conservative in the same locality, came down and took the contract in the name of Burgoyne & Tiers. Yet my hon. friend would have us believe that this was one of the occasions on which he gave a contract to a Liberal firm.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the London Advertiser of April 16, 1915, which reads as follows:

> Ald. Harry Fitzsimmons has a scheme whereby the manufacture of shells for the British army may be undertaken in Chatham. The old Defiance Iron Works is now vacant and the deed is held by the city. When Gen. Sam Hughes was in the city a few days ago, Ald. Fitzsimmons interviewed him and received the assurance that if a manufacturer undertook to make shells in this city Gen. Hughes would see that a contract was given. It is likely that at the next meeting of the city council Ald. Fitzsimmons will have a proposition to make whereby the Defiance Iron Works will be utilized to give employment to between 40 and 50 people.

If the Minister of Militia and the Government had not anything to do with the making of these contracts, what authority had my hon. friend for telling Alderman

Fitzsimmons that he would see to it that he got a contract?

I have said that one of the four requirements for the proper carrying on of Canada's part in this war is that of proper officers to conduct and control the men on the field of battle. From the information which I have, I understand that when the Canadian soldiers go over to England they are placed under the command of British officers. Against this I have not a word to say; but I do wish to say a word to the Minister of Militia in regard to the officering of the men while they are under training. I make this complaint not for the purpose of making political capital or of indulging in political criticisms. I have said at different times during the course of my remarks that I care not whether a man is a Grit or Tory so long as he is doing his best in connection with this great conflict. But I do say that many young boys, sons of the more wealthy people, are being sent to military schools and are getting commissions, while some of the older men who have been in training for years, are occupying positions as privates. In the course of their duties they are meeting with these young boys, who must appear to them somewhat as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia described the barristers the other day, with their hair parted in the middle, and with pencil and paper, seeking contracts. I do not claim this because they are Liberals, but I do say that if these old soldiers, veterans and warriors, who have had the advantage of education, training and experience, were given a better show when officers are being selected, it would be very much more to the credit of the department and would result in much greater benefit to the training camps.

I am not so big a farmer as my hon. friend the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell); I am not, I suppose, as good a lawyer, but I have had some experience with the hay question. I sell some hay myself, and I think I know whereof I speak so far as hay is concerned. I listened with a great deal of astonishment to the remarks of the hon. member for Carleton upon this subject. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, if any man in Canada is supposed to do it, is supposed to protect the farmers, who are really producing the wealth of Canada at this time; and we would expect that he would accord them fair treatment. Well, I knew that this contract had been given, and I knew the effect it had in my county. When the hon. member for Carleton made the direct charges in this House in regard to hay, a storm took place in the mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. I have only a passing acquaintance with the hon. minister; I do not purpose entering into the personal quarrel between him and the hon. member for Carleton. I hold no brief for the hon. member for Carleton; I am not here to say whether his parliamentary conduct was proper or improper, or whether my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture did himself justice in the language which he used in reference to the hon. member for Carleton. My position, however, is different from that of the hon. member for Carleton. The Minister of Agriculture seems to think that the trouble between the hon. member for Carleton and the Atlantic Hay Company was occasioned by a personal quarrel. I have a personal and intimate acquaintance with the gentleman who has charge of the Atlantic Hay Company, B. F. Smith. I am not here to say an unkind word or to make an unkind reference to that gentleman in so far as the hay contracts are concerned. I am bound to say that I do not blame him very much for getting as much as he could, within reasonable scope, for the hay he had to sell. I do charge that the Minister of Agriculture did enter into an improvident bargain and an improvident contract in regard to the supply of hay from the province of New Brunswick to the Imperial Government. I think I can show why. In the first place, when the Department of Agriculture, as agent or trustee for the Imperial Government, wanted to obtain from the province of New Brunswick a supply of 15,000 tons of hay, amounting in value to about $350,000, in round figures, it would seem to me that the cautious and business-like way to deal with the matter would be to ask for tenders from the different hay dealers, so that the farmers would have an opportunity of tendering for the supply of this hay at the lowest possible price.

My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture attempted to defend his department against the charges made by my hon. friend from Carleton; but you may search Hansard from the beginning of his remarks to the close and you will not find any indication that he asked any other firm in the province of New Brunswick concerning the price of hay. What was his answer? He said they wanted a certain quantity of hay, and he decided to make a deal with one

man. Let us take the hon. minister at his word that it was more reasonable and proper for the department to deal with one man in that matter. If the hon. minister thinks it is necessary to deal with one man and pay him an exorbitant price for hay he is placing himself before this House and before the country in a most unfavourable light. This hay was to be shipped from West St. John, one of the winter ports of Canada. There is no mistaking the facts; there is no getting around them; there is no use in saying that this thing is wrong and that is wrong; the farmer has the hay to sell. I may tell the hon. minister that last year I sold hay. I have hay to sell this year. Last year I sold my hay for $15 per ton; the merchant who bought it resold it, and made his profit which was not less than $1. He sent the hay to the United States, I understand.

What happened this year? The hon. minister says that he made this contract with the Atlantitc Hay Company at the price of $23 f.o.b. West St. John. The distance from Woodstock to St. John is about the same as from Sackville, my shipping port, to St. John, and from Sackville the freight to St. John costs from $1.65 to $1.75 per ton. The price we pay for pressing is $1.25, sometimes $1.30; but on an average the pressing and freight to St. John run about $3 per ton. It costs $3 to compress the hay; that is what the hon. Minister of Agriculture admitted in his remarks yesterday. That makes $6 as the cost from the time the hay leaves the farmer's barn till it lands f.o.b. cars at West St. John. Now, to-day they are buying that hay in my town or in the vicinity of Sackville, and shipping it at Sackville for $12 and in some cases as low as $11 per ton. But let us say $12; it was up to $13, and dropped back again to $12. Add the $6 which it takes to get the hay to West St. John, and you have $18. Now, the contractors of the hon. minister are getting $23 per ton, which means that they are making a profit of $5 on every ton of hay that goes from Sackville to West St. John. They are making a profit of $5 per ton on 15,000 tons, or a net profit of $75,000. There is no getting around these figures. There are no excuses; there is no answer to the charge made. When my hon. friend from Carleton charged the Minister of Agriculture as the head of his department, and the man responsible for the conduct of that department, with taking $45,000 or $50,000 out of the pockets of the farmers of New Brunswick, or out of the coffers of the Imperial Government, he left him to choose whichever horn of the dilemma he cared to take. My hon. friend from Carleton put the amount very fairly, because as a matter of fact they are buying a very large portion—I will not say more than half—but a good portion of the hay for at least $13 per ton and in many cases less.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, from his place yesterday, stated that he always wanted to do what was fair and right for the agricultural people of this country. We all remember the cry of patriotism and production that passed over this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific last year. It was all very well to talk about patriotism and production. The farmers responded to the demand for production, and what is the result? The Minister of Agriculture has entered into an improvident contract with a firm of political supporters in the province of New Brunswick which is taking from $2 to $3 and in many cases more on every ton of hay from the farmers of that province. The hon. minister said he was ready to defend his action from first to last. He charged the hon. member for Carleton with striking below the belt. Let me tell the Minister of Agriculture that if my hon. friend from Carleton struck below the belt in defence of the farmers of New Brunswick, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture struck below the belt when he entered into that contract, and sacrificed the interests of the farmers of New Brunswick to the tune of $50,000 to which they were entitled. That is the condition of affairs as regards the hay question in that province, and, although the Minister of Agriculture attempted to defend himself, he utterly failed to answer the charges made by my hon. friend from Carleton. His own confession is the very best evidence that he did wrong. He told us that he had cancelled the contract at the demand or request of my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., because he had concluded it was an improvident contract. That is the confession he made. He found it was not a proper contract. We have heard read the letters that passed between the Minister of Agriculture and the firm which got the contract. I can discuss this question without any personal feelings against the firm. The minister charged the hon. member for Carleton with entertaining some such feeling against the firm, but I have a very warm feeling for the farmers in my own county, and proper-

ly so. When the minister entered into that contract and immediately afterwards, the Government put an embargo upon the exportation of hay to the United States, what did it mean? It meant that they were taking from $2 to $3 per ton from the farmers in that section of the country. If it was necessary for the Imperial Government to have all the hay in the province of New Brunswick, or in that particular section of the province, in order to carry on the war, the farmers were prepared to allow them to take the hay, and they were willing to make the price $13 or $12 or $10. But they were not and are not prepared to make sacrifices in order to put $3 or $4 per ton into the pockets of certain individuals. I know that I am voicing the sentiments of every one of the farmers of my county when I say that they are prepared to put in their hay to this Government if the Government will take it themselves and do away with the middlemen provided they are prepared to accept the hay at the price mentioned by my hon. friend. But they are not prepared to sacrifice their interests for the benefit of others.

I hope that the Minister will not, in the future, for his own benefit, for his own credit, attempt to make the people of the country believe that he has made a proper contract and one that is in the interest of the farmer. The best proof that he has made an improvident contract is that he has changed it because, for, to use an expression often heard, the coon came down. He has changed his contract, and in that connection my hon. friend from Carleton says he does not know his man. I am not going to go that far, but my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, in making that announcement, at the same time makes the admission that he has made a contract at too high a price. Now, he has told the Atlantic Hay Company that in the handling of this hay they will only be allowed to make a dollar a ton. He has opened a situation that I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman, with all the ability that he may have, will be able to carry through. I am anxious to see what kind of a bill of expenses will be made up for buying this hay and these presses and other incidentals; it will be interesting to have it brought before Parliament and see what final adjustment is made. It reminds me of the story of the man who got a bill from his attorney. The attorney put a great many items in this long bill—so much for drawing the bill of costs, so much for drawing the defence, and so much for drawing something else. This was so astonishing to the client that when he got his bill that he wrote at the bottom of it: You forgot to put in anything for drawing your breath. When the Minister of Agriculture gets his bill from the Atlantic Hay Company he will find many items that he did not expect. Surely the Minister of Agriculture has been in this House and has been allied with his friends long enough not to be so innocent as to expect the House and the country to believe that with a contract entered into with the Atlantic Hay Company, that contract being signed, sealed and delivered, he is going to be able to compel these people to come forth with their books of account and cheque stubs and make a settlement, and at the same time give a fair deal to the farmers of the country. It is absolutely impossible.

There was an altercation between the Minister of Agriculture and my hon. friend from Carleton with regard to the conditions of a contract for the supply of hay in which my hon. friend from Carleton was interested some years ago. I know nothing about that. I was not a member of the House at that time, nor was my hon. friend from Carleton. But there was one mistake that the minister did make, and that was where he claimed the spread between the purchase price of the hay from the farmer and the amount paid by the Government was $9.50 under the present contract, whereas the spread between the price paid the farmer by the company with which my hon. friend was associated and that paid by the Government was $9. There was a mistake of $1 per ton, and $1 makes a great deal of difference when you come to consider the question of the profit on a ton of hay. But, in so far as this present company is concerned, $1 is neither here nor there when it is making a profit of $4 or $5 a ton. It seems to me that my hon. friend the minister did not get very far in the defence of his actions in regard to the hay question. May I ask the Minister of Agriculture if he will not reconsider this matter. I care not about Mr. Smith's contract; it does not affect us very much, although he has been driven from his own county and has come down to our county. But, I ask the minister to consider well and carefully whether it is necessary, with the amount of hay required about secured, to continue the embargo on hay to the United States.

An hon. MEMBER: He does.

Mr. COPP: He does? Then he should lift the embargo, and give us entrance to the United States markets at a fair competitive price, or else he should say to this man: You must show that so much has been paid for this hay, so much for freight and so much for expenses, and we will give you so much per ton. I would request you not to leave this contract in the hands of this man in the slipshod way in which it now is. Reduce the price, because there are no ifs and ands about it. If the man is getting $2 or $3 per ton too much under his contract, cut it down to a fair price and give the people of the province of New Brunswick a fair show in regard to their hay.

There is just one other matter that I will refer to, and it is one which is dealt with in the gracious speech that His Royal Highness delivered at the opening of this House. I refer to the question as to the extension of the life of this Parliament. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made some reference to that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne. My hon. friend discussed the question in a serious manner. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries rather replied in a strain of levity, saying that my hon. friend from St. John had given an interview out West to the effect that it would be a deplorable thing to have an election, but, now that the scene had changed, it was a serious thing to extend the life of Parliament. I think it is a most serious thing. That does not mean that I am opposed to an extension of the life of this Parliament by any means. I think it is a serious thing at any time to change the Constitution of this country under which the people have lived and of which they are very jealous indeed. The question is: Is the situation of so serious a nature that it is a proper thing to do? When the measure comes before this House I think the Government will find that every member on this side at least is prepared to give it that consideration that it deserves. But, to say that it is a serious matter is not going too far. It is a matter between ourselves and our constituents. The Constitution gives those who happened to be elected at the beginning of a parliamentary term the privilege of retaining their seats for five years if the Government choose to continue the life of Parliament for that time. This is a delicate matter for every member of this House to consider as between himself and his constituents; he must ask himself the question whether or not he should vote himself another year in Parliament. If the wishes of a member, in his personal capacity as the representative of his county, only had to be consulted, I do not think there would be any question in his mind, because I do not know of any man who is anxious to run an election when he has a seat in Parliament if he can retain that seat another year. Therefore, I repeat that it is a serious matter that every member in this House must decide for himself, and when the resolution comes before the House I am sure that it will be given the very best consideration of hon. gentlemen, at any rate upon this side of the House.

I realize that I am a young member of this House so far as experience goes, and I must apologize for having detained the House so long, but when one is gathering facts for a speech one's notes are increasing all the time, and sometimes become too voluminous. I have felt it my duty to bring these matters to the attention of Parliament. I believe the people of this country desire more information in regard to these matters. My hon. friend has been accused of making insinuations based on newspaper clippings. In regard to that I would say that a man who reads the newspapers must be more or less influenced by what he reads. A man reads the newspapers to get the view of the public on these matters, and in regard to the charges which have been made against the Shell Committee I am bound to say that practically all the large and influential newspapers in the country, both Liberal and Conservative, have for some months been criticising the Shell Committee, if they have not actually made charges against it. One can hardly attend church without hearing the subject treated from the pulpit. Surely that is evidence enough that the public is keenly interested in this matter. I sincerely trust that whatever may be the outcome of the charges that have been made, every member of this House will see to it that his best thought and best endeavour is given to the proper carrying on of the war to a successful conclusion; and that, we trust, will not be very long delayed.

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

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.37 p.m.

Monday, January 31, 1916.

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

REPORT.

Report of Experimental Farm for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. Martin Burrell.

PRIVILEGE—MR. TURRIFF.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the Peterborough Review of a late date I see the following:

> Bound to Have an Election.
>
> The tilt between the federal member for West Peterborough and Mr. Carvell, the somewhat famous member of the Liberal Opposition for Carleton, N.B., and Mr. Turriff, the Liberal M.P. and free wheat champion from Assiniboia, was very illuminating. Could anything be plainer? We leave our readers to guess who are trying to run this country into the horrors of a general election in war-time. Hansard says:
>
> Mr. Burnham: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?
>
> Mr. Carvell: Certainly.
>
> Mr. Burnham: Does the hon. gentleman intend to move a vote of censure upon the Government for the conduct of the war, so far? If not, of what avail is all this abuse now?
>
> Mr. Carvell: I do not wish to be discourteous to my hon. friend—
>
> Mr. Marcil: Do not hurt his feelings.
>
> Mr. Carvell—but I may say I am not the leader of the party, and do not move votes of censure unless I am instructed to do so. I have the greatest confidence, however, that the people of Canada, when they get the opportunity, will carry into effect a vote of censure much more effectual than anything we can say in this House.
>
> Mr. Schaffner: They do not want it.
>
> Mr. Burnham: This is for a general election, then?
>
> Mr. Turriff: That is what we wanted last year.

I am not attributing any blame whatever to the paper. The mistake has occurred through the Hansard reporter not catching exactly the right word; the word "we" was substituted for the word "you," which changes the whole meaning of the sentence. What I said was:

> That is what you wanted last year.

Instead of "you," they put in "we."

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say to the hon. member that a correction will be made in Hansard according to his wishes.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Friday, January 28.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, before beginning the few remarks which I purpose making on the motion before the House, I wish to refer for a moment to the speech made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. McCurdy), who, I regret, is not in his seat. The speech was made on last Friday night, and it has the appearance of being a deliberate attack upon my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). I suspect, Sir, that the brains of more than one Nova Scotia member were commandeered in the preparing of that speech. It was written out so that the statements made were deliberate and made in cool blood. The incident arose out of remarks by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton on pointing out the importance of the appointment of men bearing good characters to command the volunteers from the province of Nova Scotia, and incidentally my hon. friend referred to the part that Major Muirhead took in a celebrated election in the county of Victoria. The hon. gentleman began by indulging in a lecture to hon. members on this side of the House on political decorum. He deprecated the mixing up of politics with the discussion of military affairs, and then he launched out into a violent partisan speech. He was not speaking ten minutes until he consigned my hon. friend from North Cape Breton to political oblivion. Then he took the Premier of Nova Scotia, Hon. Geo. H. Murray, and threw him to the wolves. I do not often undertake to give advice to my colleagues in this House, but if I were permitted to give a word of advice to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, it would be that he would take the rafters out of his own eyes and then he would be able to see more clearly when he attempts to extract motes from the eyes of hon. members on this side of the House.

The incident arose, as I have said, out of the election in Victoria, N.S. I do not intend to discuss the Victoria election or the character of Major Muirhead. Major Muirhead may be a good soldier; my hon. friend says he has already seen active service at the front. That is greatly to his credit and, for my part, I would forgive him a good deal on that account. It may be that Major Muirhead was unfortunate in getting into bad company. If he is the kind

of man that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens say he is, and I do not dispute it, the best thing he can do is to change his friends, because if he continues to associate with the gang that took part in the Victoria election and tries to behave himself like a decent citizen at the same time, he will be lonesome. The reason I mention this matter at all is that I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my regrets that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens should have found it necessary to have said that my hon. friend from North Cape Breton had deliberately stated what was not true in this House. I do not hold any brief for my hon. friend from North Cape Breton; he is well able to take care of himself, and I have no doubt will do so when the opportunity arises. He may unintentionally make a mistake in a name or a date, but when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens stated to the House that he deliberately made a false statement to this House, I want to say to him that that accusation will not be believed in any place where my hon. friend from North Cape Breton is known.

I have known my hon. friend from North Cape Breton for twenty years, and I hold him in the highest respect as an honourable and truthful man. I am sure my opinion of him is shared by the hon. gentlemen who sit around me in this House, and I think I may say by a good many honourable gentlemen opposite. The best that I can wish my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens is that after he has been twenty years in public life he will have as clean and honourable a record, and will stand as high with the people of Nova Scotia as does my hon. friend from North Cape Breton.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to this debate, as I have done for the last ten days, one cannot fail to observe that there is one question, and one question only before the House and the country. Other matters may and will be mentioned, but the war overshadows them all. It is the duty of this House at all times, Sir, to give the closest attention to what may be called our domestic affairs, as a nation, and especially does this duty devolve upon His Majesty's loyal opposition. When we remember that a defeat of the Empire in the present crisis would leave us without any domestic affairs to attend to, it follows that our first duty must be the vigorous prosecution of the war. Did it ever occur to you, Mr. Speaker, that this may be the last session of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Your last.

Mr. SINCLAIR: A complete and final victory for Germany in this struggle would almost certainly make Canada a province of the German Empire and there would be no further need for this Parliament. Your seat, Sir, and the mace on the table, would be thrown on the scrap-heap, the British flag would be torn from the main tower, and this building itself instead of being a place where the representatives of a free people meet to make laws for a free state, would probably be converted into the headquarters of a company of Prussian Dragoons with the sign of the death's head over the front entrance. And that, Sir, being a possibility, is it not our first duty, following the example of the Highland chiefs in the olden days, to send out the fiery cross to the young men of Canada, inviting them without distinction of race, or party, to rally to the call of King and country in the great crisis in which the Empire is engaged. In my judgment one of the most impressive sights the world has ever seen is the way that men have flocked to join the colours from all parts of this vast Empire—from Australia, from New Zealand, from South Africa, from India, from Newfoundland, from Canada, from wherever the flag floats. If the German Emperor ever stops to ask himself the reason for this, he must be driven to the conclusion that Britain's colonial policy of the open door, and self-government, has knit this Empire together as no military system ever could have done. Why, for example, is the Boer in South Africa, who was our sworn enemy only fifteen years ago, willing to-day to enter the lists for Great Britain against men of his own blood. The reason is plain; Mr. Speaker, loyalty is the child of freedom.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Boers received fair and generous treatment from Great Britain; she trusted them and accorded them the right to govern themselves.

There are two matters on which the people of this country have every reason to congratulate themselves. The first is the united front we have been able to show to the enemy. This is largely due to the patriotism and leadership of the distinguished statesmen that, we are so fortunate as to have at the head of the Canadian Liberal

party in this crisis. With the exception of the attitude taken by a small and unimportant wing of that hyphenated party known as the Conservative-Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, I suppose there never was a question on which the people of Canada have been so unanimous as on the question of this war.

The second matter on which we have reason to congratulate ourselves is the splendid record made by our soldiers at the battle front. Many people feared that raw colonial troops, without much training and without experience, would be at a great disadvantage when facing trained German soldiers in the shock of battle; men who have had the advantage of long training in the art of war. But we have every reason to be proud of the results. The courage and heroism of our soldiers has shed new lustre on the name of Canada; and while this result has been purchased by the sacrifice of the lives of many brave men, it throws upon us who remain here a new duty to see that those brave men shall not have died in vain. The sacrifice of life has been great, but the heroism that has been developed in the course of this struggle will ever be a cause of inspiration to the Canadian people. The tales of the brave deeds on the part of our soldiers, told to our boys around our hearths and camp fires, will go far to kindle love of country and devotion to the cause of liberty in the hearts of young Canadians for generations to come. There is undoubted evidence that the Canadian soldier has made a splendid record in this war; I wish we could honestly say as much for the Canadian Government.

I notice in the speech from the Throne a proposal to extend the life of Parliament for one year. That is a question which, when it is brought forward, will have the serious consideration of the members on this side of the House. In my opinion there is a pretty general feeling in my province that this House is suffering from senility, and that some new blood, especially on the Speaker's right, would be a good thing for the country. If we on this side of the House had even a moderate degree of confidence in the present Administration it would be easier for us to agree to the proposed extension, but in the face of the damaging disclosures of the past eighteen months it is asking a good deal of us on this side to pass what is in effect a vote of confidence for another year in the present Administration. I suppose the main argument in favour of the extension is that the country is at war, and that it is not wise to swap horses when we are crossing the stream. During the present session we will be asked to vote enormous sums of money to carry on the war, and while we on this side of the House will cordially do so, we shall also insist on full particulars as to how the $150,000,000 already voted has been spent. It may as well be understood at the outset that we shall regard it as our duty to expose graft and crookedness, wherever found, even at the risk of seeming to break the truce which my hon. friend from East Toronto (Hon. Mr. Kemp) said never existed, so far as the Tory party is concerned. We on this side of the House have no desire to spend precious time in the apparently hopeless task of trying to induce this Government to do business on business principles. All the same, this is no time to tolerate the grafter or the patronage hunter; on the contrary, it is the very time when that kind of vermin should be stamped out relentlessly by honest men of both parties as soon as they are seen crawling along the floor. Looking back over the disclosures before the Public Accounts Committee and the Davidson inquiry, I think it is a safe statement to make that this Government, at the very outbreak of the war, capitulated to Tammany methods in the purchase of war supplies, the only difference being that instead of one Boss Tweed we had scores of them operating in every province of Canada. The patronage system, which has been rampant under the present Government, is the cause of a good deal of our trouble. No hon. gentleman opposite will deny that. This is why we have been compelled to go to war with spavined and painted and decrepit horses, rotten boots, squinting binoculars, shovels without handles, high-priced trousers and a discredited Shell Committee. The man who steals the church collection has always been regarded as a low type; but to my mind he is no lower than the grafter who steals the money dedicated by the people for the defence of the country.

These abuses have all grown out of the patronage system. If the business of purchasing supplies had been open and above board and conducted by the trained officers of the Militia Department, men like Foster and Garland and Ellis would never have had an opportunity of carrying on their operations. The system produced the men.

Scattered over this Dominion from Cape Breton to Vancouver we have hundreds of Borden clubs, and Conservative-Nationalist Associations, whose advice is taken by the Government to the great loss of the ratepayers of this country. This is no picture of the imagination. We have the statement on oath of Mr. H. W. Brown, the head of the purchasing staff of the Department of Militia and Defence, to the effect that the patronage list on file in his office here at Ottawa, a list furnished to him by the supporters of the party in power, contains the names of no less than 8,000 of their political friends, all insisting on giving Mr. Brown advice of a Tammany character, as to how he can combine the task of defending the Empire and fattening the Tory party at the same time. Now, if any one desires to have examples of the working of this Tammany system, they can be easily supplied. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has already placed on record the mode of appointing shell inspectors in the province of Nova Scotia. His remarks will bear repetition. The letter which I am about to read was written by Mr. Joseph A. Gillies of Sydney. Who is this Mr. Gillies? He is the defeated Conservative candidate in the county of Richmond and has the patronage of that county. When I read the letter, Sir, you will see that there is not a word in it about the fitness of the man to be an inspector. He is not required to know anything about the manufacture of steel or of shells. The only requisite is that he is a Conservative, and that he can secure the recommendation of the Borden Club. This is the letter:

Sydney, C.B., June 30, 1915.

Mr. ————,
Sydney, N.S.

Dear Sir,—I am to-day in receipt of the enclosed letter received from Mr. Douglas in reply to mine of the 28th, written in your behalf, making application for the position of inspector of shell steel. From the enclosed you will see that Mr. Douglas has acted upon my suggestion, namely, that he should write yourself so that you might see that he was interesting himself in the matter.

I hope to see you get the position. I will see the president of the Borden Club and will urge upon him to have you strongly recommended for the appointment.

Trusting that you may get this position, and wishing to see you from time to time, I remain,

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. A. Gillies.

The second letter that I purpose to read is over the signature of Mr. John C. Douglas, M.P.P., of Glace Bay. Now, Who is this Mr. Douglas? He is a Conservative member in the Nova Scotia Legislature. He has also been nominated as one of the candidates for the Dominion Parliament from the county of Cape Breton and Richmond, and he has the patronage of that county. Mr. Douglas is well posted in political affairs; in fact, I would regard him as an expert in such matters. I suppose there is no Conservative in the province of Nova Scotia who knows as much politically of a subterranean character as Mr. Douglas. There is no man who knows the underground workings of the Tory party better than this gentleman; and when he says it is absolutely necessary to have the recommendation of the Borden Club in order to be a shell inspector at Sydney, he knows what he is speaking about. This is Mr. Douglas' letter:

Glace Bay, C.B., July 29, 1915.

Joseph A. Gillies, Esq., Barrister, etc.,
Sydney, C.B.

Dear Mr. Gillies,—I have your favour under date of June 28th, with reference to the application of the above-noted for a position as inspection of shell steel. I have to day written Mr. ———, as you suggest, and am also placing the case before the Borden Club, through whose hands all Sydney recommendations must be made.

Thanking you for your interest in the matter,

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) John C. Douglas.

If more proof of the prevalence of this system of patronage is required, I can furnish it. The letter that I now purpose reading is from the pen of another Conservative candidate, a dispenser of the patronage of the Department of Militia and Defence. The writer is a very respectable gentleman, a townsman and personal friend of my own, and I wish it to be understood that I am making no personal attack on him. I refer to Mr. Alex. McGregor, Conservative candidate for the county of Pictou. The letter explains itself. It appeared in the Glasgow Evening News of January 10, 1916. This is an extract:

I have only to say that I did no talking about this shell business, boastingly or otherwise. When the time comes for talking about shells, I can talk as much as any one and will do so if it will be necessary. It is sufficient for me to state that the trip I made to Ottawa in connection with the manufacturing of shells was instrumental in keeping the local plants working up to their capacity to the present time.

My visit to the capital was at the request of a number of shell manufacturers who considered they were not receiving fair treatment from the old Shell Committee. I have been successful in satisfying these manufacturers and enabling the workingmen in this district

to continue their employment. I am unable to imgaine what the Eastern Chronicle thinks I did not get.

(Sgd.) Alex. McGregor.

Now Sir, what does Mr. McGregor's letter mean? It means that political influence had to be resorted to in order to secure shell contracts. It means that the Tory machine at Ottawa, and not the Shell Committee at Montreal, was running the shell business. The remark was made in this debate that a political machine can never be a substitute for factory lathes; but in the case of New Glasgow, if Mr. McGregor's statement is believed,—and I have no reason to doubt it,—the factory lathes could not turn at all until started by the Tory political machine. Mr. McGregor had no special knowledge about shells. He is a lumber merchant, and the only reason why he was any better in this case than any other lumber merchant, is that he is the Tory candidate for the county of Pictou and has the patronage of that county. Here we have in New Glasgow two or three well equipped shops, with machinery and skilled men ready to make shells, but they could not get a contract nor could they even get fair treatment, if we are to believe Mr. McGregor, until they called in the help of the Conservative candidate. The inference is that with the Shell Committee and the Government, it is politics first and shells afterwards. The whole business is a disgrace to Canada. Is this Government prepared to sell our birthright for a mess of politics? Is petty political patronage to be considered when our country's future and the fate of the Empire are trembling in the balance? We are told that Nero fiddled when Rome was burning, but Nero was an irresponsible tyrant, while my right hon. friend for the time being, is the responsible head of a nation of free men. Just look for a moment at the grim facts. Our brave soldiers on the western battle front, amid clouds of poison gas and the crash of Germans' artillery, are crying out for shells, and this Government instead of dealing with this great question in a broad and comprehensive manner are wasting their precious time on petty questions of party politics, are granting contracts which should be open to everybody, at the instance of such political favourites as Mr. Alex. McGregor, who went home boasting that he had influence enough to secure contracts and employment for the men of New Glasgow. The inference we are asked to draw is that, if it were not for him, no shells would be made in these factories. Such a condition is well-nigh intolerable in a nation of free men. What a grand thing it would be at such a time as this if we had rulers who would rule. One is reminded of Tennyson's words, written in the dark and stormy days of the Crimean War:

> Ah, God! for a man with head, heart, hand,
> Like some of the simple great ones gone
> For ever and ever by;
> One still strong man in a blatant land,
> Whatever they call him, what care I?
> Aristocrat, democrat, autocrat—one
> Who can rule and dare not lie.

Mr. Speaker, we can furnish the man, if the people of Canada will say the word. In my judgment, they are only waiting for the chance.

I was discussing the patronage system. The question arises, who is responsible? I submit, with all due deference, that the main responsibility must be placed at the door of the Prime Minister. He is the one man with sufficient authority to put a stop to this state of affairs. By this indefensible patronage system we are not only wasting our resources but are making the war itself a partisan affair. Let me make a suggestion to the Prime Minister. My suggestion is that he should issue an open letter addressed to Mr. A. B. Crosby, president of the Conservative Association of the city of Halifax, stating firmly and plainly that in future the advice of this patronage committee of which Mr. Crosby is the head will not be taken in any matter connected with the purchase of supplies or appointments to office. Let him state at the same time that the same rule will apply to all the other Borden clubs and patronage committees throughout Canada. If my right hon. friend desires to win the war—and I know he does—there is no way in which he can contribute so much to the final result as by adopting my suggestion.

Then the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) must take some responsibility in regard to this patronage system. He is our trustee; he holds the bag and bears all that is put therein. When he took charge of the bag some four or five years ago, it had in it a snug little nest-egg of some thirty millions of dollars. Would it be too much to ask him what he did with that money? I am afraid that it has gone through his fingers so fast that he does not know now exactly what he did with it. The Minister of Finance has been giving advice to the people of this country about the practice of economy. Here is a part of what

he said on that subject in a recent speech in the city of Toronto:

> I do not know any other way for Canada to become a lending country than to save more money; produce more and save more; I do not know any way whereby an individual can save money and have it for investment, except by the old fashioned mode of living within his income and saving his profits to the extent that he can. I do not believe there is any magic method.

Now, Sir, that is good advice. He advises us to live within our income. It is the philosophy of the immortal Micawber with whom, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, you are familiar. Micawber had a formula something like this: Income £20, expenditure £19 0s. 6d, result happiness; income £20, expenditure £20 0s. 6d, result misery. If Micawber's philosophy be true, and it is ratified out of the mouth of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, then it follows that the minister himself has been the cause of a great deal of misery to the people of this country. Let us have economy by all means, in so far as the war is concerned, as every dollar wasted weakens our chances of final victory. The advice is all right, but why does not my hon. friend the Minister of Finance take it himself? The economy that begins and ends in words is no good. St. Paul tells us that faith without works is dead, and talk that never matures into action is what they call palaver down in my country. What is the good of palavering, Mr. Speaker? We want something more definite from the Minister of Finance to show that he really means what he says. Let him stop all this graft and patronage to begin with, and then let him stop, for the time being at any rate, the expenditures in Hudson bay and at Halifax. No public interest would suffer if not one blow was struck in either place for the next five years. Pouring out millions to equip Halifax as a winter port, and at the same time degrading the National Transcontinental Railway, and diverting the mail-boats to St. John, are samples of the weak and flabby way in which this Government does public business. I do not say that I would never go on with the work in Halifax, but any further expenditure there for the present might be delayed. The expenditure of twenty or thirty millions in Hudson bay is even more indefensible. The Government now has a report from their expert, Mr. F. Anderson, the officer in charge of the Hudson bay survey, to the effect that the Hudson bay route cannot be regarded as a commercial enterprise. When this scheme was mooted, some years ago, we did not have the information about the difficulties to be encountered that we have to-day. At that time there was an overflowing treasury. All that is changed, and this is the time to call a halt, and I desire to enter my protest now against the expenditure of another dollar on the Hudson bay scheme.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that he is opposed to the finishing of the Hudson Bay Railway and the building of the terminals?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think I made it quite plain. I believe that route cannot be made a commercial enterprise. If we have thrown away a great deal of money in it already, and we now find it impossible to make it a success, it is better we should stop now rather than go on piling up more millions in Hudson bay.

Reference has been made in this debate to the irresponsible way in which the public money has been handled by this Administration and especially by the Militia Department. For example, take the case of Mr. De Witt Foster. This gentleman was given a blank cheque-book. No limit was set to the amount of the cheques to be drawn, any more than to the age of the horses he was authorized to purchase. He spent about $73,000, and I do not know how many more thousands were spent later on in trying to find out what he had done with the money. There has been a disposition on the part of the Tory press and of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I fear to some extent on the part of Judge Davidson, to throw the blame of this disreputable piece of business on the farmers of King's county. As a matter of fact, the farmers had very little to do with it. The sales of spavined and aged horses were mostly made by horse-traders, and you can find horse-traders anywhere to take your money if you are foolish enough to give it to them. The Prime Minister, in a speech delivered in this House on the closing day of last session, exonerated the farmers and horse-traders too, and practically placed the blame where it belonged, on this Government. This speech was made on the 15th of April last in this Chamber. The Prime Minister said:

> We are confronted with this extraordinary situation, that the Government having placed $73,000 in the hand of Mr. Foster and the veterinary surgeon, have, up to the present no accounting for the money entrusted to them.

There you have it in a nutshell. It was the Government that did it. That is frankly admitted by the Prime Minister. Who appointed Mr. Foster to purchase the horses? The Government. Who gave him the blank cheque-book? The Government. Who selected the veterinary surgeon, Chipman, to assist him? The Government. Who is responsible for the loss of the public money? The Government. Who is responsible for the purchase of the antediluvian and spavined horses? The Government—I mean the Borden Government—and no one else. There is another peculiarity about this Government. They do not seem to have confidence in their own appointments. They no sooner appoint a man to perform some public service than they issue a Royal Commission or send a secret service man to see whether he does his work right or not. We have the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that these Royal Commissions are as thick as blackberries; the Conservative press has actually counted it for righteousness, the willingness of this Government to appoint Royal Commissions to investigate their own misdeeds and the misdeeds of the men whom they appoint to responsible positions. The case that I have just mentioned is an example. They appointed De Witt Foster to purchase horses in Nova Scotia, and afterwards they sent Sir Charles Davidson, with a full-fledged Royal Commission, to see what he did with the money. They selected James R. Fallis, Conservative M.P.P., to do the same kind of work in the county of Peel, in the province of Ontario, and they followed his appointment up by an official investigation which, I am told, resulted in damaging disclosures. They selected a number of politically appointed doctors to take charge of the military hospital at Halifax. One of them was Dr. Hayes, the Conservative organizer for the province of Nova Scotia, who had not been engaged in the practice of medicine for ten years. Subsequently they sent a secret service man to set traps for these doctors, the doctors were easily caught. Then we have a Royal Commission to lay bare the whole miserable business. The evidence goes to show that the medical staff of that hospital is incompetent, and a menace to the lives of our soldiers. Do you suppose that if these doctors had been selected on their merits from the medical profession of Halifax, without any political interference, we should have had any such results? What have we gained by all these investigations? The cases of graft have been frequent; scores of them have been exposed, but so far as I know, only one criminal has been punished. I submit that it would have been just as well to have left that solitary crook at large with the others.

In dealing with the matter of purchasing supplies, I may say that in the early months of the war horse buyers were sent to eastern Nova Scotia; and in the county which I have the honour to represent, as well as in the county of Antigonish, represented by the hon. gentleman who sits behind me (Mr. William Chisholm), very good horses were obtained for war purposes. The prices were fair; there was no scandal; no aged or spavined horses were offered on the market; everything was properly done. The farmers were encouraged to go into the breeding of horses; to keep their half-grown colts in the hope that they would be bought later, and to refrain from selling the horses that they had in stock. During the year 1915, while, I am told, very large numbers of horses were purchased for military purposes in Western Canada and in the United States, no opportunity was given to the farmers of eastern Nova Scotia to supply any horses to the Government. I want to ask that the persons who have this matter in charge will give the farmers of that part of the country an opportunity of supplying horses to the Militia Department. I can assure the Government that this can be done to the advantage of all parties concerned.

Reference has been made in this debate to charges against the Shell Committee. I do not intend at this stage to discuss those charges; I presume that the matter will come up later. The question that the people are asking—a question that has not been answered—is: Why was the old Shell Committee dismissed? If the first Shell Committee deserve all the praise that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia showered upon them the other day—and I am not saying that they do not—why were they turned out when their work was only half finished? That is a very pertinent question, and the House and country should have an answer. The hon. Minister of Militia was closing his speech the other day without giving the House any light on that important question, when the hon. member for Pictou interrupted to ask the following question:

Would the minister be good enough to say why there was a change from the old Shell Committee to the Imperial Munitions Board?

To this question the Minister of Militia replied as follows:

The early part of the work was what I might call scientific. I chose the very best men I could get who would do the work. Bertram, Carnegie, Cantley and the others were all experts. I also picked the very best military men I could get, such as Col. Lafferty. I don't remember the names of the others, but they were men who had been accustomed for years to this highly technical work. Before the Shell Committee was dissolved there were in the factories of Montreal and Toronto, and the other big cities of the dominion, a hundred men who were just as expert as these men were at the beginning of the war. A commission was appointed to look into the question of the steel production of this country, and to look after the best interests of the steel work, for steel is the basis of this industry. I think that should be a satisfactory answer to my hon. friend.

But that was not satisfactory to the hon. member for Pictou, who again asked:

Why were the services of these men dispensed with, and new men who knew nothing about the business taken on to purchase shells?

To which the minister replied:

I am not aware that there has been any purchase of shells. Orders have been placed with certain firms. Before the Munitions Board was formed the arrangement was that a certain number of shells would come in automatically from month to month.

I submit that this answer given by the minister was very extraordinary, and very unsatisfactory. He tells us that he selected General Bertram and Colonel Cantley because they were experts; because they understood the business. That, of course, was a good reason for selecting these gentlemen. The minister informs us also that they made a splendid record; that they produced shells cheaper than they were produced in Great Britain or in the United States. To an ordinary man like myself, that would be a good reason for retaining their services. Why, I repeat, did the minister dismiss them when their work was only half finished? Look at the reason which the minister himself gives. He says that when they started this business, experts were scarce; that he retained the services of these men until he developed a hundred experts in Montreal, Toronto and other cities who were just as good and who knew just as much about the steel industry as Bertram or Cantley. I do not believe that a man in Canada will credit that statement. Are we to be told that these so called experts with the experience of a few months making shells could be expected to know as much about steel as Colonel Cantley, who has devoted a whole lifetime to the study of the industry. Then, the minister goes on to say that when he found that there were a hundred other experts in the country who were as good as Bertram or Cantley, he decided to dismiss the Shell Committee and appoint some one else in their place. The extraordinary thing is that he did not select any of these mushroom experts for the new munitions board. He went outside altogether and recommended as chairman of the new board a man who never saw a shell; who, while he might be a thoroughly trained business man in other ways, could know no more about the highly technical steel industry than a cow knows about algebra. In other words, the minister tells us that when the business was small and in its early stages, he secured the very best men in Canada to manage it, but when the business grew to enormous proportions, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, he dismissed the experts and appointed inexperienced men to take their places who knew nothing about it. When the minister called the old Shell Committee to his office to inform them that their services were no longer required, his explanation to them, if we are to judge from the remarks which he made during the course of his speech the other day, must have been something like this: Gentlemen, you have made a splendid record. You have created a new industry in Canada. You have given employment to hundreds of thousands of Canadian workmen, and have brought millions of money into the country. You have made scientific tests at your own expense and proved that native Canadian steel is as good as any in the world. Your success, gentlemen, has been beyond my wildest dreams, and I desire to tender you my warmest congratulations.

But there is one thing that I must draw to your attention. True you are only now in the middle of your gigantic task. When you were first appointed experts were scarce. They are now as plenty as honorary colonels. The woods are full of them. For this reason I have decided to relieve you from all further responsibility and my plan is to place a Toronto gentleman at the head of this industry who knows absolutely nothing about steel but who is thoroughly posted on all questions relating to the packing and selling of pork. I trust, gentlemen, you all see the wisdom of my decision. If you do, well and good. If you do not, you can go straight to blazes, for its going to be done anyway. And that was the end of the

interview. Mr. Speaker, the pretence that has been put forward by the Solicitor General and by some other hon. gentlemen that this Shell Committee was an Imperial institution in anything more than name has been completely disposed of by the speeches of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), and the very able speech of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). One charge against the Shell Committee is that they handed out fat contracts to companies in which they were interested. I am well aware that the rejoinder is that provision had to be made in these contracts for the initial outlay. All these questions must be considered. The man chiefly responsible was General Bertram, the chairman. The Treatment of General Bertram by this Administration is a sample of the flabby way in which this Government deals with important matters. If Gen. Bertram and Col. Cantley were innocent of any wrong-doing and nothing has been even hinted against Col. Cantley, then the Government that appointed them should have stood by them.

My own idea is that Gen. Bertram, who says he let all contracts without consulting his colleagues, was, to a large extent, a sort of figurehead, and did what he was told to do by the party machine here at Ottawa. He nominally held for the moment a very important position. As well as being chairman of the Shell Committee, he was trustee of large Imperial funds, and in an important sense custodian of Canada's honour. If he was found guilty in any degree of a breach of trust then he should have been promptly dismissed. But what does the Government do? They depose him from the position of chairman, put another man in his place, and ask His Majesty the King to mix himself up with the unsavoury business by conferring a knighthood on General Bertram! But they do more. They induce the Imperial Government to take him back, not as chairman, but as a private member of the new Munitions Board. I submit that by doing so they have made themselves responsible to the people of this country for all the sins of the former Shell Committee, whatever these may be.

One does not care to dwell on these matters, but it is our duty to speak plainly. It is far from creditable to this Dominion that the Shell Committee appointed by this Government to deal with a matter so vital to the safety of the Empire as the production of munitions should have to be disbanded when their work was only half done and the business practically taken out of the hands of the Canadian Government, and a new Munitions Board appointed to take their place, not by the Canadian, but by the Imperial Government.

In demanding the fullest details about these war expenditures, we are doing no more than our duty. We are doing no more than is expected of us by the Canadian people. We do not look for perfection from hon. gentlemen opposite, or their political friends. If we did we would be sadly disappointed.

We on this side are prepared to make allowances. There was a Judas among the twelve apostles and that was bad enough—But, all the same, we do not expect to meet a Judas Iscariot at every street corner with his hand out and ready to betray his country for a consideration—and every single one of the motley gang claiming allegiance to one political party. Lloyd George's representative, Mr. Thomas, did right when he called public attention to the fact that there was too much politics mixed up with our military expenditures. We, on this side, cannot fail to notice the importance that has been given to political considerations all through this struggle in connection with the production of munitions and the purchase of war supplies. It leads us to wonder if this Government even yet realize the tremendous issues at stake. Do these gentlemen really believe that the Empire is in danger and that success in this war is more important than the triumph of any party? The war itself is world-wide. From the valley of the Euphrates in the Far East to the bay of Biscay in the west—and from the Arctic Circle to the Southern boundary of Egypt, the whole of Europe and a large part of Asia and Africa is an armed camp. Every mountain pass and hamlet and every city street, echoes with the sound of the bugle and the tramp of armed men. The results are so tremendous should our Empire be defeated that it makes a man's blood hot to think that petty questions of party politics get any consideration from the Government. Imagine if you can the position of our army on the western front through the long and dreary months from August 1914, to August 1915, holding their ground as best they could, crying out all the time for munitions and being mowed down day by day by the German artillery. What was our Government doing

4 p.m.

through all this anxious crisis in the nation's affairs? Were they making a broad and statesmanlike effort to deal with the most important problem ever committed to them to solve? Did they consult the Manufacturers' Association as to the best plan to be followed? Did they use their own shops at Winnipeg and Quebec, which were standing idle and which were so well equipped for the manufacture of munitions? They did nothing of the kind. They had a splendid opportunity to do a big thing for Canada and for the Empire—and they failed. They spent their time in dealing with petty requests from Borden clubs and Tory committees and in peddling out war contracts and other war jobs to their political friends. Is it any wonder that there is a demand for the exposure and punishment of these war grafters?

We have had glimpses from time to time of what was going on behind the scenes. We hoped for improvement but have been disappointed. If we make up our minds on this side that it will make for efficiency to do so, we may decide to take the lid off the pot at the present session and show the whole miserable mess. I venture to say that there will be no class of the population that will be better pleased if the war grafter is exposed and punished than the men who are risking their lives for us on the battlefields of Europe. And it would be no small thing to win the approval of the 200,000 gallant men who have already enlisted in the country's service.

Is it any wonder that there is a demand on the part of the people of this country for an opportunity to rid themselves of a government that has so signally failed to measure up to its opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, a general election has been hinted at in the press. We on this side are not throwing out any challenges about an election. That is a matter for the Government. If they decide to take the offensive they will find no shortage of munitions on this side of the House. Election or no election, the Liberal party are united as never before. They are full of hope and confidence, because they know that the triumph of their cause is made surer day by day. However we on this side are not asking for an election. We are demanding a vigorous prosecution of the war, honest administration, and fair and generous treatment of the men and the families of the men who are risking their lives in the country's defence.

I read somewhere recently a story of Charles M. Schwab, the great Pittsburg steel manufacturer. He was crossing the Atlantic and met a prominent New York merchant on the deck of the ship. It was during that period of severe depression in the United States. The merchant remarked "And you, Mr. Schwab, are, I suppose, like the rest of us hoping for better things." "No" said Schwab, "I am not hoping for better things, I've got my sleeves rolled up and I am working for them." That, Sir, is the spirit that should animate hon. members on both sides of the House in this crisis.

The only desire of members on this side of the House is to guard the public treasury, to see that Canada plays her part with honour, and to assist in such measures as will hasten the final victory of Britain and her allies.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the opportunity of addressing you as the presiding officer of this House and I think my first words to you ought to be that we in the West still want free wheat and free agricultural implements. Lest you might, like some of your predecessors not remain long, I want to make sure that I should not forget that announcement. Having made that very important observation that we are more anxious than ever for these two desirable steps to be taken by the Government, I will proceed with more general remarks. The debate, so far, has been one in which there have been a great number of very excellent speeches coming from both sides of the House. I think I would be justified in applying the words "very clever" to them. With many of them I do not entirely agree, but I do not recollect ever having heard a debate in which the speeches have been, on the average, of so high an order as those that I have listened to here.

Our hon. friends opposite say that everything went smoothly until my hon. friend from St. John, N.B. (Mr. Pugsley) spoke, and they seemed to think that he was the wicked partner on this side of the House who broke up the love feast and started things along quarrelsome lines. I am afraid that hon. gentlemen opposite must owe more of that idea to their own accusing consciences than to anything else. I say that there is no exception to be justly taken to the speech of my hon. friend from St. John; I say that that speech was in good faith, and was reasonable. My opinion of the speech made by my hon. friend from St. John is that in almost every

detail it was a speech that a supporter of the Government could make. His attack was not an attack on the Government, but it was based on the request that there should be brought to the administration of the affairs of this country in these critical times the greatest honesty and ability that this Administration is capable of calling to its assistance. Whether a persons is a supporter of the Liberal or the Conservative party at this juncture, I cannot see why there should not be just as strong a desire on one side of the House as on the other, that the Government should ventilate these charges in order to stop the leaks, if leaks there be.

Even the press of the Conservative party, in many instances are saying that there should be an investigation. Why should not the same attitude be taken in this House? Since we hear so often from hon. gentlemen opposite that there should be no partisanship at this juncture, why is it that we do not find any of these hon. gentlemen taking the same view of this question? If they are so anxious that party feeling should be repressed at this time, if there is so little partisanship on their side of the House, how comes it that it is left to their press outside of the House to take an independent stand? Why is it that these hon. gentlemen opposite do not show the same independence as the press supporting them? Why do not these hon. gentlemen rise in their places and say that there should be an intelligent and a capable administration of public affairs, and that the conduct of the Government in connection with these matters should be investigated?

I do not think there is a great deal of exception to be taken to the statement by hon. gentlemen opposite, that party politics should be laid aside at this juncture. Unless a person sees some advantage to be gained, not for his party, but for the country, in connection with the administration of public affairs, we should almost entirely keep silent on questions of party politics. Unless his partisanship is going to take him somewhere along the line of improvement in the administration of public affairs he had better keep it in the background at the present time. If it is simply to get a crack at the other fellows, I do not see what will be the benefit of it. But surely, no matter which side a man may sit, or stand, on, he is a loyal subject if he says that the Government should be supported and that the leaks should be stopped.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Therefore, I would like to address myself to the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) for the moment, as one of his supporters.

I am not a Conservative, and I am almost sure that I never will be, but I would think it my duty to uphold the hands of the Prime Minister at this time. The Conservatives are in; there is no doubt about that, and we might as well admit that fact. It is the country's misfortune, but let that go. The Conservatives are in, I say, and, therefore, what is the use of making a fuss about it? They are there, and being in power, while the war goes on, they are entitled to a fair, honest support, from both sides of the House. But how will an honest man support the Government? If the Government are carrying on the administration in connection with the comparatively small part that Canada is taking in this war in a dishonest and a crooked way, in a way that would hurt Great Britain and help Germany to win, is he a true patriot or a true member of either party, if he does not say that these charges shall be investigated, and that he will see what he can do to put an end to these leaks that are hurting the cause of Britain and helping the cause of our opponents? Would it not be the only consistent thing for him to do, and again, I say in all frankness, that I think it my duty not to try to hamper the Government, but rather to help them in so far as I am able, and I think I help them best by advising them so to act that they will have the confidence of the people of the country, and so that they will stop all the terrible leakage that is going on, and stop the flight of the money into the hands of the blood-suckers who are filling their pockets, and who at the end of the war will come out millionaires, while the great majority of the people will be nearly broke because of their patriotism.

Quite a number of years ago—1907 or 1908—I said in this House that, if there were a third party formed in this country, I would follow it if it were genuinely and honestly devoted to what I thought was right, especially regarding low tariff. I will not say that I am any more independent than the next man, much as I would like to be able to make that claim, but I believe that if we have a liking for independence, this juncture of the war may afford an opportunity of putting the genuineness of that desire to the test—I do not see why hon. members on both sides of

the House at the present time could not say that they belonged to neither party. It seems to me to be very strange that while you find the Conservative press, strong, intelligent, and carefully conducted papers, stating that they were ready for an investigation, you never find one of these hon. gentlemen opposite taking that view. Surely this war will do something to break down the selfish partyism that unfortunately binds us too much in this country. You see that kind of thing running through all the different provinces of Canada. If, in the Legislature of British Columbia, there is a vote to be taken, you will find forty or fifty men taking the same stand as Sir Richard McBride, and in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, all the way across and coming right into this House, you will find that in ninety out of one hundred cases, every time there is a vote in any of these responsible bodies, the man behind thinks the same as his leader thinks. That is an unfortunate thing. If the leader of the Government says one thing is right, and the leader of the Opposition says another thing is right, nobody need say that everybody always thinks the same as the leader on either side does, yet they always vote the same.

When we multiply that condition of affairs by the number of provinces in this Dominion, nine times, I say it is an unfortunate thing that we have to such an extent come to be slaves to our party. What the remedy is going to be I do not know, but I was going to make the observation that possibly the shaking up, and the sobering influence of this war may do something to make men realize the unworthiness of party; that it is not worth while for a grown man to devote his whole life to obeying the dictates of any political party he may happen to belong to. The Dominion of Canada had an exhibition not very long ago of twenty-one men elected irrespective of either party. Those twenty-one men came here and, elected as they were by the honest habitant of Quebec—than whom I am told there is no more decent man under the sun—we hoped they were going to show us something of independence in this responsible Legislature. We looked at them and said: Here are twenty-one men who have had the boldness to stand up and say, I do not promise allegiance to any party—as a matter of fact they abused both parties. But how we were disappointed in them. We were disappointed just twenty-one times, because there were twenty-one of them. Every mother's son of them lined up behind the party that had its feet in the trough, and to-day every mother's son of them is enjoying the husks, and filling his belly with what he can get. Perhaps these twenty-one examples have done a great deal to discourage independence in the people of Canada. If I were to go to my electors again and say: It is my desire to run again; I will support what is right and will not be bound to any party, perhaps my electors would say to me: Twenty-one men played that trick in 1911, and they all got something out of it; what are you looking for Brother Knowles? Well, I might get into the Cabinet; God only knows. Nobody could have foreseen four or five years ago that my hon. friend (Mr. Blondin) yonder would to-day be sitting with his hands folded and a smile on his complacent face as Secretary of State under the loyal Borden Government—and he was the most unlikely one of them all. I believe independence in Canada got quite a blow when these twenty-one men played Judas Iscariot. At the same time I trust—I fervently trust, for as I get older I get tired of this party strife—that this war may make us more sensible, may make us act more like grown-up men and less like pawns on the chess-board. I hope it will make us real men, having our own thoughts, and being independent in our acts as well as in our professions. I was saying that I thought the speech of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was of a kind that not even my hon. friends opposite could complain about; it was indeed what a friend of the country or even of the Government might have said.

I am not going into all the different points of the Address, but as regards the extension of the term of Parliament, I would say that our action will depend to a large extent upon what the Government may present to us. If the extension means a continuance of the leaks, and of the bleeding of the country, then it will be a very serious thing. To extend the life of Parliament is a very serious thing to do anyway, and a somewhat cheeky thing. We want to go fairly easy on this question of prolonging our own life. Personally, I hope to not be a candidate again, and as I may never have to answer to my constituents for my action on this extension measure, I am a little extra sensitive about it. If a man entrusts you as trustee with a certain number of dollars for a certain length of time, it is just a question how grave

and critical the condition of affairs must be to justify you in extending the trust he has placed in you. I notice that the Government's main organ in the West, the paper of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, uses rather unfortunate language in speaking about the prolongation of the term of Parliament. In its issue of January 19, 1916, after giving an account of the Address in the Senate, and quoting Senator Lougheed's words, the Winnipeg Telegram went on to say with regard to the extension:

> This statement from the Conservative leader in the second Chamber is taken to indicate that the Opposition may accept or reject the measure as presented, and that a refusal to agree to their proposition will result in an immediate appeal to the people.

That is the utterance of the mouth-piece of the Minister of Public Works. I do not say that the Minister saw it himself. I admit that a great many people do not read the Winnipeg Telegram to-day who used to read it a year ago, but no doubt it is still the mouth-piece of the remnant of the Conservative party in Manitoba, or, to use the word of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, the corpse; I would not have used the word if he had not. There is no use saying unkind things about a defunct party, for we shall all be defunct some day. However, the Conservative party is gone, and the Winnipeg Telegram remains for the sole purpose, I presume, of being the mouth-piece of the Minister of Public Works, and the Winnipeg Telegram says: The Opposition may accept or reject the measure as presented. I leave it to my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) whether that is a good way to start off if you want unanimous action on the part of this House. This same article appeared in the Moosejaw News, and I expect in all the Western Conservative dailies, and the Conservative faithful in the West will be possessed of the fact that either we are going to take the measure as presented, without any changes, and without using our minds on it at all, or else it will be a matter of going to the country. When the Minister of Public Works puts the matter in that, shall I say, slightly offensive form, it is no use saying that we on this side of the House are throwing down the hat. This extension measure should be the subject of deliberation, and perhaps we can reach a common meeting ground.

Previous speakers have spoken of the greatness of the struggle in which we are engaged. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) seems to estimate a man's loyalty by the time he spends talking about the war. Among other things, he sized up my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) by giving him a lecture on what an English gentleman should be, and again he measured up his speech with a tape-line or foot-rule, and said there were a certain number of inches devoted to the war, and ten times as many inches devoted to other things. According to that figuring my speech will not be an Empire-saver, for I am not going to talk about the war very much. One thing I would say, and that is that the war has helped to make Canada a nation. The boys who went over there were officered, as the Minister of Militia has said, very largely by Liberals, and I must say that in my town there was no quarrel at all about the officers. I think they were chosen irrespective of their politics, and I think I should have known had it been otherwise. There was no preference given as far as I know, and that is as it should be. I speak only for my own constituency, because I know nothing about any other. The fact that our boys went to fight was to my mind a remarkable proof of what before had been a matter of more or less sentiment. When 200,000 or more of our young men take the sword in their hand and plight their troth to their king, and say farewell to all they possess and to all whom they know and love, and go forth and endanger their lives, there is no doubt about their being true citizens of the British Empire. Our soldiers who have gone to the front have acted in such a way so as to cause us to be proud of them. Since this war began, there was no hour that we were prouder of the gallant conduct of our soldiers than at Langemarck, the first place where poison-gas was used, and where our gallant soldiers, in the face of that gas and the deadly fire of the German artillery, so conducted themselves that one of the British generals declared that the Canadians had saved the day. Our young fellows lived up to the high standard of British manhood, and we were proud of them. I could not help thinking, as all Canada was aglow with pride and gratification on that occasion, that if we had only sent thirty-five million dollars or ever thirty-five billion dollars as our contribution in this war, it would not have taken the place of our boys going out there and fighting, not as vassals, nor as slaves, but as free men fighting for freedom. Let us apply the same argument

to the navy. The Government is gratified at the conduct of our gallant soldiers, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) will no doubt be proud of the boys who have gone from Prescott. Suppose in a naval fight our contribution was represented by only $35,000,000 and that none of our young men had gone out to fight in the navy, would we not have felt a pretty poor lot. That is just what we Liberals fought against when the Borden Naval Bill came up a few years ago, and I think that this war should do much to confirm me in the belief that my view was then correct, and that our contribution to the navy, as our contribution to the army, should be to send our men, and to do our part as a young nation to the best of our ability both in men and money.

The country to the south of us has so far not taken any part in this war. I am not here to reflect at all upon the United States, but my opinion is that the issue before the different countries engaged in this war is just as vital to the interests of our friends to the south of us as it is to us. Hon. gentlemen are aware that at the second Hague Convention, to which ex-President Roosevelt was a signatory, it was agreed that the neutrality of the minor nations should be respected. That convention was violated by the Germans when they overran Belgium. It will be recalled that ex-President Roosevelt wrote a very strong letter, which appeared in the Chicago Independent about a year or so ago, in which he said that he never would have been a signatory to the Hague Convention if he had thought it would not have been lived up to by the United States. Whatever this war may be costing this country in men and money, it will be a source of gratification to us afterwards, if justice prevails, that we have done our share as a nation instead of merely making money out of this struggle as the United States has. Perhaps there were reasons why the United States did not enter this war; perhaps their population is so cosmopolitan that there would be a revolution if they were to do so, but it seems very strange that we have never heard a protest from them as a nation, and that they did not even protest, at the very first, the violation of the neutrality of Belgium. When I see in the American newspapers accounts of the new millionaires that are being made in the United States, it makes me think that when this war is over, we in Canada, however depressed we may be financially, and however much of our men we may have lost, will be gratified to think that we have done our little share in this war, instead of making millions out of it. Although it has been a heavy self-sacrifice, we will ever be proud that we have not shirked our duty, and that we have done our utmost to preserve civilization and justice in the world. I recently read an article in the January number of the American Review of Reviews describing the immense fortunes that the Americans are making. Your head, Sir, would reel and stagger if I were to give the figures. The writer goes on to say in regard to peace:

> Surely the coming of peace will be foreshadowed so that the manufacturers can prepare for it, and surely there will be some kind of advance notice given before the blow is struck.

I have not the article before me, but I think you will find that my words are correct. This statement strikes me as something that the American nation cannot be very proud of, because it is a very selfish and a very material way of looking at this great struggle. The day when peace will be declared is, of course, unknown to any of us, and personally I feel that it may be very far off. When one considers how long it took for Great Britain to overcome a comparatively weak and small nation like the Boers, how long it took the powerful North to overcome the South, and how long even the Crimean war lasted, it makes one very doubtful, with all the preparedness of Germany, and with Poland and the Balkans, and with part of France, and part of Belgium, in her possession, that we are going to beat the Germans in a very short time. We are asked to extend the life of Parliament for one year, but I shall be pleasantly surprised if at the end of that period we are not in the same position as we are now, of not knowing when peace will be declared. We can only go on and fight the fight as long as we can.

I presume we shall have a report from the Government that it is making every preparation possible for the returned soldiers, to fit them to enter some kind of occupation, and that every necessary step will be taken with regard to supplying artificial limbs and instructing the cripples, the deaf, and the blind. The salvage of humanity is, at best, a sorry job. It is a terrible thing that humanity has to be wrecked at all, but our first duty—and we shall never be forgiven if we omit it—is to do what we can to save the wreckage that comes back from the battlefields of Flanders and France.

The Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen), and

also the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who is a sort of omniscient man, a very omnibus of knowledge, have dealt with the question of transportation, and we were pretty nearly as wise when they were through as when they started. They both told us they had secured transportation for the wheat of the West. If the transports were let loose in such a way that they were to charge 43 cents per bushel for taking the wheat across the ocean, it is a pity that my hon. friends went into the business of engaging transports. They released 23 transports, and the result is that the freight on wheat is forty to forty-two cents per bushel, whereas the normal rate is four or five cents. It would have been better if my hon. friend the minister of Marine had commandeered the transports, and given the owners a fair remuneration for the use of the boats, and not made them rich by permitting them to charge rates 800 per cent over what they should be. The wheat problem out West—it seems that annually we have a sorry tale to tell——is a serious one. I do not suppose that any one will question it, when I say that we are greatly up against it for transportation. Our elevators are full at Fort William and on the prairies, and there are many people on the prairies who are in great need of opportunity to transport their wheat so that they can get money to pay their debts. I wish the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) could do something for them. He commandeered wheat—though I will not deal with that now, but intend to come to it later—and I wish he could do something for those farmers who have not been so fortunate as to get their wheat out. I wish he would buy their wheat for which they are not able to get transportation. In the western part of my own constituency, in the country of Webb, Maple Creek and Gold Lake, there are millions of bushels of wheat lying on the ground that cannot get transportation. Further west, in Alberta, it is even worse.

Of course, we have the Government elevators. Now, I am not going to try to give the Government elevators a black eye. If I did, I am sure that my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) would think that I am against the farmers. I noticed that he was careful to ask my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr Sinclair) if he was against the completion of the Hudson Bay railway. No doubt he will mark and send out many copies of Hansard containing the hon. gentleman's reply. I am not a political faker, so I will get along. I am going to give you a few figures to show what a disappointment the Government elevators have been. I think the Government should try to devise some way to get the elevators more used.

Mr. REID: Up to what date do the hon. gentleman's figures cover?

Mr. KNOWLES: To the 12th of January.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman has not the figures down to the present time?

Mr. KNOWLES: No, but I shall be glad to have them if they are available. But January 12 was months after harvest, and I should think it would be a reasonably fair date to take. When I prepared this speech, I got the latest figures that the Trade and Commerce Department could furnish me. They are as follows:

Capacity of Saskatoon, Moosejaw, and Calgary Elevators with Quantity of Grain in Store, January 12, 1915.

——	Capacity.	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
Saskatoon	3,500,000	1,249,057	86,802	5,935	23,709
Moosejaw	3,500,000	187,232	54,337	8,246	4,462
Calgary	2,500,000	29,072	70,657	2,991	
Total in store		1,466,361	211,796	17,172	28,171

Mr. REID: Has the hon. gentleman received the figures down to the present time? The reason I ask is that I understood from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) on Friday last, when I asked him a question on the subject, that the elevators were filling up very fast. I take it for granted that the elevators at Fort

William and Port Arthur being almost empty at the end of navigation, they would fill up first.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am not giving these figures at all in a contentious spirit. One party is as much responsible as the other for these Government elevators, for both parties supported them. But the responsibility is on the Government to use these elevators and not to allow them to remain idle. The Government could secure favourable freight rates, or offer some other attractions—advertise the elevators if necessary.

Mr. REID: I will get the figures down to Saturday last and send them to the hon. member that he may see whether they confirm what I have said. If they do, I am sure he will be glad to know it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thank the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) and shall be glad to have his statement confirmed. The obligation is on all of us to do what we can to prevent the great expenditure that the country has made in building these internal storage elevators being a loss. The farmer is like anybody else, if he gets a car to load he controls that car, and is not apt to be concerned whether it will make a short haul and come back to be used by somebody else, but he shoots it right down to Fort William even though that trip takes longer. I think the trouble is that there are no buyers in the internal elevators. If a man could put his grain in the Government elevators and release a car so that it would be available for another farmer in a few days, that would be a good thing. I do not intend to dogmatize as to the way this is to be accomplished. Perhaps, as I have said, it would be better to advertise the elevators, and so make them better known among the people. Advertise them, let us say in the Grain Growers' Guide, or in the Winnipeg Telegram, for that matter. Some people may read it even yet, and so it might be made the means of making known to the people the advantages of using the Government elevators. It seems an unfortunate thing that with all the hopes we have entertained of these elevators they are used only fifteen per cent.

Now I come to another point which, I hope, will interest the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), whom I am glad to see in his place. I refer to the commandeering of wheat. I hope the Solicitor General will do me the honour of listening to me. A year ago, out West, we had no wheat. We were urging the Government to buy what wheat there was in the West—not commandeer it but buy it from the farmers before it got away, and would have to be brought back. But they would not commandeer it, they waited until the spring came on, and then through their political friends, the Roblin Government being then in power—they bought the mixture of seed and weeds and brought it back to us. This year there was the greatest plethora of wheat the West ever had, and there was no more need of commandeering wheat than there is need of commandeering "hot air" in this Chamber. Then the Government come and commandeer the wheat. The farmer's dream in our province, as in the Solicitor General's own province, is to get a dollar a bushel for wheat. Last year the dream came true—wheat went over a dollar—but the farmer had no wheat. In the spring, when he came to buy wheat from the Dominion Government—and they bought many millions of bushels, for the first time in their lives wheat was at a dollar and a half a bushel. But the poor farmer was on the other side of the bargain. The Borden Government had the wheat to sell and the farmer was the buyer. A brighter day than even that which he dreamed of had dawned, for wheat instead of being a dollar was a dollar and a half a bushel—but on that occasion he was the buyer. If our friends opposite are so strong on commandeering wheat, why did not they commandeer it when it was needed for the farmer, instead of buying it and bringing it back and making the farmer pay all expenses as well as a profit to somebody, as they did?

I do not know why they commandeered the wheat. I think the Government does not know itself. Of course I am not in the confidence of any members of the Government. The first announcement they gave us as a reason for commandeering was that the crop was so abundant and they were going to assist in marketing the surplus. This commandeering of wheat was, I think, a specialty of the Solicitor General; I believe he had special charge of it. I would advise him after this to stick to closure, if he wants to make a name for himself. He will do much more in that way to raise his own stock than by commandeering wheat. Later the announcement was made that this would have the effect of inducing a repetition of orders from the Allies. Then he said:

> The action taken by the British Government is based entirely on war conditions.

I think this Government did not know why they commandeered the wheat; and apparently the British Government not only did not know why they did it but even did not know that they had done any commandeering, because they came out with an announcement that they knew nothing at all about it. The Solicitor General does not seem to think that it would keep up prices for he says:

There seems no reason why the grain markets should be radically affected by the action taken. Obviously, it does not involve any increase in the world's consumers or indeed in the world's consumers demands. It means simply the filling of the existing demand to the extent of the grain taken by this much of the Canadian surplus, instead of filling the same from other surpluses.

In reply to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who spoke early in this debate, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) stated that this action had been taken on the recommendation of some people of whom he was confident, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would have a favourable opinion. On November 30, a few days after the commandeering of the wheat, the Winnipeg Telegram said:

T. A. Crerar and Geo. R. Crowe—

T. A. Crerar is president of the Grain Growers Grain Company, and George R. Crowe has some other official position.

—who were called to Ottawa last Tuesday by Sir George E. Foster to confer on this question, returned last night. Mr. Crerar issued a statement this morning, in which he states that he has no doubt the Government's intentions were good. Nevertheless, he advised against commandeering, holding the opinion that such action would too greatly disturb trade. He was asked what effect the commandeering would have on the export business of the Grain Growers Grain Company, of which he is the president, and replied that he had no statement to make as to that, for the present. Mr. Crerar in his typewritten statement handed to the Telegram, says, against commandeering:

"The thought that first occurred to me when I received a telegram from Sir George Foster, asking me to come to Ottawa, was that possibly it might be in connection with the question of free wheat."

But that was too good to be true. (Reading.):

"Both Mr. Crowe and myself were quite unaware of what matter was coming up for consideration until we reached the conference. We advised strongly against the plan of commandeering to secure the wheat desired, pointing out that it would very seriously disturb the trade, and that if the proper method were taken the grain required could be secured through ordinary channels without any serious disturbance of trade conditions. We urged this view as strongly as we could, pointing out that the disturbances of trade might result in more or less of a tie-up that would be in the interests of either the trade or the producers."

I presume their expenses were paid; they were then sent home and their advice rejected. On the same day—Nov. 30, 1915, page 4, column three, the Winnipeg Telegram, under the heading, "Farmers Get Raw Deal," says:

John E Smith condemns the commandeering and prospective purchase of the wheat because he has fifteen cars of grain that he thought he could have sold for a higher price, and now he can't. "The farmers always get a raw deal," he grumbled. "The Government might as well have put its hands into a man's pocket and taken money away from him."

In the Winnipeg Telegram of Nov. 29, page 1, column 8, there appeared a statement by A. T. Hepworth-Simpson Company. As I am quoting from the Winnipeg Telegram, there should be no question as to the correctness of the statements made:

One point that stands out is the fact that a large percentage of the wheat that has been taken by the Government is farmers' stored grain, which was held there by them for higher prices.

I hope the Solicitor General notes that carefully.

And the Government has taken it, fearing the price might be driven too high by speculators.

Notice that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who says that?

Mr. KNOWLES: A. P. Hepworth, of the Hepworth-Simpson Company. I quote from the Winnipeg Telegram, a paper which my hon. friend relies upon. The hon. gentleman cannot be paying much attention to what I am saying, otherwise he would not have to ask who said it. (Reading.)

The farmer is entitled to any advance that may accrue to his advantage through speculation, the same as he has to suffer by speculation, by bear operators who sell in order to make money on declines.

That, Sir, is a reasonable statement. Many of my constituents were holding their wheat—using their brains, which they have just as much right to do as the hon. Solicitor General has—thinking that the price would go up. My hon. friend comes along and says, I am afraid that the price is getting too high and that you will get more for your wheat; I will take it from you at $1.04½ and call it square—and the farmers lose their profit. But hon. gentlemen opposite did not commandeer steel—I am told

that steel has gone up a good deal. They did not commandeer anything in connection with war munitions, except the boats to get them across to the other side. They did not commandeer any boats to take the wheat over; they commandeered the wheat itself for fear the farmer would get a little more money. Patriots, friends of the farmers, Empire savers. Then hon. gentlemen go to work and lend some of the grain back to the millers and shippers. The hon. Solicitor General had better have kept out of the conversation which he had over special telegraph wire that Sunday afternoon. I would advise my hon. friend to leave special wires and special cars alone. I know dozens, even hundreds of farmers, who do not say bless the hon. gentleman, but who use another word when they speak of the wheat that was taken away from them at $1.04½ cents. I tell them, however, that the hon. gentleman did not realize what he was doing; he went about it blindly, or he would not have done anything so unwise as this commandeering turned out to be. As I say, they lent some of the wheat back to their friends the millers; I think the operators got some too; I am not sure—we have never had any statements in regard to that. Ever since I entered this House I have been an admirer of the speeches of the hon. Solicitor General. They are clever and pleasant to listen to. My hon. friend is an expert in the business of leaving alone the things that he had better not refer to, and of hair-splitting in dealing with the matters to which he wishes to refer. I enjoyed my hon. friend's speech the other day, but I notice that he did not say a word about the commandeering. He flashed these answers—I have every one of them; there are nine—that Sunday afternoon to Winnipeg as fast as you would say "good morning" to me if you met me in the corridor. It is reported that the last message from the Government to the effect that the move was "actuated by an earnest desire to secure timely markets for our abundant crops," brought forth a ripple of laughter from the meeting in Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman answers these questions like clockwork. Put at one end of a special line a representative of the grain dealers, who are handling 285,000,000 bushels of grain; call my hon. friend from Sunday dinner and put him at the other end, and he can give all the information that is desired; but when he gets up in this House, he has not a word to say about commandeering. He can split hairs and chop off minute particles when dealing with the remarks of my hon. friend for St. John City, but about the poor farmers who lost twenty-five cents a bushel on their wheat, he has absolutely nothing to say. I am informed by what I believe to be good authority—if I am wrong, I shall be the first to take it back—that this is the way my hon. friend lent back some of this wheat: He asked for a deposit of ten cents a bushel, in case the price of wheat should go up. Wheat did go up, from $1.04½ to $1.10, $1.12 and $1.14¼. When it got to $1.14¼ their friends the millers said: keep the ten cents and go to blazes. Now it is up to $1.31, and the millers are twenty cents better off, because they told the Government to keep the ten cents. I am told that this happened in connection with a great deal of the wheat. I have here certain items on this point from the Winnipeg Telegram of December 1, 1915, as follows:

> At conferences which took place last night between members of the Government and representatives of the milling and shipping interests, arrangements were made which will obviate the difficulties apprehended by these interests, following the action of the Government in commandeering all high grades of wheat in store at elevators in the East and the head of the lakes.
>
> The needs of the milling industry will be met by a loan of such portion of the commandeered wheat as is necessary to meet immediate demands. The wheat so loaned will be replaced by the borrowers within a specified period in the quantities and grades as are taken out. The amount affected by this arrangement has not been stated, etc.

Another article published in the Winnipeg Telegram on September 3 from New York, says:

> New York, Dec. 3.—Some difference of opinion exists between grain dealers here as to the extent of the concession made by the Canadian Government when it allowed commandeered wheat to be delivered to the United States buyers who had contracted for it before the order of seizure went into effect.
>
> Henry Stemper of the Grain Growers Export Company, said he believed about 5,000,000 bushels of grain would be released to Canadian contractors so they could fulfil their American contracts, but that no grain would be released for any neutral country.
>
> Holland, Greece, Spain, Sweden, and other neutral European countries, will not be permitted to get any of the commandeered grain", he said. "It will be released on the condition that it will be replaced within 60 days, and it will be necessary that the grain released was contracted for before the wheat was commandeered. It must be declared for delivery in the United Kingdom, however, or the Canadian Government will not permit its shipment.

If it be that my hon. friend helped the great big millers and helped the great big

contractors out of the hole and did not help the farmers out of the hole, then I just say we have got another piece of evidence to show us which side he is on, with all his fair words. If it be that on that occasion the farmers got no redress from him, but the great millers and the great wheat dealers came here and got his ear and said to him: Lend us this wheat back, and he helped them out of the hole, it shows that his first desire was to serve these people, whose interests, as we say, are always in conflict with those of our con-

5 p.m. stituents and you cannot serve two masters. Whether my information be correct or not, I have this to say; that it is no courtesy to this House, as a gathering of the people's representatives, that when my hon. friend was on his feet for an hour or two he never made the slightest explanation of this very important matter, although he knew all about it, that it had been referred to in the House, and that questions had been asked by different members, particularly by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) long before my hon. friend addressed the House.

I wish to say a word about this dirty seed grain. Here is a letter which I received last June from Gravelbourg where the municipal authorities rejected a great deal of my hon. friend's seed grain because there were too many weed seeds in it, and I suppose they burned it. The letter is as follows:

Gravelbourg, Sask., June 4, 1915.

W. E. Knowles, M.P.,
Moosejaw, Sask.

Dear Sir,—The following case has been brought to my attention and I wish to communicate the facts to you as the same may furnish an interesting subject for an article in the newspapers.

One H. E. Cork has been sent to Gravelbourg by the Dominion Government to distribute feed grain to the farmers. I take it that the Government sells this grain to the farmers who want it and take a lien on their land as security for the payment of the purchase price.

The grain thus distributed is however of a such poor grade that the weed-inspector of the municipality was compelled to take proceedings against Mr. Cork for disposing of the Dominion Government grain contrary to the Noxious Weeds Act of the province.

The case came up on the 29th of May for a hearing before P. N. Aussant, a Justice of the Peace, and Mr. Cork having failed to appear, the evidence on the part of the complainant was heard. Mr. Cork was found guilty and fined $25.00 and costs.

The farmers of this vicinity and more especially the grain growers are greatly disgusted with the work of the Government.

Rural municipalities spend their money yearly, earnestly striving to get rid of the weeds, and the Government comes along and infests the country with more weeds than ever. Apparently friends of the Government secure contracts to provide the grain for seed purposes, and its seems immaterial whether it is free from weeds or not.

I shall not go further into the matter of the seed grain, but I wish to say a word or two about the collections made by the Government this fall. This fall they got busy. I suppose the Solicitor General was consulted about this. However, they said: We are going to get every dollar we advanced from the farmers of the West, no matter whether we leave them without coal and shoes for the kiddies, or food to eat, or dresses to wear. Mr. J. Bruce Walker, for the Minister of the Interior—I wish the minister was in his seat, he is away a very great deal, I am sorry to say, but perhaps he will be in some time this week—Mr. J. Bruce Walker, for the Minister of the Interior, wrote a letter on the 31st day of July to the elevator people saying that when the homesteader brought in his grain the elevators were to grab as the first grab out of that grain, enough to pay the Government. Those are the homesteaders my hon. friends opposite are helping! That letter reads as follows:

Department of the Interior,
Immigration Branch.
Winnipeg, July 31, 1915.

Sir,—The seed grain or other advances made to you by the Dominion Government in the winter of 1914-15 are, under the terms of the mortgage agreement entered into by you and the legislation governing the transaction, payable at the time the crop grown during the year 1915 is sold. I am therefore directed to notify you that the amount of such advances is required to be paid when you market this season's crop.

Arrangements have been made by the Government with the respective grain purchasing interests and railway companies (these being the agents of the Government for this purpose) under which there will be set off or secured against the proceeds of the grain marketed by you the amount due by you. The receipt of the elevator representative or the member of the Grain Growers' Association or other licensed grain buyer, or of the railway company (which will endorse the amount payable to the Government on the bill of lading in the case of grain shipped by the grower before sale) will be delivered to you and will be evidence that you are entitled to a discharge of the lien or mortgage. These receipts will be on forms furnished by the Government to the grain purchasing and shipping interests. Information as to the amount of the advances and particulars of the location of the land charged with payment will be in the possession of these respective interests at the points at which you market your crop.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. Bruce Walker,
For the Minister of the Interior.

It was no trouble for this Government to make an arrangement with the big elevator companies, and the railways, to act as their agents. This seed grain, and these coals, and this relief work, had all been extended to men who were at death's door from starvation a year ago. They had not a cent left with which to buy anything; they had nothing but debts, and this beneficent, parental Government of which the Solicitor General is such an active member, a Government which has millions of dollars to see flow away to the blood-suckers, and vermin around here, making themselves rich—it says to the poor homesteader who is trying to make a country for us in Canada, and to develop our resources: You bring your grain in to our friends and agents, the railway companies and the big elevator companies, and we have written to our friends and agents to grab the first bushel, or ten bushels, or one hundred bushels, and let your children go hungry, your wives unclothed, and your houses unwarmed, until we get paid. That is the true honest story of it, and I do not care whether I were a supporter of Sir Robert Borden or not, I say that is an outrage. Is there a man opposite who will say it is not an outrage? If these people were worth helping as a charge on and an asset of our country, it was the greatest suicide to strangle them and put them out of business as soon as they had a chance to get on their feet. It was bad business, as well as being lacking altogether in the humane element.

When that came out I sent a long telegram—I remember it cost me $4 or $5. I paid for it because I did not think that a Government that has to take the last cent from a homesteader would pay for it. I sent it right to the Prime Minister, I did not fool with anybody else. That telegram was as follows:

Moosejaw Sask., Sept 4, 1915.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

Interior Department threatening to force payment by homesteaders for advances made by the Dominion Government last winter. This seems unreasonably drastic. Advances often made in former years and no such exacting requirements, and never was understanding under which advances accepted this year. As Federal representative of district most vitally concerned, I earnestly request your immediate and favourable consideration with view to withdrawal of such drastic orders. Considering total losses of last year, present low markets and unaccommodating attitude of banks, homesteaders cannot finance if Government exacts its pound of flesh, and result will be another year of pitiful privation for homesteaders and their families. Surely this is not the year to coerce loyal and devoted citizens who are the chief factor in development and prosperity of our country.

That is signed W. E. Knowles and marked paid. I did not get any answer until the 8th, when I got this answer from the Prime Minister. He was afraid that I would get a little credit in this matter. I could understand, perhaps, my hon. friend from Souris thinking that. The reply was as follows:

Telegram received; Minister of Interior has already given consideration to subject—

It took him four days to tell me that. I do not believe Sir John Macdonald, or Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or Sir John Thompson, would have taken the trouble to wire an ordinary back bencher that he had already attended to it, that his wiring had had no success, and that he had spent his four or five dollars for nothing.

Telegram received; Minister of Interior has already given consideration to subject and arrangements have been made which I think will be regarded satisfactory.

(Sgd.) R. L. Borden.

However, his wire came along showing that it had been done. I am glad that I received the wire because nobody knew it had been done until long after my wire was sent. I do not doubt the Prime Minister's word, but, of course, he has a great many things on his mind, and I think he has got a little mixed on the sequence of events. I very much question if it had been all fixed with the Minister of Interior because it was three days after my wire had been sent forward that the announcement came that they were going to be content with the collection of half of the seed grain advance. After having got that wire of mine—I do not say that it influenced their decision—but having got that wire, they decided that they would only take half of it this year. But, you will be sorry to know that a man who is so unfortunate as to have a judgment against him, and the sheriff goes after him, must submit to having it all taken from him. The poor chap who is in difficulties, and whose possessions the sheriff is seizing, is placed in a most unfortunate position; the Government is taking every cent that is due by him, they are exacting their pound of flesh from him. I am going to prove it. Here is a letter from Mr. Charles H. Beddoe, superintending accountant, Department of the Interior, addressed to the sheriff, saying, that if a

seizure has been made this concession to let half of the thing go until next year does not apply, but that he must take every cent out of the poor fellow who has a judgment against him. The letter is as follows:

Ottawa, Jan. 8, 1916.

J. Rutherford, Sheriff,
Moosejaw, Sask.

Re Dominion Seed Liens and Liens for relief.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your favour of December 30, regarding the above, I beg to advise you that the ruling of the department in regard to seizures, is, that the full amount of the Government's indebtedness must be provided for in full.

While the Government is satisfied to collect one-half of the seed grain account in all cases where the security is in no way impaired, and the crop not interfered with, this does not apply where seizure has been made. Therefore, I will like your office to see that the total amount of indebtedness is collected. Unless in cases where half or part have been paid I will then advise you of the balance owing, which must be collected and remitted to this office.

I trust that you will regard the above instructions as being specific and entirely satisfactory to your office. Thanking you for your co-operation, I am,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Chas. H. Beddoe,
Superintending Account.

Does my hon. friend not think that instead of helping out the wealthy milling interests and the grain operators, he might have had some humanity in his heart and done something for the poor homesteader who has worked year after year, who is unavoidably the victim of an execution, who has a judgment registered against him, whose wife and little children have never had a cent spent on them for two or three years, and who has had to get credit for clothes, school books, and fuel to warm his house? But this Government said to this poor homesteader: If you are so unfortunate as to have the sheriff after you, we shall come and take every accursed cent, besides costs and everything from you, and we will not make any concession to you. The man in the department, Charles H. Beddoe, who, under instructions, wrote that accursed, inhuman order, had no bowels of compassion whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say to my hon. friend that the letter which he has quoted was, I believe, written on a misinterpretation of a departmental letter, and that as soon as it was brought to the notice of the Department of the Interior, I believe that the interpretation was corrected, and that no difference is made at all in such a case.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. KNOWLES: I accept that as being so; but there is no doubt that it was acted on for months out there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Until a considerable time after I left Moosejaw it was acted on, because this was forwarded to me from Moosejaw a few days ago, and no letter had been sent to correct it up to that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the only case that was brought to the attention of the department that I know of.

Mr. KNOWLES: I accept the statement that it was brought to the attention of the department, but why should the Government squeeze and persecute, and inhumanely treat these poor homesteaders, and say that they should get from them as much as possible, and that they should refrain from doing this when it is brought to their attention? There is nothing to show that the sheriff acted on any representations from the department to the contrary, and I will be very much surprised if the Government has not a lot of money in its coffers collected from this source. I will be glad to find that the money collected has been sent back to the homesteaders. But, in view of the harm that was done by the course that was pursued by the department, the Solicitor General now comes forward and says something about a misinterpretation. Misinterpretation fiddlesticks. They realize that they made a mistake. If they could have got away with it; if they could have got away with the homesteader's money, we would not have heard anything about misrepresentation. The Government do not make mistakes that hurt the manufacturers, but they do make mistakes that hurt the homesteaders. They would not make any great mistakes affecting the manufacturers, the wheat operators or the millers.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Has the hon. gentleman any information as to how much was paid back at the end of the year of this $15,000,000? I understand about $1,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: I could not say as to that. The Government did all they could to have it paid back and it was not for lack of trying that they did not get the last drop of blood.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is not correct.

Mr. KNOWLES: They were trying to get every cent, and if I can do anything to

prevent them from bleeding the homesteader I will do it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is your business.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, that is my business. I wish it was my hon. friend's business, and if he realized his position he would make it his business.

There are certain problems that confront us that I wish to refer to and I say again that I am sorry that the Minister of the Interior is not here. The greatest problem in this country, during and after the war, will be the problem of producing wealth. We are taking on very heavy financial responsibilities and liabilities. We are going to lose a great many of our producers. The country is going to be very severely strained in many ways and it is for us to-day to consider how we can replace this national loss by promoting national production. The production of wealth in this country has to come out of the soil. We have the productions of our mines, forests, fisheries and things of that kind but in the last resort our wealth must come out of the soil. Before this war started when we are of course, under an abnormal condition of affairs,—and it has been that very much since, although not so much now—there was not a town or city in the east or the west—and I will speak now more particularly of the west—in which you could not find men by the hundreds and thousands who could not get work. I could take you on trains and trails in almost any back township and I could show you millions upon millions of acres of land unused and producing nothing.

The problem of Canada is to bring together these men who are crying for work, and the land that is crying out to be worked. That is our national problem. You may call it a Western problem, but it is not a Western problem; it is a Canadian problem, and not a Liberal problem any more than a Conservative problem. We have millions and millions of acres crying out for men to go and cultivate them, and we have great numbers of men crying out for work, though not so many to-day as before the war,—and the problem of Canada is to bring these two together. Then you will have a great and wealthy Canada. When the Liberals were in power—I do not say it was because the Liberals were in power—these men wanting work, and the land wanting men, were brought together. Three or four years ago that all stopped, like a broken-down Ford automobile, and it has not gone on again since. The land is crying out for men, the men are there, but the two are not being brought together. It may be a joking matter to some hon. gentlemen opposite, but what made Canada great during the fifteen years the Laurier Government was in power was that these two were brought together. I do not say it was the Laurier Government that made Canada great, but the men and the land were brought together, and national wealth was produced and we had a rich Dominion; and until these two can be brought together again Canada is not going to develop. What is going to bring them together? That is for the Government to decide. We on this side of the House thought and we still think in our humble way that conditions must be so favourable and inviting that the men would be attracted to the land and become wealth-producing citizens. We tried to bring about these conditions by open markets, by reducing the taxation, by encouraging immigration, and by the Railway Commission. We tried in every way to encourage men to settle on the land. For four years now those conditions have not prevailed. I am not going to make a party speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. KNOWLES: I could make my speech a great deal hotter if I liked. If the Government does not think our way of bringing these two factors together is right, in Heaven's name let them tell us what is their way. The land should not be allowed to remain idle when we have railways, elevators, and steamships to take the grain out. We should not remain at standstill. We want to grow, and especially so in these times when we are assuming such large national obligations. The Minister of Finance would be doing a great work if he could solve this problem of bringing the men and the land together. If every acre was made to produce $15 or $25 annually we should have a wealthy Canada compared with what we now have, for there are millions of acres idle. I say that it is a problem for the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of the Interior to solve. If I were Minister of Interior I think I would tax those men who own land and are not using it, say twenty-five cents an acre, or fifty cents, or a dollar an acre, any amount that would make them get rid of the land or hire a man to cultivate it. That is what the land is there for. Surely some method could be devised of making it too expensive for a man to hold

idle land. Perhaps a commission could solve the problem, though Heaven knows we have commissions enough. There must be knighthoods to spare, and if a commission could make a success of the job, we could afford to make them knights, or honorary colonels. The greatest problem in Canada is how to use the soil that the Creator has given us. When we have solved that, there will be no trouble in financing the country. The Liberal party's solution of this problem was not accepted by the people of Canada. The present Administration does not think well of that solution, and it is therefore up to them to say what is the proper way to bring about the condition of affairs that we stated our policy would bring about. And in the meantime—I do not think this is a partisan statement to make—the responsibility is on the Government that such a vast amount of land is lying idle.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first opportunity I have had of addressing the House since you have been elevated to the position of first Commoner in Canada, I wish to take this opportunity of tendering to you my congratulations. I feel satisfied that in the discharge of your duties you will be absolutely fair and unpartisan, which is all that any one can demand from the Speaker of this House. While I do not hope that you should stay in your office too long, I do hope that you may stay there until there is a change of Government.

The speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General deals with two matters only: the extension of the term of Parliament, and the war. I would have thought that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and the men behind him, would have considered the carrying on of the war to a successful issue the most important question that this Parliament has to deal with at the present time. But the Prime Minister puts war in the second place, and the extension of the life of Parliament in the first place. I suppose that keeping himself and his party in power so much longer was of more importance to the Prime Minister and his party than the carrying on of the war to a successful conclusion.

I shall deal with these two questions in reverse order, which is, I think, their proper order. As I have said on the two previous occasions we have met here during the war, we on this side of the House stand shoulder to shoulder with the Government in anything that pertains to the proper carrying on of this war. We told the Government last year that if the $150,000,000 we voted did not carry them through, we would be ready to vote whatever further amount was needed. We said plainly on both those occasions that while we were voting large sums of money we did not intend to relinquish the right that every Opposition member, and every private member has of criticising the manner in which this money was being spent, and that we would hold the Government to account for the proper expenditure of that money. I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite can take exception to that position. I know that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will not take any exception to that position, because he said that it was all right. But what do we find now? As soon as any effort is made to have an investigation of any kind in connection with the carrying on of the war, hon. gentlemen opposite undertake to lecture us and to tell us that we have no right to criticise the Government as we are doing, and that we are endeavouring to hinder them in the conduct of the war. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) the other day read us a great lecture about our action in criticising the Government, and he tried to make out that we were doing our best to force an election. During this debate I have not heard one word about an election, or about the forcing of an election. Why then did the hon. member from Peterborough wax so indignant at us? Where was his indignation last year and the year before, when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) was doing his utmost to drive the Government and the country into a general election? It was far more objectionable to consider an election then, practically in the middle of a term, when only three sessions of Parliament had been held, than it is to-day when we are practically at the end of a parliamentary term, and when we are holding our fifth session. But there was no indignation on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite then. They thought there was going to be an election. Why was the Bill giving votes to our soldiers put through if hon. friends opposite had not thought of bringing on an election? Why did the Minister of Public Works make a speech down in Montreal practically announcing that there was to be an election, and when he took the opportunity of handing out a gratuitous insult to a large number of the clergy of the

Dominion of Canada? On those occasions no one on the other side of the House said anything at all against bringing on an election. Then it was all right; but now, when nobody on this side is saying a word about an election, when all we are doing is asking for an investigation into the expenditure of the Government, hon. gentlemen opposite, because they do not want to have the accounts looked into and investigated, say: Oh, you are trying to force the country into an election. Was anything ever further from the truth than that? We stand here to-day just as much in favour of supporting the Government in the carrying on of this war as we ever were. We are deeply involved in the war, and things have not been going as well as might have been expected or as many of us hoped, but we are into the war, and we are in it to stay until the end, cost what it may in men or in money. That is the position the Liberal party has taken, and that is the position we are going to stand by until the end of this war.

When the Prime Minister gave out a message on New Year's day calling for 500,000 men from Canada, he was only echoing the sentiments that have been advocated by many people in Canada during the past year. It was nothing new. Mr. Rowell, leader of the Opposition in Ontario, had advocated the same thing for many months. While I do not think it will be possible to get 500,000 men under the voluntary system, still it may be, and I hope it will be; but if we are going to succeed in getting 500,000 men, the Government will have to adopt very different tactics from what they have used in the past. The greatest hindrance to volunteering in the last year and a half has been the action and the words of the Minister of Militia. Time and again when I have been going through the country, I have said, when talking to young men: "well, why have you not volunteered to help the Empire?" "Well," the young man would say, "why should I? I have a good job and am getting good pay; why should I offer to go when the Minister of Militia says that for every man they want there are two and three volunteering?" Ever since the war started, the Minister of Militia has been taking credit to himself for the manner in which he is conducting the raising of an army. In this way he has prevented hundreds and thousands of young men from joining the army, and at the same time that the Minister of Militia was making these statements, thousands, and tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of dollars were being spent in the endeavour to secure troops. If you want men why not say so at once, and then you will have some chance of enlisting them. When the minister makes statements such as he did, it savours a good deal of partyism. He wanted to take some party advantage from it. There should be no partyism in the army. There is no partyism in the ranks. The Government is just as glad to get Liberals to fight in the ranks as to get Conservatives. I think it will be found throughout the country that at least as good a proportion of Liberals are volunteering for the trenches as are the Conservatives. One hon. member undertook, last year, to state on a platform that ninety to ninety-five per cent of the men who were going to the trenches belonged to the Conservative party. I characterize that statement as an absolute falsehood, and that hon. gentleman was forced to retract his words before he could leave that platform. I know of one settlement that is practically almost all Liberal, a Scotch settlement, and in that whole settlement there is only one man of military age who is not wearing the King's uniform. And in face of that, for a man to say that ninety to ninety-five per cent of the men in the trenches belong to the Conservative party is not the way to deal with recruiting. Does this Government expect to get volunteers if such statements are made? I trust that in the future the Minister of Militia will put a little grip on that tongue of his, because it is very apt to run away with him, and I hope that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in the future will take a greater part in military matters than simply acting as a balance wheel for the erratic actions of the Minister of Militia. It was not I who said that the Prime Minister was a balance wheel; it was the Minister of Militia himself who made that statement, and I am only quoting his words.

I would like to ask my right hon. friend why the large number of vacant constituencies in Parliament have not been filled, some of which have been vacant for quite a long time? Are these seats not to be filled, and especially when the Prime Minister is coming down to ask for an extension of the time of Parliament? Why should these constituencies be disfranchised during this session? This is a rather serious matter. We are badly enough handicapped by still

representing constituencies according to the census of 1901, which is now fifteen years old, but surely, when there are so many vacancies, the by-elections might have been held, and the vacancies filled so that we could have the advantage of full representation in this House.

My hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has referred to the matter of seed grain, and has dealt with it so fully and ably that I will not take up time upon that question except to bring forward one point that he did not touch upon. It happens that on this occasion very little seed wheat was given out in the part of the country that I represent, but I have information on the subject from outside my own constituency. My information is that the elevators were instructed that when a farmer came in with wheat to sell, as my hon. friend from Moosejaw stated, he was told that he had to pay his seed grain indebtedness, or, after a time, that he had to pay half of that indebtedness, and could not sell a bushel of wheat on the market until he had paid what the Government demanded. The effect of this was to put the farmer absolutely in the hands of the man in the elevator who was buying the wheat. He had to bring in enough wheat to sell to that elevator to pay the half or the whole of his indebtedness to the Government for seed grain, and so he had to sell his wheat at what the elevator man chose to give. Suppose the farmer brought in wheat that in the ordinary way would grade No. 1 Northern or No. 2 Northern. The man in the elevator who was collecting for the Government—I do not say by instruction of the Government, but this man was getting an opportunity of standing in—would declare that the farmer's wheat was only No. 3 Northern. The farmer might reply: I can go anywhere and get No. 1 or No. 2 for it. But the elevator man's reply would be: You cannot sell a bushel of wheat until you pay off what the Government demand. And so, in scores and scores of cases, the farmers have been compelled to take a grading of No. 3 for their wheat, when they ought to have had No. 1 or No. 2. As the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is not here, I will ask the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) to call his attention to this matter and ask him to see to it that it does not occur again. Dear knows, the situation is bad enough without making it worse. When I was up there in the fall the farmer was getting from 80 cents to 85 cents a bushel for his wheat, which was about half what he had paid for his seed grain. But to put the farmer in such a position that he was compelled to take a lower grading than ought to have been given is simply an outrageous state of affairs. But it is along the line with practically all other dealings that this Government has had with the farmers. As was said by the farmer who was quoted by my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles): The farmer gets a raw deal every time he has anything to do with this Government.

I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has gone out, for the remarks I now have to make concern his department. I congraluate the Minister of Finance upon the honours that have come to him in connection with the carrying on of financial arrangements of the Government during the war. In many respects, I am pleased to give him credit for what he has done. Much praise has been showered upon my hon. friend for the manner in which he handled the loan that he placed in Canada a few months ago. But there are one or two points about that loan that I think are not right. When that loan was placed before the public, there were many people with money who were glad to subscribe. Would it not have been the proper thing for the Minister of Finance to give the country every advantage possible in placing that loan? Why was it necessary to call in the banks and give them a rake-off? Why should $250,000, or a large part of it, be handed out to the banks? All that the bank had to do was to hand out a form of application to be signed and mail it to the Minister of Finance. This Government has agents in every town and city throughout the Dominion. It is not for the lack of officials that the banks were called into service in this matter, for this Government have from 12,000 to 15,000 more officials than the Liberal Government had four years ago. Anybody wishing to make application for a share of this loan might just as well have gone to one of these Government officials, signed his application, and mailed it direct to the Minister of Finance. The minister has been receiving great credit for having secured $100,000,000 when he asked for only $50,000,000. But let us look into the conditions and see if there is as much credit coming to him as some of his friends would like to make out. When this loan was floated we had something over

$1,000,000,000 of the people's money lying in the banks. Of this sum, $600,000,000 was drawing three per cent interest, or, rather it was supposed to be drawing three per cent interest, but I have the statement from a prominent banker that the rate actually paid is only about two and a half per cent. Here is the explanation of this: if you make a deposit on saving account say on the sixteenth of the month, you get no interest for the fourteen or fifteen days remaining in that month, and your interest begins to accrue only on the first of the following month. Then, if, after a time, you draw the money out, say on the twenty-fifth of the month, you get no interest for that month, but only up to the last of the previous month; and so, the savings depositors had this $600,000,000 lying in the banks at two and a half or, let us say, three per cent. The Government comes forward and offers them 5 per cent and sells the bonds at 98 cents on the dollar, making about 5½ per cent, at least double what the depositors are getting. It seems to me that it did not take any great financing to get that money from the people, especially at that rate of interest. I noticed that one bank in the State of New York the other day put up $25,000,000 by way of loan to the State of New York at 3.80 per cent. It seems to me, therefore, that at 5½ per cent. the Canadian Government should get the money without serious difficulty.

I have seen a good deal in the papers about Canada's financing her own part in this war, and also about her helping Great Britain to finance the war. If we are in a position to help Great Britain finance the war, the best thing we can do is pay back the $150,000,000 that we have already borrowed from Great Britain in connection with the war. I quite agree with the policy that the Finance Minister has inaugurated of getting loans at home, but it is probable that before this war is brought to a conclusion we shall have to put up many more loans, and we shall have to borrow either here or in the United States. If the State of New York can borrow money at 3·80 per cent, I am sure that my hon. friend the Finance Minister, when he makes his next loan, will be able to borrow money in the United States at a good deal less than the rate at which he obtained his last loan there. I understand that my right hon. friend got $45,000,000, for which he paid something like 5 per cent. The only thing that surprised me about that was that the hon. gentleman who, only four years ago would not allow my constituents to sell a pig, or an ox, or a load of wheat, or anything else in the United States—no truck or trade with the Yankees—should go over to the United States to borrow money, and not to carry on the war, Mr. Speaker, because that money was not used for the war in any way, but to keep the wheels of Government running in Canada. However, I trust that when he goes over for the next loan, he will be able to do a great deal better than he has done in the past.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TURRIFF: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had been making a few remarks about the loans that had been effected by the Government. I stated that I was very pleased to see the Finance Minister borrowing money both in Canada and in the United States. I think in that way we can help Great Britain in this war a great deal better than by continuing as we have done in the past, to borrow in Great Britian alone. I pointed out that we were paying a fairly high rate for the money, but I have learned since then that we are paying even more. I understand now that bonds have been issued for $100,000,000, and that these bonds can be exchanged, during a certain period, for forty years bonds at five per cent. I understand from the minister's gesture that that is not exactly right.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The notes issued in New York for one or two years are exchangeable at the option of the holder for twenty year bonds.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am glad to hear that, because that is much better than forty year bonds. I do not object so much to five per cent or five and-a-half per cent to our own people, but I trust, if the minister goes to the United States for more money—and I think it would be good policy to borrow in the United States if we can get the money at the right rate—he will be able to secure more favourable terms. I see that the state of New York has borrowed money within the past few days at 3·80 per cent. The securities of Canada ought to be as good, I think, as the security of the state of New York. I trust that the Finance Minister, in making future loans, will be able to make a good bargain, and that he will have lots of trucking and trading with the Americans if he can borrow money cheaper there than he can any place else.

I would ask the Minister of Public Works to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia a matter which I wish to bring before this House. My information is—and I get this information from an officer in Canada who ought to know what he is talking about—that in the ordinary battalions stationed in Canada full rations are drawn every day for the number of men in the battalion. If a battalion is at full strength, with a thousand men, they draw their rations daily for one thousand men. I am informed that in the average battalion throughout the country, through leave of absence and one thing or another, from ten per cent to twenty per cent of the men are not at headquarters—but the rations are drawn just the same. So the people of Canada are paying for those rations, whether the men are there or not; and in the opinion of this officer this amounted to about $500 a week in the case of many battalions, which would represent $2,000 per month for each battalion. If we have one hundred battalions at $2,000 per month, there you have $200,000 per month, or $2,400,000 per annum. Where does that money go? If the men are not at headquarters they can not use the rations, but yet the rations are charged up in full. I do not know that that is an absolutely correct statement, but that is the statement I have from an officer of the force who knows his duty, who is a good soldier, and who assured me that his statement to me is an absolute fact which can be verified by the department very, very easily. If that is the case, surely to goodness such a state of affairs should be stopped.

Mr. BRADBURY: An affair of that kind could not possibly exist in a battalion which is run properly, because the rations are requisitioned by the quartermaster every morning. If you had a dishonest quartermaster it might occur, but it could not occur in the regiments generally.

Mr. TURRIFF: If that state of affairs exists it must be by connivance between certain officers and contractors. After what we have heard in connection with shell contracts, I do not know that it would be beyond belief that perhaps some of the contractors who are furnishing the supplies might not be above making some money over and above a legitimate profit. However, I bring the matter to the attention of the Government and hope it will be investigated; and, if it is found that the statement is well founded, that the abuse will be put a stop to.

My attention was also directed, by an officer who has been overseas and has been through many battles, to a statement that the medical examination in Canada is hardly worthy the name of inspection, and that hundreds and hundreds of men have gone overseas who should never have been allowed to pass. They have been drilled, and fed, and paid for from six months to fifteen months before being sent over. Then, after experiencing the discomfort of the trenches, and the other discomforts, altogether apart from the danger, they get tired of the trench life, they trot out this trouble, whatever it is, that should have been detected in the first place by the medical examination; they are unfit according to the law and they should never have been sent to the front. They are tired of the whole business and they want to be sent home, and they are sent home at a cost of probably $1,000 or $2,000 per man. They come home, and in many cases they will demand and will secure pensions. There is no doubt that this has happened and is happening. It is a matter of great importance that should be looked into. We will have tens of thousands of men to look after through our pension office when the time comes; but why should we have men who are taken over there through the absence of proper medical inspection, and who, as soon as they get tired of soldiering, show up their defects and are sent home to become a charge on the country, and to remain so, many of them, as long as they live. To my mind, it is a most serious matter and one thoroughly well worth looking into. If it be the case, as I know it is the case, a stop should be put to it at once. Let us send no more unfit men overseas; let us send only fit men to bear the brunt of the fight, because it is only a waste of money to send the unfit.

That brings me to the question of pensions. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) speak as he did in connection with pensions. In my judgment that will be one of the most important phases of the war that we as a Parliament will have to deal with; there will be a great many men who will be entitled to claim a pension from the Government, and it would seem that the matter should be removed, as suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, entirely out of the hands of politicians in any shape or form. You know that there will be 300,000 or

400,000 coming back from the war and they will be a big power in the country. They will probably represent one-fifth, or one-seventh, of the voting power of Canada. and it seems to me of the utmost importance that the subject of pensions should be dealt with early by absolutely independent men, or by a department as long as it is properly dealt with that it should be gone into thoroughly and quickly, and that a decision should be arrived at that will be fair to the men, the officers and the relatives who have been left behind by those who have lost their lives in the war. The whole matter should be settled once and for all so that we will not find ourselves in the position of the United States which, fifty years after the war, is paying a larger sum in pensions that it was paying many years ago. With regard to the sums that are now being paid according to the schedule, it seems to me that there has been too wide a difference between the private and the officer. However, I am not in a position to take that subject up and I am quite sure it will be dealt with by whoever may handle the pension fund. My main point is that whatever is done should be done quickly so that there will be no complication that can be avoided.

I want to touch for a moment on a subject that has been discussed very much here during the debate and that is the question of the supply of shells. I am not going to deal with it at any particular length simply because the matter has been dealt with fairly fully. But, there is one thing that strikes me as very strange. If the Shell Committee was all that the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) says it was, if it was such a fine committee, the minister has given us no good reason so far why that Shell Committeee was dismissed. Practically every member of it was dismissed. If they had done their duty, why should they have been dismissed? I should like to get an answer from some hon. member of the Government as to why that should have taken place. Of course, I think the Government have a very poor opinion of that Shell Committee, because the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) stated absolutely that he would not defend them, meaning, judging from his remarks, that they could not be defended. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries also stated that he was not here to defend the Shell Committee.

They had no defenders whatever in this House until the Minister of Militia and Defence came along. He undertook their defence at once. He said that this Shell Committee was his child, and that he was going to stand by them. He spoke about the Shell Committee in a manner different from that of the two ministers who had preceded him. He was very careful to say nice things about them, but he did not explain, any more than the others did, why, if the committee had done their work, and done it properly, they should have been dismissed. The fact remains that this old Shell Committee gave out contracts to themselves at the highest possible prices, and we have the evidence of the Solicitor General that these prices were extortionate. He took credit to the Government that it had reduced the prices from $5.70 for machining a certain class of shells to $1.75. It seems to me that, considering that all this took place within a few months, instead of it being an excuse for the Shell Committee, or the Government, it was the very highest possible sort of condemnation; within a short time they were getting shells, or certain parts of them, manufactured for $1.75 that, a few months before, they were paying $5.70 for. They are getting in shells to-day, and will be for months, for the machining of which they are paying $5.70, and at the same time letting contracts for $1.75. If ever there was a case of where a thorough investigation was advisable it is this one. To my mind it would be the best thing that could happen the Government, and if they refuse this investigation the people in the country can almost take for granted that all the charges which have been made in connection with this Shell Committee are true, and that the Government do not want to have them examined into.

It is no use saying that it is an Imperial Board, and that, therefore, we can not deal with it. The hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has told us plainly that we are paying our share of the shells manufactured under this committee, and our share of the munitions that the Canadian army uses in any part of the world that it is fighting in. If we are paying for these shells and these munitions generally why should we not have a committee of this House to look into the question and find out whether the right thing is being done or not? In every case where, during last session, the Opposition undertook to bring any matter up for investigation, either before the Boots Committee or the Public Accounts Committee, it was shown that they were absolutely justified in all the state-

ments they had made, it was proven that there had been a great deal of wrong-doing, and since then the Militia Department and the Government have been buying their supplies, boots, drugs, horses and everything else at much better prices and more in the interest of the country than before these investigations took place. If good resulted from the investigation of these matters last year, why should it not be beneficial this session, and why should there not be an investigation?

We have heard a good deal in the last five years about patriotism and loyalty. Is it patriotic or loyal to charge Canada and the British Empire $5.70 for doing the work that we now have done for $1.75, and which can be done at a profit for $1? If that is patriotism and loyalty, then the members of this Government are the most patriotic and loyal men in Canada. We have had a change; the old committee has been done away with and we now have a new Munitions Board. The chairman of this Munitions Board, Mr. Flavelle, of Toronto, states that as long as he is chairman of the Board all of the shell contracts are going to be let by public tender.

If that is so, how is my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works able to assure his manufacturing friends in the West that they will get their full share of contracts?

Mr. ROGERS: When did I do that?

Mr. TURRIFF: I will show my hon. friend. I am reading from the Tory Bible of Winnipeg, in other words, the Winnipeg Telegram:

> Winnipeg will get full share of War orders—Letter from Hon. Robert Rogers read at Trades council last night—War is taking many from labour ranks—Building trades have lost over half their strength, according to report.
>
> There is no basis for the rumour that the West will not get its fair share of the munition orders awarded in the future, according to a letter from Hon. Robert Rogers, which was read at the meeting of the Trades and Labour Council last night. Mr. Rogers declared that he would always keep in view the interests of Western Canada in this connection.
>
> This letter was written in reply to a communication from the machinist's union in which it was stated that persistent rumours were going around to the effect that no further munition contracts would be awarded in this city. The union requested the minister to use his influence in obtaining a fair share of war orders for this city.

According to the Solicitor General and the Minister of Marine, the Shell Committee is absolutely divorced from the Government, and the Government has absolutely nothing to do with it. How can the Minister of Public Works then see that these western manufacturers will get their fair "share" of war orders?

Mr. ROGERS: In so far as any orders are concerned that come to the Dominion of Canada from any of the Allies, it is only natural to expect that they will be distributed fairly over all portions of the Dominion of Canada. If my hon. friend thinks that the West is not entitled to its fair share let him say so from his place in the House. My opinion is that the West is entitled to its fair share, and must receive it.

Mr. TURRIFF: I agree that the West is entitled to its fair share, provided that it manufactures at the proper price, and is equal to the lowest tender. My hon. friend states that he is going to see that the western manufacturers get their fair share, and I think he will see that they do. But that just proves my contention that this Shell Committee is only a patronage committee of this Government. It is not independent at all, but merely an appendage of the Minister of Militia. I quite believe that patronage and pull on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will get a fair share of orders for the western manufacturers, and get the orders irrespective of price.

Mr. ROGERS: They will get them at the same price.

Mr. TURRIFF: Wherever there was political pull men got higher prices on their contracts. Why, the Imperial Munitions Board let contracts at different prices. They let a contract to one man at $4.50, and a contract to another man who had more pull for $4.75, and it was for a much bigger order. A larger contract still was let to their own friends at $5. It does not go by merit or by tender. They may call for tenders, but the contract is given to the man who has the most pull. It seems to me that this has gone on long enough. I was in hopes that under the new board things would be better, but apparently it is going to be under the influence of ministers just the same as the old one was. And who pays? The people of this Dominion pay. It strikes me as nothing less than an outrage at this time when the Empire and Canada is bleeding at every pore, and when we are sending off our men by the hundred thousand. At such a time the Government should be trying to save every dollar in the letting of contracts. They should find out where the contracts can be

let the cheapest, and then let them irrespective of politics, and irrespective of pull. Where they can give an advantage to their friends, well and good, I quite understand that. But why should dozens of big machine shops in Canada, owned by Conservatives as well as Liberals, be refused contracts for a single shell even, while mushroom companies organized within the last six or eight months, with a small capital and no facilities, are able to get orders at top prices running into hundreds of thousands, and sometimes into millions of dollars? It is an outrage, and should be put a stop to. But I am afraid, after reading this letter and hearing of other things that have taken place under the new Munitions Board, that things are not going to be much better than in the past. They will probably be a little better; they certainly could not be worse, and perhaps not as bad. But the business is not on a proper basis yet by any means, and it is time it was.

I should like to touch on another phase of this shell business. This demand for shells came some three or four months after the war started. At that time the Government had all kinds of large machine shops lying absolutely idle. These shops, which had cost many millions of dollars, were equipped with the most modern machinery that exists in the world, and if anything further had been necessary for them to turn out shells, it was simply the addition of a few simple lathes and boring machines. Everything else was in apple-pie order. You would have thought, Sir, that this Government would have wanted to supply shells and other munitions of war cheaply, and as there were four or five hundred million dollars worth of contracts to be let, that they would have organized a department to look after the manufacture of shells, and find out just what they cost to produce. Did they do it? No. They said they would do it when they were asked by Mr. Thomas, the man Lloyd George sent out, and they got credit all over the country for their patriotism in placing these shops at the disposal of the Empire at the eleventh hour. Did they carry out their promise? They never thought of carrying it out. As one of the ministers said, he thought it would be a very bad thing for the Government to establish shops in competition with private labour. Why should that be any worse in Canada than in Great Britain or Australia or anywhere else? The only way in which it would have been a bad thing is that it would have shown the Government and the Shell Committee just what it cost to make shells, and public opinion would not have allowed the game to go on. Public opinion would not have allowed Britain to pay three times as much as she should for shells, simply because these blood suckers had fastened themselves on the Government and were bleeding the country white. Many of these shell manufacturers have already become millionaires out of the excess profits on these shell orders. It is one of the most humiliating things that have ever occurred in Canada. A good many people believe, and I would like to believe myself, that the war will be over in another year. Unfortunately we have no proof of that.

It is only a supposition; it may occur or it may not. The history of all wars is to the contrary, namely, that they last much longer than appears at the first, and if this war should go on for two, or three, or four years yet, what is to hinder the Government from taking those big railway shops and turning them into hives of industry where the men will get fair wages and where the country will get shells manufactured at actual cost? Would not that be a patriotic thing to do? Would it not be a better order of patriotism than this business of giving out large contracts to their own friends in order to enable them to become millionaires? That subject is worthy of consideration by the Government and the Government should take action on it. If the Government does not take action, the people of this country will be very likely to take action on the Government, because the people will not stand forever being fleeced in order to make fortunes for half a dozen big ammunition concerns.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said it was costing Great Britain $25,000,000 per day to carry on the war, and the cost is increasing practically every month. Now if it is costing as much as that every day to carry on the war, is it not the duty of every one to see that the war is carried on as cheaply as possible, because as was pointed out by an hon. member on this side to-day, every time you pay a dollar more for an article than should be paid for it, you are just weakening the Empire and strengthening the enemy to that extent, so that if there ever was a time when economy should be practised, it surely is at this time. Economy should be practised not only in war matters but in do-

mestic matters. This Government is not trying to practise economy. The Minister of Finance every year hands out to his colleagues thirty or forty or fifty million dollars more than it took to run the country five years ago. For this increased expenditure, there would be some excuse perhaps if we had an overflowing treasury, but we have not an overflowing treasury these days. The public revenue has been very materially cut down; and had it not been for the practically double crop that we have had in the West, and the moderately high prices—fair prices, in many parts—the revenue would have fallen very much short of what the Minister of Finance estimated last year.

But what has taken place throughout the country? I shall not go into details now, because this is neither the time nor the place for that, but let me draw the attention of the House to some of the things which have taken place, and which are to-day taking place throughout the Dominion. The Department of Public Works is the big spending department of the Dominion, and I am sure every hon. gentleman on both sides of the House knows that we have had a good, lavish spender in charge of the Public Works Department for the last two years.

Mr. GRAHAM That seems to be right.

Mr. TURRIFF: Let us take the matter of the harbours of Victoria, B.C. It was shown the other day that even in the small matter of buying coal for the dredges, a friend of the minister would not give the orders to the man who had secured the contract, but gave them to the secretary of the Conservative Association in Victoria at about $1.50 to $2 higher than the tender price of the man who actually got the contract. It was shown by an investigation held there the other day that the secretary of the Conservative Association got a rake-off of fifty cents a ton on each ton of coal, the total amounting to a few thousand dollars. But what took place in connection with some dredging that went on in the harbour ? The engineer of the Department of Public Works, a first-class engineer, a capable and honourable man, a man accustomed to the work and one who knew what he was about, made all the surveys and the estimates, and according to the plans there were some 4,800 cubic yards of rock to be removed. A contract was let at $9 a cubic yard for solid rock and sixty cents for clay. This contract was sublet to a sub-contractor at $7 a cubic yard for solid rock. As soon as the sub-contractor went to work, he got into trouble with the engineer; and because the latter would not stand for any monkey work, he was got rid of and another man put in charge, and this sub-contractor, by giving a quarter interest to the superintendent of dredging whom my hon. friend sent out, and another quarter interest to the resident engineer—the minister knows about it—was enabled to put in estimates, have them certified to and paid, for over 20,000 cubic yards of solid rock at $9 per cubic yard, when less than 5,000 cubic yards had to be removed. An additional four or five thousand yards was certified to by the resident engineer, and the superintendent of dredging, but fortunately one man got tired of seeing the country robbed to this extent and he squealed on the whole business, and that part has been tied up. It has been shown in the evidence given in court that they had planned to put in 30,000 cubic yards of rock at $9 per yard, where only 5,000 yards existed.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend has made a definite statement which I want to say is absolutely incorrect and not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. TURRIFF: Has my hon. friend paid for over 20,000 cubic yards?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know what we have paid for, but my hon. friend has made the statement that we had deliberately planned to pay for 20,000 cubic yards, where only 5,000 existed. That statement is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not make any such statement, that the Government had deliberately planned anything. I said that the sub-contractor, the resident engineer, and the superintendent of dredging had deliberately planned it. That is what I stated, and that is what I know to be a fact. I do not suppose anybody in the Government outside of the Minister of Public Works knows anything about the matter.

Mr. ROGERS: May I say that, as I understand the facts, that is equally incorrect.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend can say that, as he understands the facts,—and I guess he does understand the facts—it is incorrect. I know that over 20,000 cubic yards have been paid for, and I know that the Government engineer, the good engin-

eer, the honest engineer, who made the plans, certified that there were less than 5,000 yards to be removed. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works can put that into his pipe and smoke it and make what he likes out of it. Those are the facts. The matter will perhaps not come up this session, but it will come up next session and the whole matter will be ventilated in the Public Accounts Committee. This case, however, has been in the courts of British Columbia, and the facts have come out and there are sworn affidavits.

Mr. ROGERS: It has been in the courts of British Columbia at my own request.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am not saying that it was not in the courts at the request of my hon. friend. I do not know at whose request it was. I understand it was the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) who put the papers into the court.

Mr. ROGERS: At my request.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, that is all right. That may be all true enough, but the fact remains that less than 5,000 cubic yards of rock had to be removed, and that my hon. friend's department had paid for over 20,000 cubic yards, and has also certified to an additional 5,000 cubic yards more or less These are the facts, and they can be proven. If the Government wish them proven before they come out in the Auditor General's Report of next year, all they have to do is to appoint a committee to investigate the matter.

But all this is no worse than what is going on in Vancouver, I am told; no worse than what is going on in St. John, or Toronto; no worse than what went on in Winnipeg under the machine built up by my hon. friend. But he got away in pretty good time from that. And this is what is going on at a time when we should have economy, at a time when the Minister of Finance should be right on his job and watching his colleagues—because some of his colleagues will stand a whole lot of watching if the expenditure of the country is to be kept within proper bounds. I would urge the Minister of Finance, in the interest of the Empire, in the interest of Canada, and as a means of bringing this war to a successful issue, that these overcharges should be done away with, and that the Government should pay only for the work done, and not pay three or four or five times over in order to put money into the pockets of sub-contractors.

Now, I come to the question of the commandeering of wheat. I am sorry the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) is not in his place. Because, although this comandeering of wheat was done through the Department of Trade and Commerce, as a matter of fact that department did not have a great deal to do with it. The matter was left pretty much to the Solicitor General, and I think it very probable that he was the villain in the play. The Government make the excuse that this was a rush order for wheat from the British Government. If so, how is it that for some weeks after they got word that the wheat was wanted, the Government took no action to secure the wheat in the ordinary legitimate way? Why did they not employ brokers to go on the market and buy the wheat, instead of dislocating trade, as they did? Do the members of the Government mean to say that they could not find brokers who could handle this business properly, buy at a right price, and hand the wheat over to the Government at a right price? I hardly think they would take the position that they could not find honest men to buy the wheat for them. They wired to Winnipeg for two experts to come down, Mr. Crerar and Mr. Crowe. I do not know Mr. Crerar very well. He has been for some years president of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, a prominent man in the grain business, a man who handles probably thirty or forty million bushels of wheat every year. Mr. Crowe I know very well; he has been in the wheat business all his life, and for thirty years, to my knowledge. I do not think the Government could have got advice from two better men. But why did they not follow the advice when they got it? Both these gentlemen advised them strongly not to commandeer the wheat but to buy it in the ordinary way. I know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had bought some wheat for New Zealand—I think it was for New Zealand—the year before, and his experience was very sad in that transaction. But why did not the Government leave the buying of the wheat to the Department of Agriculture? That department has men who are accustomed to buying wheat, and who would have looked after it. Or, what is this Grain Commission for, to the three members of which we pay large salaries? I am afraid that the trouble was that the Solicitor General wanted to handle this matter himself, thinking to make a political scoop. At that time there was a very strong agitation in favour of free wheat, and I think the Solicitor

General wanted to do something to offset it, and he conceived the idea that if he were to commandeer 15,000,000 bushels of wheat no more would be heard of the free wheat cry. If so, he should make another guess. Let him make a trip to the West, and I think that there he will find out that he was very far from the truth. They commandeered this wheat on the 27th of November. Within a couple of days there was absolute turmoil and the Grain Exchange had to be closed, practically, for all business purposes. Nobody knew where he was; the whole trade of the country was dislocated. And this happened at the very worst possible time of the year, just when the St. Lawrence navigation was closing, and when it was most difficult to get wheat out. What was the result? The millers raised such a row that the Government weakened and gave away to them, and told them they would let them have the wheat. Then the operators kicked up a row and said that they must have wheat in order to fill the contracts they had made for shipping, and so the Government gave them their wheat. But it happened that over one-third of this commandeered wheat belonged actually to the farmers. Some hon. gentlemen, who do not understand the conditions in the West, might wonder what the ordinary farmer out on the prairie was doing with wheat at Fort William. The explanation is simple. Many of the farmers have not proper granaries in which to hold the wheat during winter. Those who are fairly well off will sell a carload or two in the fall to pay off their debts, and, if they think there is a prospect of a higher price in the spring, they will hold the remainder of their crop. But they are not allowed to hold it in the elevators at the stations to which they haul it, for these elevators would soon be filled up, and the trade would be blocked. The elevator at the local station ships the wheat to Fort William, and there it is held to the order of the farmer who owns it. It costs the farmer about six cents a bushel to hold the wheat from early fall until navigation opens in the spring. If wheat goes up more than six cents a bushel the farmer makes money, but if it goes down, or if the rise is less than six cents a bushel, the farmer loses. This fall the price of wheat was comparatively low. A great war was on, and many of the farmers anticipated a higher price in the spring, and so they sent their wheat to be held at Fort William. In this way about one-third of the wheat commandeered by the Government belonged to the farmers. I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) what right they had to take the farmers' wheat at a fixed price, without consulting the owners in any shape or way? I want to tell my hon. friends that this Government have robbed the farmers of the West, many of them in my constituency, of over a million dollars by the action which they took in the commandeering of wheat. Dozens of farmers in my constituency had from 1,000 to 10,000 bushels of wheat stored in Fort William waiting for the higher prices. That wheat has been taken away from them without leave or license, and they have been paid $1.04½ a bushel for No. 1 northern. That was two months ago; to-day that wheat is worth 25 cents a bushel more to the farmer than the amount the Government paid him. Mr. Speaker, is that fair? Was it reasonable deliberately to rob the farmer of his well-earned money? That is what the Government have done, and that is what the Government will have to answer for to the people of the West. To give you an example, Mr. Speaker: a few days ago I got a letter from one of my constituents. I do not happen to know the gentleman—I think I met him once—I have not the slightest idea whether he is a supporter of mine or not. Here is his letter, written from Exeter, Ont., and dated January 27, 1916:

J. G. Turriff, Esq.,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—We own and work some farms at Frobisher, Sask., in your constituency of Assiniboia. On November 28 last the Government commandeered about 10,000 bushels of wheat which we raised on above farms and had stored at Fort William. In view of the fact that we had no intention of selling the grain for some time and that wheat has since gone up some 25 cents per bushel in price, we would like you to let us have the following information, viz.: for whom was the wheat commandeered by the Government purchased? At what price was it sold by the Government? Could the Government not have purchased the quantity commandeered, 17,000,000 bushels, in the usual way?

By giving us the above information you will greatly oblige,

(Signed) Robert E. Pickard.

Here is the case of a man who had 10,000 bushels of wheat at Fort William waiting for the rise in price that he felt would come some time between the fall and the spring. Without his permission, that wheat is taken out of his hands, and he suffers a loss of $2,500, which would have been a very considerable profit for any farmer. The Government takes the wheat from this

man, and he gets no redress whatever. But look, Mr. Speaker, at the different treatment that my hon. friends hand out to the miller and the speculator. The millers and speculators are organized; they get right after the Government, and what do hon. gentlemen opposite do? They give way to the miller and the speculator to the extent of lending back to them, upon their paying ten cents a bushel, this wheat that the Government said was a rush order. Now that wheat has gone up 25 cents, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance—possibly my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works can tell us—if the Government is going to get that wheat back.

9 p.m. Or will the millers, finding that they can save 15 cents a bushel, say to the Government: keep our 10 cents a bushel? The Government was in no hurry for the wheat; they did not need it at the time; my information is that not ten per cent of that wheat has left Canada up to this time.

Now, by what method could this wheat have been properly obtained? If the Government had not among their own friends anybody whom they could trust to buy 15,000,000 bushels of wheat, there were many other people whom they could have trusted. The Grain Growers' Grain Company and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company could have handled that 15,000,000 or 17,000,000 bushels of wheat in ten days. Over 2,000,000 bushels of wheat per day were pouring into Fort William; thousands and millions of bushels of wheat are stored all over the West. These concerns could have got the wheat quite as cheaply; they could have got it from men who wanted to sell at that time and who would have been satisfied with the price, without interfering with the men who wanted to hold their wheat. But the Government did not adopt that common-sense, businesslike method of doing it; they had to try to make a little political scoop, and they thought they were doing so when they commandeered this wheat. Is it not the irony of fate, Mr. Speaker, that the Government used the farmers' wheat to help out the miller and the speculator? They take that wheat from the farmer and hand it to the miller and the speculator, who suffer no loss, while the farmers whom they robbed of it got no consideration whatever. That is quite on a line with everything else hon. gentlemen are doing: anything is good enough for the farmer, but nothing is too good for the manufacturer. The interests of the Government are all tied up with the big concerns, and the farmer has to take anything he can get. In this case, as the hon. member for Moosejaw said this afternoon, the farmer gets a raw deal; for some years past he has been accustomed to getting a raw deal. I happened to see a farmer to-day from the West, not from my own constituency, but from Alberta, in the constituency of the hon. gentleman who sits beside me (Mr. Buchanan). This farmer tells me that he has over 20,000 bushels of grain, including 13,000 bushels of wheat, and that he has been able to sell only one carload, not because he was not satisfied with the price, but because he could not get cars. He happens to be in the Goose lake country, I think, along the line of the C.N.R., of which the people of Canada are owners of 40 per cent of the common stock. In that great stretch of country there are millions of bushels of wheat, and my information is that scarcely an average of a car of wheat per day gets out of that country. Many farmers do not know what to do with their wheat; the crop in that part of the country was a tremendous one, almost double what they expected. They did not have granary accommodation, and hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat are lying covered over with straw, because the farmers can not get the cars to take it away. I hold in my hand a letter from an American firm offering to supply cars; I will read it:

Hallett and Carey Company, Grain Commission, Minneapolis, Manitoba.

Mr. ROGERS: Minneapolis, Manitoba?

Mr. TURRIFF: If I said Manitoba, I meant Minnesota.

Friend Davis: I understand the Canadian railroads will not accept cars from the railroads on this side to load with grain to be delivered at Minneapolis or Duluth. We have several large shippers in western Canada who must move their grain at once. We stand ready to furnish the Canadian roads with 100 cars a day if they will let the cars run to Minneapolis or Duluth, and can guarantee shippers as much or more than they can get in the Canadian market.

Yours truly,

William F. Converse.

Now here is the situation. As I stated a moment ago, we have millions of bushels of wheat that cannot be shipped out this winter over the Canadian roads. Millions of bushels of wheat are lying outside, with just straw between it and the ground and

straw over it in the shape of a stack. That is all right in our dry western winter, but when spring comes it will be difficult to save that wheat. They cannot get the cars, and here is an offer of 100 cars a day. That would mean at least 1,500 to 2,000 cars at work to keep that going. But because that wheat would go down to Minneapolis, and Duluth, to the Minneapolis and Duluth markets, where the farmer would get as good a price or a better price than he could get at home, they cannot get cars.

Mr. REID: Are they not shipping a lot down to Duluth now?

Mr. TURRIFF: Certainly, they are shipping some, but here is a special offer that—

Mr. REID: To whom is the offer made?

Mr. TURRIFF: This is a letter written to the Hon. Senator T. O. Davis.

Mr. REID: To whom did they offer the cars, was it to Senator Davis?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes. I understand that my hon. friend is the acting Minister of Railways. I shall give the letter to my hon. friend. Here is an opportunity to do something that will be of real value to the farmers. The farmer to whom I was talking to-day has 13,000 bushels of wheat and has so far been able to get out only one carload. He cannot get the cars; the road is tied up. But here is a chance to get 100 cars a day.

Mr. REID: They have to have motive power too.

Mr. TURRIFF: They will supply the motive power from the boundary.

Mr. REID: But to the boundary.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does my hon. friend acknowledge that this road, to which the Government gave $45,000,000 a year ago, has not sufficient motive power to carry wheat out of the country as far as the boundary line?

Mr. REID: Not all in a day.

Mr. TURRIFF: Oh no, not all in a day. Here is a man with 13,000 bushels of wheat who has got out only one car. I saw it stated in the press that on that whole stretch of railroad they did not average a car a day per station. That is the state of affairs that exists in certain parts of the West. Where two or three roads come in competition at any point they get all the cars they need, but in certain parts where there is only one railroad they cannot get cars, and the railroad keeps the farmers waiting until it suits its convenience to send cars. The Government is the owner of 40 per cent of the stock of that railroad and ought to have something to say about this, and see that this wheat is got out. If it is not got out, a lot of it will spoil, and the farmer will be the sufferer. There can be no doubt that if it is not got out in the near future, owing to the rise in the price of wheat some farmers will be better off than if they had sold their wheat earlier; but if they lose it in the spring they will suffer a tremendous loss, and it is up to the acting Minister of Railways to see that the wheat is got out in the near future.

A word as to the freighting of the wheat across the Atlantic. We have heard a great deal since this debate started as to what the Prime Minister has done for this country in connection with shipping; we have been told that he went across to the Old Country almost purposely to have arrangements made to get the produce of Canada taken over there. We heard it from his own lips on the opening day of the debate, and then we heard it from the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) how much they had done and what they had accomplished. I want to take that question up with the minister, too. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made the following statement, page 194 of Hansard:

> At the end of June the Prime Minister went to London to confer in person with His Majesty's Government, and particular attention was devoted to this problem of providing adequate transportation for general commercial purposes. The whole question was fully discussed during July and August at a number of interviews which the Prime Minister had not only with the permanent officials of the Admiralty, but with several of the members of the Cabinet, all of whom realized its importance. It was recognized that the matter was equally important to Great Britain and to Canada; to Great Britain because of the food supplies which she must receive from this country and in order that her manufacturers might have access to the Canadian markets; to Canada in order that trade with the Mother Country might be maintained, and that the large crops which were to be harvested might find a portion of their market in Great Britain and other European countries. It was pointed out that in view of the part Canada was taking in the war it was especially desirable that every facility should be given to continue our export trade. The fact that a very large wheat crop was anticipated was particularly and insistently put forwrd. It was urged that from sixty to sixty-five per cent of our normal tonnage, peculiarly constructed for the North Atlantic trade, had been requisitioned, and that a serious situation would develop unless adequate steps were taken to meet it.

Then, a little further on, the Minister of Marine pointed out that the Government had secured three prize ships from the British Government and that they had been put on this route to carry produce from Canada to Great Britain. I would ask the Minister of Public Works, who is leading the House, a question. The Minister of Marine stated that three prize ships captured by Great Britain had been put on the Canadian route to carry produce from this country to the Old Country, but these ships did not carry the wheat any cheaper than other ships. Might I ask the Government why these captured ships, which were not owned by anybody else than the British Government, could not have carried the wheat at the ordinary rate in order to help the western farmer out, or if not to help the western farmer out, to help the British tax-payer out. Why did those vessels charge five and six times the rate of freight that was in force before the war?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that the question is quite clear to me.

Mr. TURRIFF: According to Mr. Hazen's statement, Sir Robert Borden, by great effort, arranged that some twenty ships which the British Government had commandeered should be released for trade between Canada and Great Britain. Later on they got about twenty more released. Then, in addition, there were three prize vessels that had been captured by Great Britain and put on this route. The British Government is the owner of these vessels; the Germans who owned them cannot claim any ownership in them now, I would think. These vessels were put on this route to carry wheat and other produce, and they are charging just as high freight rates as any of the other vessels; that is, they are charging rates about six times higher than they were before the war. Who is getting the profit? Why do these vessels make such high rates of profit? Why do they not carry wheat at the rates that existed before the war, or charge low rates and give the advantage to the British consumer of bread?

Mr. ROGERS: In so far as the ships are concerned, they were entirely under the control of the British Government, and when they gave them to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to the Government of Canada for the transport of grain, they no doubt fixed the rate that they should obtain for that business, which would be the general rate that existed on shipments of grain from ports in Canada to different ports in England, France or elsewhere.

Mr. TURRIFF: All right, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to get a clear and definite answer from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works who is leading the Government. Now, I am going to deal with it. My hon. friend is not the only leader of the Government to-night, but he is chairman of a committee of the Government that was appointed particularly to deal with this question. He, and the Minister of Agriculture, and our friend the villain of the piece, the Solicitor General, and one other member of the Government—I forget who he is—composed this committee. However, we have a definite, straight answer from the Minister of Public Works on this matter. Now, let me give you a little more of what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said, and then I am going to ask the Minister of Public Works to reconcile the two statements, the two positions. Here is what the Minister of Marine said further. He had spoken about the appointment of a gentleman, named Mr. Harris, to look after the shipping of goods from Canada—munitions and other things, and this is what he said:

> Under the direction of the Government, this officer entered into negotiations for the chartering of suitable vessels, and by anticipating charter conditions and securing ships in many instances considerably in advance of requirements, the Government was enabled to move war material, munitions and supplies at rates approximating those prevailing in normal times for ocean freights.

Here we have the admission that this Government, through the right hon. the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the committee of which the Minister of Public Works is the chairman, were able to go to the British Government and secure from it commandeered ships and that they were able to ship shells and other war munitions over to England at practically the normal rates that existed prior to the war. Have I made it clear that this Government, through their efforts, were able to get for the manufacturers a rate of freight between Canada and Great Britain which was the normal rate of freight and practically what it was before the war? But, when it comes to the western farmer, or the eastern farmer, and he has to send freight over to the Old Country, this Government, although they could have done for the farmers what they have done for the manufacturers, did not

do it. If this Government had been able to do for the farmer, or had been willing to do for the farmer what they had been willing to do for the manufacturer, instead of securing from the British Government a release of a certain number of ships which were permitted to charge the piratical rates that these ships do charge the Canadian farmer, rates six times higher than those which existed prior to the war, they would have secured for the farmer as favourable conditions as they secured for the manufacturers. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson), in the very able address with which this debate was opened, stated that, owing to the work of the British navy, we are free from German raiders, certainly, thanks to the British navy, which we have no part in, unfortunately, we are free from the German raiders, but is my hon. friend who is leading the Government to-night able to get up in his place and say that we are also free from the Canadian raiders in the form of Baron C.P.R., Baron Allan Line and Baron Somebody Else?

Mr. ROGERS: I would like to know from my hon. friend whether he realizes, that Great Britain is in a state of war, and, being in a state of war, that the Government have commandeered, and have control of the ocean-going ships, and that they have secured a special rate, for the munitions of war necessary to carry on the conflict in which we are engaged; and that in so doing they are fulfilling a duty which they owe to themselves and to civilization. I do not know whether my hon. friend purposes making a point as against this Government, by instituting a comparison as between the rates charged for the transportation of munitions of war, and of grain, to the markets in the old country.

Mr. TURRIFF: The British army to-day is using 50,000,000 bushels of wheat. If a soldier were in the trenches, without wheat, without bread, without food, what good would his munitions be to him?

Mr. ROGERS: That is a matter for the British Government.

Mr. TURRIFF: If he is left with an empty stomach of what use are munitions? He has to have wheat as well as munitions to fight the enemy, and my hon. friend's Government could secure for the manufacturer of shells a rate that was practically the same as the rate before the war, but when it came to the farmer they charged him six times as much—

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. OLIVER: Ten times.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) says ten times, but I am going to be within the mark and I will put it at six times. That is only in line with all of the actions of the Government in their dealings with the farmers. How does it come that you can ship a car load of wheat from Regina, Calgary, Brandon, or Portage la Prairie, to Winnipeg and down to Fort William over the Canadian Pacific Railway at exactly the same rate as you could two years ago before the war started? There is no difference. Why? Because we control the rates on the railways in Canada. As soon as that wheat strikes the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers at Montreal they charge us as much to-day for one car of wheat as they charged for six cars two years ago.

Mr. ROGERS: Simply because we cannot control the rates.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend says that, but last year, when the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was up for discussion in this House I moved the following amendment:

That the following clause be added to the Bill as clause 6:

That the freight rates charged by the company—

that is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who were asking for a new charter for their boats.

—shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

The Minister of Public Works and all his colleagues, would not accept that and defeated it. Therefore, we have no control of the rates at the present time, and, therefore, we are paying from six to ten times as much to get a bushel of wheat from Montreal to Liverpool as we did prior to the opening of the war. The previous year a new charter was granted to the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. On that occasion we on this side of the House, and, to their credit, some hon. gentlemen opposite, tried to induce the Government to put that and other companies under the direction of the Railway Commission, which would regulate their issue of securities, freight rates, and other matters. The majority of hon. gentlemen opposite, however, refused to support us, and the result is that on the lakes to-day we have freight rates three or four times as high as before the war. Has the war made shipping on the lakes any more dangerous, thereby causing insurance rates to go up? No.

Owing to the refusal of hon. gentlemen opposite these inland and ocean lines are able to do anything they like in the way of robbing the farmer of a legitimate price for his wheat.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What proportion of the export grain of the Northwest passed through Buffalo during the past year?

Mr. TURRIFF: I cannot give my hon. friend the exact figures, but it would be a very large amount.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I am told it was about eighty per cent. How could the shipment of this grain to Buffalo be caused by the rates on Canadian vessels, when the bulk of it was carried by American vessels?

Mr. TURRIFF: Why should this grain not go via Buffalo when it cost such a high rate to take it from Montreal? Had the freight rates been lower on the St. Lawrence route, more wheat would have gone that way. Another reason that accounts for this grain going from Buffalo was the commandeering of the wheat by this Government a month ago. Dealers do not want to be put in the position they were in then, of having their wheat taken from them, and being unable to fill contracts. In order to take no chances they shipped via the United States rather than via the St. Lawrence.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no difference between the two routes.

Mr. TURRIFF: Instead of commandeering the wheat, what might this Government have done? The lake and rail rate to Montreal during the fall was thirteen cents a bushel. That price would enable the Transcontinental Railway to land the wheat in St. John, N.B., or in Halifax, or in Portland, Maine, and make a big profit. It would have made about ten thousand dollars per train from Winnipeg to Portland, or to St. John. There was an opportunity to do something for the railroads, but the Government did not take advantage of it. And they could have helped not only the railroads, but the farmers, too, to the extent of six or ten cents a bushel. Some time during the month of November last I was in Estevan, in my constituency. I went on the market, and found that farmers were getting eighty-four cents a bushel for their wheat, but when it was loaded on the car, if it was available at once, they could get ninety-four cents a bushel. That is, there was a difference of ten cents a bushel between the track price and the street price. The Government could have bought the wheat in the elevators in the West, and paid the farmers a higher price than they could have got elsewhere, and then they could have brought the wheat over the Transcontinental to St. John, or Halifax, or Portland. The wheat could have been got to the seaboard cheaper, and the farmers would have got a bigger price. But oh, no, the Government would not do that. They commandeered the wheat, and did the farmer out of his legitimate gains, in order that my hon. friends the Solicitor General and the Minister of Public Works might make a political scoop. It was done to stem the rising tide of a demand for free wheat.

Mr. BRADBURY: How much of the farmers' wheat was commandeered?

Mr. TURRIFF: Those in a position to know better than myself state that more than one-third of the wheat commandeered belonged to farmers.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not believe it.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend does not like to believe what does not suit him. He does not know—

Mr. BRADBURY: I know as much as the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. TURRIFF: Neither you nor I know much about it, especially you. Those in a position to know state that between five and six million bushels were owned by the farmers, and they were deliberately robbed of twenty-five cents a bushel. That is a fact. My hon. friend may not like it, because he will have his difficulties in explaining to his constituents the action of his friend the Solicitor General.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: And the St. Peters affair.

Mr. TURRIFF: This will be much worse than the St. Peters affair. Every other hon. gentleman who supports the Government in commandeering that wheat will have some explaining to do before the electors. This shows very clearly how differently the Government treats the manufacturer as compared with the farmer. They secure for the manufacturer practically the same rates as before the war, and they enable their friends the manufacturers of shells to charge three prices—everything for the manufacturer and nothing for the farmer. My hon. friend the Solicitor General is a very fine speaker. He can dilate on the fine points and split hairs with the best of them, but he has some contract before him in convincing the

farmers that the commandeering of their wheat was an advantage to them Let me read from the Ottawa Citizen of January 20, 1916, an item reprinted from the London Herald, headed "Thieving Shipowners:"

Speaking in the House of Commons on Thursday last, Mr. F. W. Goldstone, M.P., demonstrated that the rise in the price of bread was entirely due to the iniquitous freight charges of shipping companies. These have risen from 12s. 6d. per ton before the war to 120s. per ton to-day, and mean an addition of 2½d. on each 4 lb. loaf.

That is, the price had risen ten times, or one thousand per cent.

Mr. Goldstone showed that one ship of 10,000 tons earned in one voyage £80,000, which is more than its original cost. Mr. Balfour did not attempt to defend this extortion but, like the prime minister, fell back on the law of "supply and demand" argument and appeared to be in doubt as to what government action could be taken to remedy this state of affairs. Surely men like the first lord of the admiralty live in an atmosphere of unreality, for he is a member of the government which passed the Munitions Act, an Act which was expressly passed to prevent the operation of the law of supply and demand where workmen are concerned. Even the author of "Philosophic Doubt" should be able to understand that a shortage of ships is no reason at all why wealthy shipowners should be allowed to fleece and rob the people. If all shipping were commandeered it could be used for the service of the nation, and not, as now, for the private profit of a handful of rich and unscrupulous exploiters.

These are the words of an English member of Parliament. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Government could have accomplished, for the carrying of wheat, if they had been desirous of doing so, just exactly what they accomplished for the carrying of munitions of war, because wheat is just as much munitions of war as are shells. The only difference is that in the one case it was the Government's friends, the manufacturers, for whom they were working, and in the other it was the farmers, and as the Government did not work for them, the farmers did not secure the same treatment. The result is that the farmers have to bear the brunt, as has always been the case since this Government came into power.

I have taken up rather more time than I had intended, but I have one more word to say and then I am through. I wish to refer for a moment to what took place during this debate in regard to hay. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) in his speech, did not in any way controvert or endeavour to controvert the statements made by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) as to the handling of the hay contracts in New Brunswick. The fact is that no denial was made of the salient facts. The Minister of Agriculture never attempted in any way to answer the charges which were somewhat as follows: that the Government gave a contract to one concern at $23 per ton for hay delivered at St. John; that they then prohibited the exportation of hay, thus putting every farmer in New Brunswick who had hay to sell into the hands of the one man, Mr. F. B. Smith, ex-candidate of the Conservative party in New Brunswick at the last election. This Mr. Smith went around and bought that hay at between $11 and $12 per ton, when he should have paid $15 per ton for it and made an ordinary contractor's profit over and above that price. These charges have not been answered in any way and the facts remain. The Government did the same thing last year in regard to the woolgrowers. They prohibited the exportation of wool, and the Canadian farmer then had to accept ten cents a pound less for his wool. The Government are doing exactly the same thing in regard to wheat to-day. They refuse to allow the western farmer to export his wheat to the United States; they refuse to put wheat on the free list in order to give the Canadian farmer the benefit of the American market. In all these matters, the Government stepped in and did the farmer an injury in order to help out the manufacturer, the miller, and the speculator. The Minister of Agriculture made a great ado about a former contract secured by a company of which the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) was secretary some thirteen years ago, and he condemned the making of the contract by which the price was fixed to the New Brunswick farmer for his hay, and it was a price higher than had existed previously; but if that was reprehensible thirteen or fourteen years ago, what about the action of my hon. friend the Solicitor General in commandeering the wheat of the farmer two months ago, and fixing the price, not at a higher figure than existed at that time, but at exactly the same figure? He prohibited farmers who had from five to six or seven million bushels of wheat from getting any better price for it. If it was wrong, as the Minister of Agriculture says, to make that bargain and prevent any extra price from being given for the hay, what about the action of the Solicitor General in commandeering the wheat? That is something with which my

hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture ought to deal, because if it was wrong in the one case, it was equally wrong in the other. I trust that in connection with the carrying on of this war, in connection with the supplying of ammunition and foodstuffs for the British Army and the British people, the Government will get busy, and see if they cannot make an arrangement which will be as suitable to the farmer as the arrangement that they have made and which has been suitable to the manufacturer. If they do half as well for the farmer as they have succeeded in doing for the manufacturer, the farmers of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, will be far more friendly towards the Government than they can possibly be at the present time.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, allow me at the outset to add my congratulations to you on your elevation to the Speakership. At this particular time, which is unparalleled in Canada's history, even although this debate which has lasted for some days may seem somewhat prolonged, it is our duty, seeing that we sit here as representatives of Canadian constituencies, and that we are all practically of Canadian birth, to offer what suggestions we may to the Government of this country in this time of stress. In view of what has been done by the citizenhood of the Dominion of Canada—and may I in that respect mention especially the women of the Dominion—there are two duties incumbent on the parties in this House.

The duty of the Government is to give the lead to patriotic public sentiment; to sacrifice all other considerations in the determination to make Canada's share in the struggle a worthy and effective one; to banish sternly and rigorously the petty and often costly intrigues of mere party politics, and the reprehensible and dishonest tactics of get-rich-quick-at-the-country's-expense middlemen. It is further the duty of the Government to invite friendly counsel and thoughtful and honest criticism; to legislate with an eye single to the speedy accomplishment of the great task of the Empire; to deal resolutely with every instance of impropriety brought to its attention, by searching public investigation, and to further improvement in methods wherever they have been shown to be faulty.

There is also a duty that devolves upon us as the Opposition party in this House. It is, to give sympathetic and hearty support and assistance to the Government in all legislation making for the attainment of the national and imperial objects immediately in view; to pass with the utmost freedom and despatch all war grants and all bills designed to make more effectual Canada's part in the conflict; to bring promptly and frankly to the Government's attention all cases of impropriety or worse, that may come to its attention, and to urge full investigation, and, wherever possible, restitution. It is as well, Sir, the duty of the Opposition to aid the Administration with helpful counsel and suggestion; to put aside for the time being mere party criticism and devote its energies solely to its foremost responsibility at this hour—to see to it, so far as may be in its power, that the full measure of the service and sacrifice of the people is applied in the most direct, honest, and efficient manner, to the patriotic purpose for which it has been so heartily given.

These appear to me to be the outstanding duties of the members of this House. I do not here desire to make any protestations of loyalty; these are unnecessary. I firmly believe that, with the exception of the leaders of the Nationalist party, there is not a disloyal man of Canadian birth in Canada. I believe that we are all loyal, that we are all doing what we can in the great cause to which all our energy should be directed. Let me point out in passing, that even Bourassa, with all that he would have us believe of Canada and of the British Empire, has his practical views of this matter. When the war broke out, by the strange irony of fate, he was in France, the home of his fathers, and immediately upon the declaration of war he was one of the first to jump aboard a British boat and under the British flag come back to Canada. That was Bourassa. He may not admire this country, he may have hard things to say of the British Empire, but the fact remains—for his actions speak louder than words—than when he desired to save his own hide the British flag was good enough for him.

It has been said, Sir, that Canada in this war has found her soul. There is this much to be said of Canada and Canadians: that more than ever before have they been brought to a greater sense of their responsibilities and of Canada's position as a part of the British Empire. Canada's responsibilities are no longer nebulous or theoretical. If we desire to remain a part of this

great British Empire and of that I have not the slightest doubt, and I pray God we may so remain—our duties are plain, our duties are concrete; Canadians must rise to a greater sense of responsibility than that to which they have hitherto attained.

The Government of Canada has passed through twenty months of happenings such as no Government in this country ever passed through before. They have met their responsibilities, in some cases well, in some cases not so well. But though great questions have arisen heretofore in the course of this war, greater questions are going to arise shortly after the close of the war; questions that will call for consideration by the whole Canadian people; questions that must be looked square in the face and in the light of day, especially by every man who takes upon himself the responsibilities of a representative of the people. The Government will have to face a period of reconstruction at the end of this war, and it will have problems to deal with that will call for men, strong, courageous, and irrespective of party, with an eye single to duty.

Our debt to-day is enormous; it is rapidly growing and will be very much greater at the close of this war. That debt must be met and taxation applied therefor in a way that shall be as equitable as possible. In levying that taxation and making provision for the payment of that debt, my own opinion is that the men of great wealth in this country—to preserve which wealth great sacrifices have been made, much blood shed, and enormous treasure given—when that final reckoning comes, the responsibility of these men who have been so greatly taken care of should not be overlooked.

Another problem that will confront us at the close of this war is the home-coming soldier, and that is a problem, with one other I shall mention, that, above all others, the people of Canada, if they dare to call themselves loyal citizens, if they have faith in themselves and in the Empire, must take care of. To my mind, it is the State's most sacred and bounded duty to see to it that these men, when they shall return, whether whole or maimed, shall find just provision made for them as for men who sacrificed their all, and by the shedding of their blood shed such lustre upon Canada.

Then there is the pension scheme, and that is the other problem that I refer to, as being, with the problem of the returned soldier, the greatest that we have to deal with. We mourn for those who have lost their lives in defence of the honour of this country, and for the maintenance of liberty, justice, and civilization. The dependents of these men, the widow and the orphan, should be protected in such a way that no man can look a Canadian in the face and say that we have not done our full duty to honour the memory of those who have given everything for Canada. We who remain at home have lived and are living, even during war, in peace, comfort and happiness. True, many of the homes of this country have been rendered sad by the loss of those who were most near and dear, and therefore it is that I say, that as through their efforts and their sacrifices we have enjoyed a period of prosperity and happiness in this country, they having lost their lives in this war, leaving dependents behind them a pension scheme must be devised by whatever Government that may be in power that will be absolutely fair and will amply provide for those who are dependent upon it.

Another matter that will require attention when this reconstruction takes place is the land question. Peradventure a great flood of immigration should come to this country from the war-ravished lands of Europe after the conflict is over, and a land scheme should be devised for the soldiers who return, on the basis of actual settlement upon the land. I am not in favour of issuing scrip as a bonus, as has been done heretofore; the land should be given to the returned soldiers upon the condition and understanding that they should become actual settlers upon it; that they should cultivate it, and that no title might be made, by way of giving speculators a chance, within five years of the granting of the patent, or at least until the death of the patentee. I think some such system ought to be evolved. It appears to me that these are some of the few problems that will have to be faced; in my humble way they strike me as being important; I give them to the House for what they are worth.

Another matter that will require consideration is improved defences both by land and by water. I do not believe that there will ever be such a thing as perpetual peace; I do believe that from now on such preparations will have to be made by every nation that hereafter no war may be brought about and carried on as this one has been. I believe that the only way

to prevent such an occurrence is by absolute and entire preparedness. There is no doubt about the fact that at the present time Canada is passing through a period of transition. She is passing from a too self-satisfied, money-making people to a people who realize that they have left behind them the dependent stage, and, by sacrifice of blood and treasure, have passed into a great world of nations. We welcome this transition; we join in that nationhood with our heads up as self-reliant, courageous Canadians.

It has been broadly stated that there should be no criticism of the Government's action at this particular time. I am not inclined to agree with that view, although for the moment I do not intend to criticise to any considerable extent. I merely desire to say that wholesome criticism of any government is good. The Government should welcome any criticism that is honest and that will make for the betterment of the country in the present strenuous times. My genial friend the Minister of Public Works, for whom I have a great regard, sometimes exercises a rather fine Italian hand along these lines. I think that in some respects he has been endeavouring of late to manufacture a few more thunder tones for the country. I make that remark on account of an article which appeared in the Winnipeg Saturday Post of January 22, 1916. I understand that the policy of this paper is in some way controlled, or at least guided with a parental hand, by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure that my hon. friend does not wish to do me an injustice. I can assure him that I have no connection in any shape or form with the Winnipeg Saturday Post, and never had.

Mr. PARDEE: I am most delighted to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation. However, the Winnipeg Saturday Post is a rather strong Conservative organ. It says:

> The Opposition, since the beginning of the war, has professed ultra-loyalty and at the same time has done everything possible to give the impression that the Government has been remiss in its duty. Either the Government is at fault, or the Opposition is in error. The most expedient method of determining the correctness of the several attitudes involved is by making an appeal to the people. Precipitating a general election at the present time may justly be regarded as unfortunate, but it could not be so unfortunate as the condition that we have to-day, where an Opposition, while professing loyalty, is striving by every subtle means to handicap the Administration in its patriotic efforts to advance the British cause.

I take a decidedly opposite view to that which is expressed in this article. As I have already said, honest criticism is good and the Government should welcome it. May I say to the Government and their supporters that if, by reason of the criticism which they have received during this session, they take it upon themselves to say that they have a mandate from the Canadian people to ask for their opinion at the polls, there will be no justification for that attitude; and if they do bring an election on, the blame will be entirely upon their own heads.

Mr. ROGERS: Do not be afraid, we do not intend to do it.

Mr. PARDEE: Surely it is not unjust criticism to say that the Minister of Public Works might to-day, when all our resources ought to be conserved, do a little less spending in his department. Surely I might say also to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs that he refrain from taking on every man who wants a job, and thus curtail the expenditures in his own department and not increase them, as he has been doing. Surely we might say to the Postmaster General your revenue is decreasing and your expenditure is increasing. Why? Because Conservatives are out of jobs and want to be looked after. Surely it is right and proper to bring these matters to the attention of the Government. Surely we might say, Sir, to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) that the people of the province of Ontario want to know why, with a tender in from T. Eaton & Company, of Toronto, for trousers at $3.20 a pair, the Capital Brand Trouser Company, of Toronto, were given a contract at $3.73 a pair, and that the people of the Dominion of Canada paid $40,000 more for the soldiers' trousers than they should have paid. Surely that is honest criticism. Is it not honest criticism also to ask the Government why Ellis & Ellis should have contracts for parts of shells when they are not in the shell-making business? These are all matters interesting at least to the people of the province of Ontario, and I do arrogate to myself the right to speak for some small portion of them. I say to the Government that these are things that must be cleared up. I say too, that the people demand the clearing up of these things; and I say further to the Government, that if they do not clear them up in a way that is satisfactory to the people of the province of Ontario, they will be deemed to have been remiss in the trusteeship of

the people of the Dominion of Canada which they are there to carry out. These are all things that must properly and thoroughly be explained to the people of the Dominion of Canada; and it is the bounden duty of this or any other Government to see that they are so explained.

There are some lessons to be drawn from this war, hard though they may have been to learn. The one lesson that strikes me and that I would ask those on the other side of the House to take to heart is that, the other day, the Minister of Militia in making his speech in this House in defence of his department, unconsciously I know, and utterly unwittingly, paid the members on this side of the House a tribute that essentially, at least to my mind, established the fact that when the Minister of Militia voted as he did vote against the naval scheme propounded by the Liberal party, he voted in a way that he knew was not in accordance with the dictates of his conscience; that he voted in that way for party purposes and party purposes only. At page 305 of Hansard the minister said, in answer to a question as to whether any shells were manufactured in Canada before the war:

> Yes, at the arsenal at Quebec. About 75 shells per day was our output, and 75 per cent were bad.

Then, he went on, and, by easy stages, led up to what was being done in the way of the manufacture of shells by the Shell Committee; and he said, speaking of an occasion where Canadian soldiers were fighting:

> Let me point out that on that occasion our boys were armed with Canadian rifles, shooting Canadian ammunition, and firing Canadian shells. Having no shells to fire on Thursday, General Morrison found on Friday afternoon that a shipment had come to one of the stations eight or nine miles back. He sent his wagons back and commandeered 8,000 shells, and found that they were Canadian. Then, on Friday evening and Saturday, Canadian riflemen, armed with Canadian rifles, firing Canadian ammunition, and Canadian artillery, firing Canadian shrapnel shells, held back upwards of one hundred thousand of the best soldiers the world has ever produced.

I would like to ask my hon. friends on the other side of the House, and I would particularly ask the Minister of Militia if he were here, if he would just transpose that a little bit and take himself back to the naval debate we had in this House but a few years ago; and then bring himself along again by easy stages until at this time he might have said to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from his place in the House: Here we have what? Canadian boats, owned by Canadians, built in Canada, manned by Canadians, patrolling the Canadian coasts, convoying Canadian troops, protecting Canadian trade routes, with Canadian guns, firing Canadian ammunition and maintained by Canadian money. It does not appear to me that that is much of a step in advance of the concrete instance given to us by the Minister of Militia the other day. To-day we might have had a naval reserve of thousands of men, and the British naval officers calling for men might go to the Great Lakes and to the sea coasts of Canada, east and west, where you have thousands of young men whose very home is the water, and who to-day would gladly enlist to help England's navy if she needs them—and she does need them. We should have had all that to-day had the scheme as originally laid down and as accepted by this House, backed by the last man of the Opposition of this House, been carried out. Together with Canadian ammunition we would have had the nucleus of our Canadian navy, and not have had to depend on Japanese boats or Australian boats. We would have had the same sight as was given as an object lesson to those Canadians who had not in them the real pride of Canadianhood, that they were as good as any people under the sun. You would have had the same object lesson that was given by the Sydney, the Australian cruiser. The very words uttered by the Minister of Militia, to my mind, absolutely prove that contention. I sincerely trust as a Canadian that I shall never again see the spectacle presented by any Government in Canada, to the world or to our sister colonies, of a Government saying to Canadian mechanics and Canadian artisans, the best there are in the world: You are not good enough to do the work that other artisans and mechanics can do. They said it only for the purpose of hiding themselves behind the mantle of nationalism. That is why it was done. The old, old story again. I shall not enlarge upon it, it would be impertinent on my part after the classic in those lines that the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) gave us the other day.

There is one other thing as to which I purpose speaking. I approach the matter, I will confess, with some degree of hesitancy because along these lines, as along others, I trust I am a good enough Liberal to let every man have his own opinion; even if he does not agree with me, his

opinion may be as good as mine, but we may not look at it in the same way. We rather pride ourselves on the fact—at least speaking for myself, I do—that this is a democratic Canada. We are young, we are big, and we are broad. We have great stretches of country that positively spell democracy.

It has become the fashion in this country to attempt to build up a sort of pseudo-aristocracy. Upon every available occasion, when we take up the papers, we see a long list of titles. You positively stumble upon these knights in the streets. I met one of them the other day and I had forgotten for the time that an honour had been conferred upon him. Presently he came around to it and, after preening himself very considerably he said: Oh yes, but you know, Fred, the women want it. That may be all very well, it may be true, but, Mr. Speaker, I have an idea in the back of my head that the women are put up to it by the men. Speaking in all seriousness, I jotted down a few moments ago such world-wide names as William Ewart Gladstone, John Bright, Richard Cobden, Herbert H. Asquith, Lloyd George, Edward Blake, George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie. Do you want better men than these? Would Blake, Brown, or Mackenzie, have been greater Canadian had they had prefixes and half the letters of the alphabet after their names? They stood upon their merits as those merits were recognized by the Canadian people. I say, Sir, that for a young, democratic country, we have had enough of titles and that a man in Canada should be recognized for one thing and one thing only—the merit that there is in him and the good that he does to his fellow-men. Provided he is a Canadian gentleman it is a good enough title for anybody.

I want to say, in conclusion, that our Canadian soldiers have shown themselves to be equal to any in courage and in resourcefulness. The people of this country, especially the women, are doing their share, and it remains for the members of this House to be their equals in political courage and political morality.

On motion of Mr. Levi Thomson, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Tuesday, February 1, 1916.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his recommendation and the clerk's report respecting the appointment of Mr. C. W. Boyce as clerk of Votes and Proceedings, House of Commons.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 17, to incorporate The Canadian Indemnity Company.—Mr. Schaffner.

Bill No. 18, respecting W. C. Edwards and Co., Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 19, respecting a patent of James W. Owen.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 20, respecting Queen's University at Kingston, and to amalgamate therewith the School of Mining and Agriculture. —Mr. Nickle.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner for the year ended March 31, 1915. —Hon. Martin Burrell.

List of Shareholders, Chartered Banks of Canada, as of date December 31, 1914.—Sir Thomas White.

List of certified cheques, drafts or bills of exchange, dividends remaining unpaid and unclaimed balances, chartered banks of Canada, as of date December 31, 1914.—Sir Thomas White.

Governor General's warrants issued since last session.—Sir Thomas White.

Expenditure on account of unforeseen expenses from April 1, 1915, to January 12, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

Temporary loans, Dominion of Canada, outstanding December 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended April 30, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of the National Battlefields Commission for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of Treasury Board over-ruling of Auditor General's decision.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of superannuations in the Civil Service during the year ended December 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, January 31.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I purpose to confine my remarks to one question, namely, the commandeering of wheat at the head of Lake Superior by the Government's order issued about midnight on the last Saturday in November. The leader of the Opposition referred to this question, and I was rather surprised to see the Prime Minister object. He appeared to think that if the leader of the Opposition was not prepared to make a charge, he should not refer to the question at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say quite what my hon. friend suggests. I said that if he did not intend to make a charge he ought not to refer to a charge. I did not say the question ought not to be referred to.

Mr. THOMSON: My reason for making the remark I did was the following passage in the Prime Minister's speech, which I think bears me out:

> Well, if he had not any charge to make, it might perhaps have been in better taste if he had not referred to a charge at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, "to a charge' —that is what I said.

Mr. THOMSON: I have no charge to make myself. I do not wish to deal with this question in any fault finding spirit, but rather with a view to eliciting information, and to stating as clearly as possible the viewpoint of the western farmer. I think my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) and my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) have clearly shown that one class of the farmers of the West sustained considerable loss through the Government's action in commandeering the wheat. I do not intend, however, to deal with that phase of the question. I do not think that that was the most serious loss sustained by the western farmers through this seizure. The most serious loss, in my opinion, was caused by the disturbance of trade. We have been told that the Government have loaned to the millers a large proportion of the wheat that was seized. I believe that this is unquestioned. We have also been told that a large portion was loaned to the dealers to enable them to fill their contracts. This, however, has been denied, and I think we should be told whether it is a fact or not. If it is a fact, I think we have a right to know how much was loaned, to whom, and when it was repaid. If the dealers had to buy wheat at a higher price at a later date, whether to repay the Government or to fill their original contracts, they would be the losers unless the Government recouped them, and we have had no information so far that they were recouped. If there was a loss, who bore that loss? If I am selling goods to a purchaser who has had other lots of goods which he had bought on former occasions, forcibly seized, and if he is still in fear of further seizures, it would be absurd for me to expect as high a price from him as if he were not afraid of further seizures.

It would be absurd for the western farmers to suppose that they would get the same price from the grain dealers after the seizure in question, as they would have received had there been no seizure and no fear of any future seizure. It would be absurd also to suppose that the dealers did not recoup themselves from the only source from which they could do so, that is, from the farmers. That they did so recoup themselves is clearly indicated by the fact that there has been since the date of the seizures a tremendous increase in the spread between the prices at Minneapolis and those at Fort William. I find, on a careful perusal of the market reports from the 1st of September of last year, the beginning of the wheat season, up to the time of the seizure, that the price for the highest quoted grade at Minneapolis was on an average about 5 cents a bushel higher than the price for the highest quoted grade at Fort William. The Minneapolis quotations, however, are for No. 1 hard, while the Fort William quotations are for No. 1 northern, and the Canadian spread between No. 1 hard and No. 1 northern is about a cent. Therefore, assuming that the value of the Minneapolis No. 1 hard is the same as that of the Canadian No. 1 hard, we should deduct one cent, which would reduce the difference between the two quotations to four cents. That, however, has nothing to do with my argument at present. I find that, since the date of the seizure, the average spread has been nine cents a bushel; or, if you deduct the one cent, it has been eight cents. What is the reason for that increase of four cents in the spread? I do not think the western farm-

ers will be very long in coming to the conclusion that the Winnipeg dealers are in this way making up whatever loss they have sustained. It is a simple way, and in fact, the only way in which they can make it up. The loss to the farmers is unquestionable, but it is not necessarily unjustifiable. If it can be shown that the action taken by the Government was in the best interest of the Empire and absolutely necessary, then it was justified notwithstanding any losses to the farmers or anyone else, and no one will be more ready to agree to that proposition than the Western farmer; but I think we are entitled to some explanation of the action of the Government. We have heard what have been termed explanations, but unfortunately the explanations do not explain. Let me refer to some of these explanations. I will quote an extract from an editorial in the Winnipeg Telegram of November 30, 1915, as follows:

> Instead of condemnation and criticism, it will be found that the Dominion Government is deserving of the highest credit for having taken an unprecedented course to protect the British consumer, overburdened as it is by the colossal burdens of war, against the designs of the wheat gamblers who think of profits day and night and of practical patriotism, not at all.

One reason is given to us in this editorial; but the trouble is that it does not explain how the action of the Government protected the British consumer, and we have no explanation of the necessity of that action further than that the Winnipeg dealers are a pack of scoundrels waiting to rob the British Empire whenever they get a chance. I am a life-member of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, and have attended a number of conventions. I have heard some pretty hard things said there of the Winnipeg grain dealers, and perhaps with some reason but I have never heard anything half as hard as this. I have never heard it suggested that they are utterly devoid of patriotism, and I do not believe that charge is true, whatever else may be said of them.

The following is an article from the Winnipeg Telegram, written by its staff correspondent at Ottawa under date of November 30, 1915:

> The Government in commandeering the wheat had several objects in view: to protect the Allies against exorbitant prices, to secure to the producer any subsequent rise in wheat values, and also to demonstrate to the Allies that as purchasing agents they could be depended upon to fill orders promptly and economically.

A number of reasons are given in this article, but it does not explain how the action taken could protect the Allies; it does not explain why it was necessary to take these steps to protect the Allies, nor how this action could secure to the producer any subsequent rise in wheat values. As was shown here yesterday, instead of securing to the producer any subsequent rise in wheat values, the Government absolutely deprives him of it. That is a publicly known fact. I think we should have an explanation as to how the action of the Government would demonstrate to the Allies that the Dominion could be depended on as a purchasing agent to fill orders promptly and economically, and how they were useful as purchasing agents in the case cited. The extracts I have quoted are at best semi-official statements; but we have some official statements; we have copies of telegrams sent by the Solicitor General to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. One of them which I have copied from the Manitoba Free Press of the 29th of November, 1915, is as follows:

> Government hopes Winnipeg Grain Exchange will realize that the action taken by the Government arises primarily from war conditions and is also actuated by earnest desire to secure timely markets for our very abundant crops. The present opportunity to that end might otherwise have been lost.

That is very fine, like most of the productions of my hon. friends of the Solicitor General, but, like the rest of them, it explains nothing. We are not told what the war conditions are which rendered this action necessary, nor how this action secured timely markets for our abundant crops, and it is very hard for us to see how it would do so.

From another official document issued by the Government some quotations were given by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Here are some short extracts from that document—I will not read it all:

> The phenomenal crop of wheat in the Canadian west has brought upon the Government the duty of assisting to the farthest extent possible in this marketing.

Further on it says:

> The British Government has requested the Canadian Government to provide within a short time a very large supply of No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 northern wheat.

And at the end of the document appears the following:

> The action taken by the British Government is based entirely on war conditions, and the response of the Canadian Government has been dictated by the same state of facts.

In this statement it is nowhere said that the Imperial Government had requested this Government to commandeer the wheat. There is no doubt, however, that the statement sent that impression abroad throughout the country, nor is there any doubt that the intention of the Government was that that impression should go abroad throughout the country. There is no doubt that the same impression was conveyed in Great Britain by that statement, for we find the following British statement quoted in the Manitoba Free Press of 30th November:

London, November 29.—The official Press Bureau made the following statement to-day: "With reference to the announcement from Ottawa on November 28, that the Canadian Government had commandeered sixteen million bushels of wheat at the request of the British Government, the Board of Agriculture states that the Government has made no such request and that at present they have no information on the subject."

So I say not only was the impression conveyed throughout Canada, but also throughout Great Britain, that the Canadian Government's action was at the request of the British Government. And from the last clause of the statement I have quoted it is quite clear that whatever our Government did they failed hopelessly to keep in touch, as they should have, with the Imperial Government. While on this subject I must refer to a point that was dealt with by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) yesterday. I refer to the calling of Mr. Crerar, President of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, and of Mr. Crowe, a prominent member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, to consult with the Government. Yesterday the hon. member for Assiniboia quoted from the interview with Mr. Crerar in the Winnipeg Telegram, and I do not need to read that again. But it is quite clear that these gentlemen were called in to advise the Government, and their advice was eminently good, but it was turned down flat. Let me quote very briefly from an interview with Mr. Crowe, published in the Manitoba Free Press of 30th November:

I argued as strongly as I could against commandeering of the wheat.

To get back to the question of the effect of this action on the people of the West: I repeat that, even though the effect were to cause loss to the western farmer, if it were necessary in the interest of the British Empire, the commandeering of the wheat would be justifiable. Further, I grant that it is conceivable that circumstances may arise under which, in order to protect the British consumer, commandeering would be necessary. But it seems to me that that time will come later, if ever it does come. The time of danger is when the wheat has got out of the farmers' hands. Never be alarmed about reports of a sudden rise in price when the grain is in the farmers' hands. But if the Government wishes to secure necessary supplies for the British consumer while the grain is in the farmers' hands there need be no difficulty about it, provided the Minister of Trade and Commerce takes the farmers into his confidence. If I may be allowed a personal word, I may say that I still have a carload of wheat in the granary on my own farm. I have sold the rest of my grain to meet the demands of the most clamorous of my creditors, but the rest of them I am holding at arm's length and trying to keep this car of wheat in the hope of a rise later on. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce will assure me that it is necessary to the welfare of the Empire that he should have that wheat, I am prepared to send a telegram to my home now asking them to ship the wheat to the minister's order. We will not quarrel about the price, either he can pay me to-day's price, to-morrow's price, next week's price, or the price of the week after that. Nor am I alone; there are thousands of farmers in the West who are of the same mind with me. The hon. minister may say that it would not be possible to deal with individual farmers in that way. Then, my hon. friend from Assiniboia has shown him a way out of that difficulty. Let him deal with the farmers' companies, the Grain Growers, Grain Company, and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company. Let the minister make a request of the secretaries of those companies and say that it is necessary and advisable in the interests of the Empire that wheat should be secured, and if those officials turn down the request and fail to do everything possible to assist the hon. gentleman there will be a day of reckoning coming for those officials; the next company elections will clear them out. I can assure the minister that the patriotism of the Western farmer is enough to ensure that. I can tell him that the main difficulty in dealing with the western farmers is that he has not had sufficient confidence in them. He has been rather devoid of faith in them. The greatest teacher the world ever

produced says that if we had faith as a grain of mustard seed we might do wonderful things. The lack of that faith as a grain of mustard seed is the trouble with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. "To him that believeth all things are possible," and I would say to the Government: "Oh ye of little faith, wherefore did ye doubt? Why did not you deal openly and fairly with the western farmers instead of launching that thunderbolt on Saturday night or Sunday morning, whichever you like to call it, disturbing the Sabbath rest of the grain dealers in Winnipeg as the Solicitor General kept telegrams flashing throughout the day?" I do not see any occasion to disturb the Sabbath rest of these gentlemen and deprive them of the consolations of religion. I do not know that I blame the Minister of Trade and Commerce very much, for he is not in touch with the western farmers, and I do not think he understands the mind of the western farmer. But the Solicitor General, who was acting for him, is inexcusable, because, if he does not know the western farmers by this time he should. Either he does not know or he altogether ignored the facts of the case. The farmers are willing to do anything in reason for the benefit of the Empire, but we want to know why the action taken by the Government was necessary. We want explanations, that explain. We want to know how the action taken protected the consumer and the producer; how it secured markets and supplied requirements. Could not the end have been accomplished better in other ways? We want to know exactly what was done with every bushel of wheat seized, and I think we have a right to know that. Was grain loaned to the millers and dealers, and if so on what conditions, and how was the loan repaid? What was done in regard to the increase in price? We are satisfied to lose if it is necessary in the interests of the Empire, but we want an explanation that explains, and we believe we are entitled to it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I shall not claim the attention of the House at great length, but there are a few things I wish to take this opportunity to discuss. As to the question of wheat referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), I still believe that it would be good policy for this Government and for Parliament to secure the entrance of Canadian wheat free into the United States. I have looked into this question rather carefully, and while arguments can be brought forward for both sides, I still believe that the western farmer ought to be the best judge of where his interests lie, and that what would be good for him would be good for the country at large. Although I say this, I am still a protectionist; I have not changed my views with regard to reciprocity or what would have been the effect of the freer trade that reciprocity would have brought about.

As to what is called the seizure of the wheat, I think that it is quite within the duty and competence of the Government, especially on an occasion of this kind, to take possession of wheat if they think it is in the public interest to do so. I believe also—and I think this will come out after the farmers have studied the question—that it might be the duty of the Government of Canada to stabilize the price of wheat, the one thing that we produce more of than anything else. I do believe that it is possible to valorize the price of wheat and in that way to get a better price for the farmers. One step in the direction of stabilizing the price of wheat is to provide sufficient elevator and storage accommodation throughout the country. I do not believe that we have enough storage accommodation for our wheat as yet; we shall need more elevators and we shall have to exercise some kind of national strategy in the marketing of this great staple product. That is all I have to say about the wheat question.

I wish for a few moments to come to the war situation. I have the honour to represent a constituency which has, I believe, sent more soldiers to the front than any other constituency in Canada. When I say that, I must ask hon. gentlemen to remember that the population of South York is much above the average constituency in Canada. There are over 100,000 people in South York now, and thousands of men have gone from that constituency to the war. I know one little mission church in that riding from which 120 men have enlisted and are at the front. I was at a little church service on Sunday last which was attended by scarcely twenty people; yet on the list of the men who have gone to the war from that church there are nearly thirty names. All through South York is found that spirit of determination to fight for the cause of the Empire and the cause of Canada. I have been at recruiting meetings in that riding where more than fifty men have enlisted. Such

is the feeling of the people throughout that portion of the country. The people of the city of Toronto and the county of York have shown their faith by the number of men they have sent to the front, by their contributions to the Patriotic Fund, and by the general service of all the people in the efforts made to promote our interests in this war.

I wish to contrast the condition of affairs that existed a year ago with those which prevail at the present time. The conditions in the riding of South York and in the whole province of Ontario are very much improved. There was lack of work a year ago; there is no lack of work now; and a better feeling of confidence exists. But what strikes one most of all now in regard to the war is that at last the people of Canada have come to realize how great this struggle is, how deeply interested we are in it—that we are in it to a finish and must stay with it. A year ago the people did not realize that; they did not realize how far-reaching the effects of this war would be. They did not realize what effect it would have on every one of us, and upon the business of this country. In view of the German menace of to-day, no owner of an acre of land, no man in any kind of business, can say definitely what the future will bring; until this German menace is absolutely removed, we can have no definite assurance as to the future. And this menace affects not only Canada, but the United States as well, just as much as it does this country. A year ago, in the debate on the Address, I spoke on this subject, and I said that what struck me then as being of supreme importance to us in regard to the war was that Germany had gone into a contest in which worldwide democracy and parliamentary government were assailed; and that if Germany succeeded we might bid goodbye to the general liberties of the world and to our system of parliamentary government. I emphasized that view by giving a quotation from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg speech. I hold more strongly than ever the view which I then held as to the seriousness of this conflict, as to our being absolutely committed to it, and as to our doing everything we can to bring about the successful issue, which we believe will be brought about. Not only are the people seized with the seriousness of the war, but they are imbued with a courage and a moral uplift such as has never been seen in the British Empire. Courage in individuals as well as in the various communities and nations that make up the Empire never was at such a high point as it is to-day, and it is because the people have come to see how serious the issue is and what sacrifices they must make and are prepared to make in conection with this conflict. I say that this is a hopeful sign. We are waking up; England is waking up; the whole Empire is waking up, and I believe that at last the people of the United States are also waking up. The drums of freedom are to-day beating all round the world, calling people to this great struggle, calling attention to the importance of it. The drums of Drake are beating to-day in the cause of freedom as they beat in the days of old. In the same cause the drums of the great protector Cromwell are sounding. The drums of William of Orange are beating to-day in the cause of freedom and democracy. If Pitt had not drums, he at least had a voice, and that voice can be heard to-day. The drums of Wellington and of Nelson are beating to-day in the cause of liberty and freedom throughout all the world. At the time of the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln made the speech at Gettysburg which I quoted from a year ago, wherein he stated:

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

And then he went on to say:

> That we here highly resolve that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and the government of the people by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

He was fighting for the freedom of the slaves, but we to-day are fighting for political freedom, for civilization, and for all mankind. It has come to this point, that the people of the United States are beginning to realize the situation; they are commencing to hear the drums beating in the cause of freedom; they are beginning to think how serious the situation is, and to ponder as to what they ought to do in the circumstances. I am not going to criticise the action of the United States, in view of what has taken place; but I do ask, with all possible candour: who is now beating the drum of Lincoln in the cause of freedom, and, who is beating the drum of freedom on this North American continent if it is not the Canadian people? Who is assuming the leadership on this continent in this battle for liberty? It is the greatest credit that has ever been won by the Canadian people, that on this supreme occasion, when the liberty of all the world has been attacked, they have assumed, on this North

American continent, the leadership in advocating the cause of liberty, by sending their sons, as they have sent their sons, to the front; and by being prepared to spend the last dollar and to send the last man until the war is carried to a successful issue. That is to the credit of the Canadian people, and that is the new view that we are taking of our position. Therefore, anything and everything must be done by this Parliament to carry this war to a successful issue. It will take time; it will require great sacrifices, it will take any amount of money; and yet we will have to give it cheerfully, and we shall have to bear the loss of blood and treasure. By doing that, we shall rise higher in the scale of nations; we shall be doing only our duty, and we shall come out tried by the fire, a better and a nobler people.

So far as I can gather from what I see throughout the province of Ontario and the whole Dominion, and judging by the recruiting that is going on, the people are more determined to-day than ever to bring about a successful issue of this war, and, Sir, they want to see the main energies of Parliament, and of the nation, devoted to the successful prosecution of the war. We can discuss the important question of munition contracts, and I do not object to that, but there are greater questions that Parliament must deal with, and they should deal with them now and not be deferred until after the war is over. We have got to finance this war, and we have got to have a new fiscal policy for Canada, not only during the war but for the future, after the war. I have taken the view that the commitments of this country are such that we will have to change our whole currency and banking laws, as they have been changed in nearly every other country. I believe that Canada will have to nationalize the currency, and to replace the bank currency by national currency, and the sooner we do it the better. We cannot finance this country, under the present war conditions, with a bank currency. We ought to have an absolutely national currency, and to do that we must change our laws so as to follow the example of the United States. Not only must we have a national currency, but we will have to have the system of re-discounting and reserve banks, which they adopted in the United States as an elementary and essential feature of their banking system, and which have been most successful. I have no objection to our present banking system, or, rather, I have no objection to our banks as they are now conducted; they are doing well. But we should have a better system, and it would not injure our banks if we had a national currency instead of a bank currency. There is a way of supplying them with a national currency, and they should have it on reasonable terms, so that they can give the country better service. We will not be able to finance Canada under these war conditions unless we change our currency and banking systems in the two directions which I have indicated.

There is another great question that must be dealt with, and it cannot be left until after the war. I refer to the question of getting some kind of mortgage credit loan system for the farmers, not only in the West but all over Canada. I have read a good deal about the meetings that have been held in Western Canada within the last few weeks and of the efforts that the local governments are making to get better credit for the farmers of the West. They are trying to bring about an improvement, but I wish to direct their attention to a plan which was introduced in Congress the other day by a joint committee of both houses, a committee which was unanimous in recommending this new plan to create national mortgage banks which shall have for their object the furnishing to farmers cheap money on long term loans. The ordinary bank system of this country or of the United States is not organized to give the farmer long credit. If he wants to go into the live stock business or to improve his farm, he cannot do it on short loans negotiated with the banks. But in Australia, and New Zealand, and in nearly every country of Europe, they have a system of lending money to the farmers at long dates and at low rates. They have proposed in the United States, which has been so progressive in the matter of her banking law, a system whereby they will give mortgage loans to farmers based on the national credit of the United States. Of course they form loan bank associations, and smaller associations of farmers under them, and a mortgage is drawn on the farmer's property for which he has to pay practically 5 per cent principle and interest, but at the end of thirty years the whole mortgage is paid off, and he has nominally paid only 4 per cent per annum. The object of this legislation, which has the support of the Administration, is to give the farmer of the United States any sum up to $10,000, if his farm property justifies

it, practically at 4 per cent interest for the development of his farm; and they are enabled to do it, as you will see when you get to the bottom of the system, by using the national credit for the benefit of the farmer, just as it has been used for supplying money at low rates for commercial requirements. And this Act, under which these district loan banks are to be created, contains one little clause, the sense of which you do not get until you investigate the details. It is, that these banks are made depositories for the United States. That is, the United States can deposit in them its own notes and all the money its agents collect, with the exception, I believe, of the customs revenue. In taking that stock in these great banks, the whole resources of the United States can be used, and will be used, after this law is passed, for securing for the farmers of the United States four per cent money. They have done it in Australia and in New Zealand, and on a somewhat similar system, and I see no reason why we should not do it too. What I should like to know is why Parliament is not now devoting its attention to this great question of financial reform, which may involve the nationalization of the currency of this country, and which does involve the creation of these mortgage banks for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. MURPHY: Is there a limit to the amount subscribed by the United States Government?

Mr. MACLEAN: There is practically no limit. Its limitation is in the control of the mortgages. They must be undoubted. It has the object of creating a new and first-class security for investment in the United States, and the investor is invited to put his money in these mortgages, which are to be absolutely first-class. Of course, there is a danger of the Bill not being passed, but the Administration that adopted that great banking reform which has been tried for a year now, and which is the most successful financial revolution ever effected in the United States, has committed itself to its passage. The business men of the United States have all accepted the system of national reserve banks. This system of credit loans for farmers is not being tried for the first time. It may be an experiment in the United States, but it has been successful in Australia, as I have said, and in New Zealand, and in nearly all the countries of Europe. Ireland has been regenerated by the credit system inaugurated there for the benefit of the farmers, and France, Germany and Russia have adopted this important reform in national finance.

What I want to see at this time is Parliament discussing these questions of financial reform. It will not do to wait until the war is over; that may be some time yet. The important thing is to get ready now, so that if we should have a great influx of settlers, as we may have after the war, our finances shall be organized in such a way that business men will be able to get what credit they want in connection with our banking system, and our farmers and settlers will get a reasonable credit to help them in the development of their farms. It will be a benefit especially to the farmers in the West engaged in stock-raising. A man in the West cannot get the money he wants from a bank for stock-raising, as it involves a loan extending over three years. It is necessary, if we are to settle this country as it ought to be settled and in view of the great war, to reorganize our financial system from top to bottom; and we cannot begin too soon. I give the legislatures in the West credit for what they have tried to do. The legislatures of two or three of the western provinces have considered this question, and some of them, particularly those of Saskatchewan and Alberta, seem to think it is within their power to create a system of credit for the farmers, based on land mortgages. Now it may be possible to work it out in that way, but to my mind it would be better to work it out on the national credit of Canada, as it has been worked out in Australia, New Zealand, and in Europe. That question is calling for settlement, and so also, as I have said, is the question of reform in regard to our banking. This is the time when Canada ought to place a great loan in the United States. I believe there never will be such a favourable opportunity as the present for Canada to secure her national currency by a gold reserve. We can get money to-day on the New York market at a lower rate, I believe, than Great Britain and France got their loans recently. In the United States they have unbounded confidence in this country, and what we want is the use of their capital. We want settlers from their country, but we also want to have this country so financially reorganized that in the recovery from the war we will be able to accomplish these reforms, and ensure for Canada a new era of prosperity.

The more I consider this question the

more I am convinced that Parliament ought to be here and now dealing with it, and trying to arrive at a solution. We are creating a great war debt, and we will have to meet it. How are we to meet it, and what is this Parliament going to do in connection with it? If we double our population we will reduce the debt by half; but we can do things now, and we ought to be doing them now. We ought to be conserving our national resources for the benefit of the country and for the payment of the war debt. We have the greatest store of nickel in the world. There is no such amount of mining wealth in any part of the world as there is at Sudbury. The part that nickel plays to-day in the world is enormous, and if we can conserve it and develop it, it will pay the whole of our national debt. What are we doing in regard to the development of that industry? So far we have allowed it to be controlled by an American company, and we do not know —I have studied the matter very carefully, and I do not know—what interest a certain group of German people have in the nickel monopoly in the United States. It is time we did know it, and it is time we conserved that great resource, our greatest resource. It is time we conserved it for the Empire, and refused to allow a pound of that ore to go out of this country until it is treated and reduced in this country. We have possession of it, and ought to know where it is going. I do not accept the assurances that have been given that that nickel has not passed to Germany. Perhaps it has not, but Germans own a large section of the stock of that company; that I do know, and I would not put anything past them. I repeat, it is high time that we controlled the nickel products of this country. It is an enormous asset, and I believe it should be under the Canadian flag, and not in the United States. I want to know what the Government is doing in regard to that. I am told—I see it in the newspapers—that there is a policy of some kind coming, and that it is intended to start refining industry in the province of Nova Scotia. I have no objection to that being done, but I want to see it done in Canada. I want to know how much there is of this nickel, and what the other products of nickel matte are. We do not know how much platinum there is in it, nor how big a profit this company is getting out of it; we do not even know whether they are paying their dues to the Ontario Government, as they are supposed to do under the law. We do know that their profits within the past year were in the neighbourhood of twenty million dollars, and they may be double that for all we know. They control the nickel supply of the world, and they are getting over fifty cents a pound for their nickel. If Canada has the greatest store of nickel in the world, we ought to have in Canada the largest production of nickel steel in the world, and we should work out a national policy in that direction. If we do that, and if we provide for a proper conservation of our resources, no one need fear for the future of Canada.

In the great Northwest to-day—and I now address myself to the western members—we probably have an enormous store of petroleum, and petroleum is one of the essentials in this war. The war has established the fact that motors, aeroplanes, and traction engines of all kinds depend on gasoline. What are we doing to find out how great a supply of petroleum we have in the Northwest, and how we are going to conserve it? If we do happen to have a large supply, are we ready to nationalize it, and use it for the cause of the Empire? I say we ought to nationalize this petroleum, we ought to nationalize nickel; and above all things we ought to see that none of these resources is alienated by private persons, or private companies, and especially by private persons outside of our own country. We must not delay about these things. The war debt is on us now, and what are we doing to make our natural resources assume a portion of that war debt? This is a question which must be considered, and it should not be left for discussion until the war is over. Parliament should be busy now on this question, as well as on conservation reforms generally.

Not only have we great stores of nickel, petroleum, and probably platinum, all of which are essential in this war, but we are developing a great silver and gold mining industry in this country. Within three years, I believe, two or three of the greatest mines in the world will be up at Porcupine and in the Timiskaming district of Ontario. At present we are letting that gold and silver go out of our country. In view of the great scarcity of gold, and the part that gold is playing in the ecomomics of this war, I do not know but that our Government should take possession of our gold and silver supplies. Some objection has been made to the commandeering of wheat. I certainly would be in favour of commandeering all the gold

and silver produced in this country, and in view of the part that these metals are playing in the war, doing everything possible to encourage production. Nothing counts like gold in this war, although the day may come when it will not be of so much importance. We know that Canada possesses these great stores of nickel, and gold, and silver, and yet we are not using them for ourselves and for the Empire as I think we should. Certainly a way could be found to utilize our nickel and petroleum for the benefit of the Empire, but of course we can do nothing unless Parliament takes the matter up, and Parliament should deal with it at once.

There are still other questions that must be dealt with. For a moment I am going to refer to the railways. I have always been in favour of the nationalization of railways. The Government nationalized the railways in England as a war measure, and now that that policy has been adopted it will never be changed. Now that the necessity for conservation and efficiency and for saving wherever it can be effected has been brought home to the people of Canada, I think our people will come to see that all unnecessary overhead expense in connection with railways, all unnecessary competition, and all unnecessary duplication should be done away with. This could be done either by state ownership or by increased state regulation. In the interests of the nation we shall also have to nationalize our telegraph lines and our express companies—and that because of the war if for no other reason. We cannot afford the wastages that are taking place. There seems to be unnecessary competition and duplication of service in everything, and the people are suddenly going to rise up and say to Parliament: What are you doing to distribute the great war debt that has been created, and what are you doing to improve conditions in this country? I do not think we are doing all we should do. I think we are discussing questions that are not of such vital importance as the questions I have raised here to-day. I think Parliament should be prepared to sit down now and deal with these questions, and try and find a solution, instead of thinking how soon we can get through with the business we have before us.

I also wish to say a word or two about munitions.

I should like to have seen our country get a larger share of munition orders, although it is surprising the number of orders we have got, and what we have done. A short time ago I spoke about the improved conditions of this country, and contrasted the present state of affairs with conditions a year ago. I see a great improvement, and probably the manufacture of munitions in this country has had something to do with it. But I am not satisfied that we have done everything we could to bring orders from the Allies to Canada. I do not know that our agent-general in the Old Country has done everything he could; I do not know that we are fully seized of the importance of this question. I admit that we have done a lot, but I believe that we could do a great deal more. If the war is going to be long—and we do not know whether it will or not—we shall have to go more fully into this question of munitions, and inquire just to what extent they can be manufactured in this country. I say that the great workshops belonging to the Canadian railways should be devoted to that purpose. We should be producing all the munitions we can, and at the lowest possible price consistent with giving a fair wage to our people engaged in the work. It is well worthy of the consideration of this Government as to whether they should not change somewhat their policy in this respect, in order to increase the production of munitions here.

The last thing I wish to say is this, and it also deals with the war: I have heard a great deal of talk about the part Canada is to play in the peace negotiations when they come about. To me what seems of more importance, now that Canada is engaged in the war, is that we should be asking ourselves: what part are we playing in the strategy of the war, in the appointment of generals for example. Rather than be represented in the peace proposals, I should like to see our country placed on the status of an ally of the Old Country, so that we could have a say in the conduct and strategy of this war. Grave mistakes have been made in this war in the matter of policy, and in the appointment of generals, but no protest has gone forth. The time has come when, instead of having a say in the peace proposals, it is, perhaps, of more importance that we should have a say in the conduct of the war, seeing how much we are committed to bringing it to a successful conclusion. I am absolutely in favour of Canada's participation in the war, but if the war is to be continued there should be some change in our connection with it. We

ought to have more say in the matter, and we ought to be represented in London by someone who has absolutely the confidence of the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian people; one who will take a part in the deliberations of the army council, or whatever the body may be that has under its control the direction of this war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like my hon. friend, because he takes a great deal of interest in this question of representation in the councils of the Empire, to elucidate a little more the point which he is making.

Mr. MACLEAN: Now that I have introduced the question, I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of elucidating his views in regard to it. I will go this far and say, that we have not had that representation that we ought to have had. There is now a war council in which all the Allies are represented, and if we are to have a say in the peace settlement, which everyone says we are to have, I think we ought to have a say now when these urgent questions of general policy are under discussion. When I say that I come back to a short speech that I made the other day in Toronto, when I said that I believed more than ever in maintaining the national integrity of Canada under the British Empire. That may mean a great deal, or it may not mean much, but there are people who wish to see what they call a great Imperial Federation. I do not see the necessity of that yet, but I think we ought to be an absolute part of the British Empire, although I believe in our maintaining our national integrity all the time, no matter what the situation may be.

As to the outcome of the war, I do not wish to assume the role of prophet. There are so-called reverses happening every day, but the cause is going on all right. The British navy is upholding its supremacy and maintaining the liberty of the world on every sea. Great Britain has been backward as regards the army as compared with the navy, but she has seen that she must have a great army, and so have her Allies. Now, that army is being created and the struggle will sooner or later have to come. We believe that the Allies will be successful in that struggle and that the liberties of the world will be preserved, although it will be a struggle to the end. This is a war between two peoples who have put themselves, the one against the other, the one to uphold liberty, and the other to assume an unfair military ascendency. I hope that the tyrant will be put down and put down forever, and that Canada will never release her efforts until that result has been successfully accomplished. But, until such is the case, this Parliament will have to make innumerable sacrifices. We shall have to stand for any amount of taxation; we shall have to revolutionize our system of finances and our way of controlling our natural resources, and we shall have to do many things which we formerly thought we might not have to do. The people expect us to deal with these matters, and the question I ask this Parliament is: What is it doing with these great questions, in view of the situation, in view of the debt that has been created, and in view of the things that Canada must do for the regeneration of herself and for the reconstruction of the Empire after this war is over? We are not doing all we ought to do. If Parliament would be seized of the seriousness of the situation, it would pay more attention to these matters and less to questions of party. Saying that, I have said all I intended to say to-day. I may, if an opportunity is presented later on, go into some of these questions in a little greater detail, and especially into the question of financial reform in this country; but for the present I have said enough. I have tried to reflect the views of a great many of the citizens of this country in regard to the necessity of greater action on the part of the Parliament in connection with this war.

Mr. PAUL EMILE LAMARCHE (Nicolet) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, since the opening of the session, you have been tendered numerous congratulations by the members who have addressed the House before me. I, as an old companion in arms, may be allowed to join in with most earnest wishes that you continue to fill with the same tact and distinction the exalted position to which you have been raised.

This year's address of His Royal Highness the Governor General of Canada, has now occupied our attention for about two weeks, and, in the course of the debate, what is known as the political truce has been largely disregarded. The usual accusations of maladministration and boodling have been bandied across by politicians on both sides of the House; and, certain opinions have been expressed and certain assertions made as statements of facts, which it is my duty, representing as I do a French-Canadian constituency, to refute or rectify.

My purpose is not to enter a plea in justification or explanation of the particular stand I have taken in this House, during

the last five years, on Canada's participation in the wars of the Empire. I feel there is no need of my enlarging on that question; my opinions are the same and the principles I uphold are those I had already laid down when I took a seat in this House.

Nor shall I stop, Mr. Speaker, at criticising piecemeal some unhappy utterances that may have slipped the lips of orators during this debate and which were rather offensive to the race to which I am proud to belong. My compatriots, I know, are above such insults.

I shall also eschew the assumption or even the mere idea that among my English-speaking fellow countrymen—among whom I enjoy some of my best friendships—there may be found a majority to endorse the opinions of a few extremists. My purpose in rising to-day, Mr. Speaker, is to stand up in this British country, before a meeting of free men, in order to defend two of my compatriots, ex-members of this House, against whom have been borne accusations of the utmost gravity.

I let a few days elapse in the hope that members older than myself would take the cudgels on behalf of men, to whose principles and efforts they are indebted for their seats in this House.

But, as the debate is drawing to a close, I take pleasure, before the third crowing of the cock to take up the task.

The fact is notorious that, in a certain section of the country, newspapers from whom we might expect fairer treatment and men who, on account of their position, should show greater moderation, are clamouring that Mr. Henri Bourassa and Mr. Armand Lavergne be hanged or shot.

I feel like expressing to my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) my appreciation of the very temperate suggestion he has made, at the risk of incurring the displeasure of his friends, that Bourassa and Lavergne be merely deported to Germany. Such generosity is a credit to him and a surprise to us. Doubtless he has been moved by the humanitarian speeches of the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), who at the last three sessions, has preached to us in favour of the abolition of the death penalty.

I confess I feared at first that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) would advocate incarceration into that penitentiary at Kingston, of which he has already spoken so harshly. No better opportunity will offer for him to settle his dispute with the hon. the Minister of Justice. Once Bourassa and Lavergne secure behind the walls of that famous jail, the hon. member for Frontenac will certainly make an end of his requests for the mitigation of the treatment imposed on convicts.

In any case, should the counsel prevail that Bourassa must be banished, I fully agree with the hon. member for Frontenac that, outside certain regions not far distant from us, Germany would be the most proper place where could be utilized the talents of a man whose life has been given to the defence of minorities and smaller nationalities.

But what is the nature of the impeachment against Messrs Bourassa and Lavergne? In different localities, it is called now high treason, now disloyalty, or simply the expression of German sympathies.

So far I know, the gentlemen in question have not urged any of their compatriots to take up arms against their Sovereign. No citizen of this country has been guilty of such a crime. Yet the records of Great Britain bear witness to the fact that only recently an important man in the Kingdom, Sir Edward Carson, has, in the course of a religious squabble, sounded the call to arms to resist the enforcement of the laws of His Majesty's Government. But his conduct did not debar him from being called to fill in the British cabinet the important position of solicitor-general, whose office it is to see to the proper execution of the laws of his country. Nor, to my mind, have those gentlemen, made pronouncements nearly as serious as those made only recently by Sir Herbert Holt, who, on his return from England, declared that the War Office was rotten to the core.

Those orators did not claim with the late Sir Richard Cartwright that all we owe England is Christian forgiveness for all the harm she has done us.

Have they ever gone the distance of my excellent friend the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Paquet), who, in bygone days, after calling upon the steeple of his village church to crush him to the ground if ever he should fail to keep any of his pledges, could be heard to exclaim that the British Empire could be likened to imperial Rome that drained her colonies' blood.

I must acknowledge that the old communard that was then found in the hon. member for l'Islet has been tamed through his coming in touch with the powers that be. The other day, in seconding the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, he

used all possible caution and delivered himself of all possible flattery towards the hierarchy and the clergy of his province. His words recalled vaguely his yesteryear's speeches on maple syrup, and I doubt not but such efforts will earn him his bishop's absolution. To his electors, however, is reserved the right of assigning the penance.

Messrs Bourassa and Lavergne, as well in Le Devoir as on the platform, have merely insisted on and developed a principle which he himself has been advocating for years, namely, that in the present state of our relations with Great Britain, Canada's duty is limited to the defence of its own territory, and that this principle should not be departed from except after the country has been constitutionally consulted.

The assertion of that principle not only is not tantamount to treason or disloyalty, but it has been professed by the most eminent exponents of both political parties, who in the past have held the helm of the State.

This principle, moreover, accords with the spirit of Confederation.

My first proof of that fact is an excerpt from an address delivered at London, by Sir Alexander Campbell, at the Colonial Conference of 1887:—

> An interview was held here between members of the then Government of Canada, including Sir John Macdonald (who is the Premier there now) and I believe the then War Office authorities, and I think the Prime Minister, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the time being. The result was this: The Imperial Government had previously given us notice of their intention to withdraw from the colony Her Majesty's troops, and they declared their resolution to carry that out. The Government here agreed to undertake the naval defence of Canada, the Canadian authorities undertaking the land defence of the colony. Upon that basis the confederation of all the provinces was formed, viz: that Her Majesty's troops were to be withdrawn (the withdrawal was then in course of being carried out), and that the local authority were only to undertake the land defences.

Further on he added:—

> I obtained, before I left Canada, the last return of the Department of Militia and Defence, a department which was organized after the conference of which I have spoken with the authorities here, and after we had undertaken that the confederation should rest upon the basis of our maintaining the land defences.

Such was the position taken at the time by that statesman, and such was his own interpretation and what he declared to be Canada's interpretation of the constitution.

Nobody then blundered to the point of charging him with disloyalty.

Some time later, in 1903, from his seat in this House as Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfred Laurier made on his return from the London conference the following declaration:—

> The Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier): . . . There is a school in Great Britain to-day, especially in the official world, whose object for years past has been to bring Canada into the military organizations of Great Britain. The views of that school and their expectations were presented to us by the Right Hon. St. John Brodrick, Secretary of State for War and by Lord Selborne, First Lord of the Admiralty. But we could not see eye to eye with them, we could not approve their views, and had to propose an absolute demurrer to their contentions. I am aware that there are men, even in Canada, who use the argument that, because Canada is part of the British Empire she should take part in the large expenditure necessary to provide the heavy armaments that Great Britain has to maintain because of her dominant position in the world. I cannot see the force of that logic. It would imply that Great Britain and Canada were on a footing of equality, whereas we know that they are not on such a footing. Great Britain has powers that we have not. To mention no others, she has the treaty-making powers which we have not. And the powers not being co-extensive, the obligations cannot be co-extensive. That argument would imply also that Canada and Great Britain have the same interest in all things. But we know by experience that we have not the same interests. The interests of Canada are divergent from those of Great Britain in many instances. This is seen in the fact that no two of the self-governing parts of the British Empire have the same fiscal policy. That argument would imply also that Great Britain and Canada are on the same footing of development. Sir, we know only too well that we have obligations in this country which Great Britain is rid of. As a consequence of our geographical position, the immensity of our territory and the sparsity of our population, we have to assume obligations, to face difficulties and to perform works which in the parent country are left to private enterprise. But though, in all these, the position of the Mother Country and the colony may be unequal yet, in the colony there is equal national pride and constitutional jealousy of our rights. This, therefore, makes it absolutely impossible to entertain the proposition made to us. But I confess that we owe it to ourselves as a nation—as we claim to be—to assume our own defence. And, so far as that goes, if we have to spend more money upon military and naval service, I am sure that Parliament and the Canadian people will not grudge any sum demanded for that purpose. But to spend money outside of Canada for military purposes is a proposition that the Canadian people, I believe, are not prepared to accept at this moment. When, in 1899, we took part in the South African war, we did it not under any obligation, not in the execution of any duty which rested upon us—and, to give Great Britain her due, she did not claim it on such grounds either—but we did it simply because we thought it was right and proper to do so. But we refused to be bound for the

future, and the position we took then I maintain still. . . .

I am unaware that the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was accused of treason as a consequence of these declarations.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read a most interesting excerpt from the minutes of the Colonial Conference of 1907, held at London, and attended by the prime ministers of all the colonies of the British Empire:

Dr. Smartt (Cape Colony): Would I be in order in moving this naval resolution after the discussion yesterday? I do not think it will take any time because it is a resolution which requires no remarks to make it acceptable to the conference: "That this conference recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the Navy to the defence of the Empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the Navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the upkeep of the Navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the Admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances."

Chairman (Lord Elgin, Colonial Secretary): I may say I communicated with the First Lord of the Admiralty what occurred, and he desires me to say he leaves himself entirely in the hands of the conference with regard to any modification or omission of the words referring to the Admiralty. Otherwise he has no objection to it (p. 541).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in [that] respect in [our] country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The Government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter: the disproportion is too great between the Mother Country and the colonies. We have too much to do otherwise; in the Mother Country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works; whereas, in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

Dr. Smartt: But the public works to which you refer are of a reproductive character which are vital to the interests of your Dominion.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Some of our railways have never paid a cent of interest or expenses.

Dr. Smartt: Still, it is developing and opening up the country to an enormous extent. All the colonies are building and developing railways of a character which may not be revenue-producing for years. I thought the wording of this resolution would have specially met your views because you will find to make such a contribution towards the upkeep of the Navy it may take the form either of a grant of money, or the establishment of a local defence force or other services. I understand Canada suggested strongly the other day that some of their other services were in the nature of local defence.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I have said all I have to say on the subject.

Chairman: I think it is a pity to pass the resolution if it is not unanimous.

Dr. Smartt: I should like very much to hear the opinions of the representatives of the other portions of the Empire.

Mr. Deakin: I have no hesitation in entering into the discussion if desired; but if we are not going to pass the resolution is it worth while?

Dr. Smartt: I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so much in the way of pious affirmation, that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: It can be passed if there is a majority. For my part, I must vote against it.

(Translation): The views expressed by the members of the conference, clearly show their disappointment at the refusal of our representative, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to vote in favour of the resolution put forward at the conference. But forsooth nobody ever dared insinuate that the Right Hon. Sir Wilfred Laurier had gone to the very heart of the Empire there to commit treason and display his disloyalty. This principle, after all is said, anent our participation in the Imperial wars, is but the logical consequence of that autonomy which is guaranteed us by the Constitution of this country and which, as I find, was formulated in very clear terms by the right hon. the leader of the Oposition in his speech on the Address a few days ago:—

Such is the spirit of British institutions, such is the lofty character of the Constitution under which we live, that not even the King of England, not even the Parliament of England has the right to order a single soldier to go out of Canada or to take a dollar from the Treasury of Canada.

(Translation): The least that may be said, even should the conclusion be reached that such principles are not logically sound, is that, at any rate, they undoubtedly belong to the domain of free discussion, and any one in this country, especially one who occupying in this House the important position representative of the people brands as disloyal and a traitor whosoever raises such a discussion or participates in such a debate, shows his utter ignorance of the laws and institutions under which we live, or must admit that he has been blinded by his prejudices. From the outcry raised in

certain quarters, one is led to believe that the position taken by Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne on the question of Canada's participation in the war, is all a new question. Yet it is common knowledge that seventeen years ago, when the question came up as to Canada participating in the South African war, Mr. Bourassa, then representing in this House the county of Labelle, resigned and was immediately re-elected by his constituents on the same principles which he holds to-day. As proof that Mr. Bourassa is to-day advocating what he urged seventeen years ago—and of that everybody is aware who has in the least kept track of the politics of the country—I shall read an excerpt from the letter which he sent the Prime Minister of Canada in the month of October, 1899, tendering his resignation as member of the House of Commons. His words are as follows:—

We are called upon to decide whether the Canadian people will have to take part in all the wars of the Empire, with the doors of the Imperial Cabinet and Parliament kept closed against him, and without even his representatives being consulted on the advisability of those bloody conflicts.

I will never give my approval to such a retrograde policy.

As a British subject, proud of his birthright and jealous of his liberties, loyal to England and its august Sovereign I stand ready to give of my person and my money, of my speech and of my acts, for the defence of the British flag throughout the whole extent of the Canadian confederation.

But loyal before all, above all and always to Canada, I have pledged myself to my electors that I should work for the advancement of my country without impairing the fundamentals of its Constitution. To redeem that pledge, I have given my support to your Government so long as you have remained within the limits which the Canadian people have set. I have approved and still approve your administrative policy. But I see in this last act the announcement of a governmental policy which has always been repudiated by the majority of your followers and upon which neither Parliament nor the electorate have ever been consulted.

Such are the principles which I should have laid down and the opinion I should have urged in the House of Commons.

As I am deprived of that right, only one course is open to me in order to assert and justify my position. It is painful for me to take it, on account of my personal admiration for you and my attachment to the other political principles which you have always followed and which it is my desire to continue to defend.

But the deep conviction I feel does not allow of any further hesitation. I therefore resign to-day my seat in Parliament and I shall seek re-election in the County of Labelle. To my electors I shall loyally explain the situation and confident in the issue of the test, await their reply before resuming my seat in the House of Commons.

I have the honour to be, sir, etc.,

Henri Bourassa.

All the older members, who had a seat in this House at the time, remember that after his re-election Mr. Bourassa advocated the same policy within these walls.

On the 1st of March, 1903, an important group of citizens of Montreal formed themselves into a league called "the Nationalists". The principles held by this organization are well known, not only in the province of Quebec, but throughout the whole country. They may be summarized in three fundamental propositions:—

(1) Canada to enjoy, in its intercourse with Great Britain, the widest autonomy, political, commercial and military, as is consistent with the maintenance of the colonial tie.

(2) The Canadian provinces to enjoy, in their co-operation with the Federal Government, the widest autonomy as is consistent with the maintenance of the federal tie.

(3) The whole Dominion to adopt a policy of economic and intellectual development on exclusively Canadian lines.

The founder of the league was Mr. Olivier Asselin, a man endowed with great talents and great energy, and whom the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) has lately raised to the rank of a major in the Canadian forces.

Later on, there was introduced in Parliament the Bill commonly known as the Laurier Naval Act. During the debate prior to and at the time of the passing of this Act, there occurred in the ranks of the Conservative party, then in opposition, a most noteworthy event.

The Hon. Mr. Monk, the recognized leader of the Conservatives of the province of Quebec, parted company with the Hon. Mr. Borden, the then leader of the Opposition. The reasons of the disagreement between Messrs. Monk and Borden had reference to the participation of Canada in the Imperial military preparation. The psychological moment of the severance of the partnership was on the occasion of a memorable banquet at Lachine on the 8th of November, 1900. Mostly all the Conservatives of the province of Quebec rallied around their leader in his protest against the policy of Mr. Borden.

Mr. Monk at that banquet delivered an address of the highest import in reply to a speech which had been made a few days before at London.

Among the leading orators on that occasion, who all were of one mind with Mr. Monk, I notice the names of Senator Landry, to-day President of the Senate, Mr.

Bruno Nantel, who, if I mistake not, was later on called to the Dominion Cabinet, Mr. Philémon Cousineau, the orthodox leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in the Quebec Legislature, and Mr. Charles Beaubien, recently appointed to the Upper Chamber by the present Government.

The banquet was presided over with much dash and dignity by one of the leading citizens of the county of Jacques Cartier, who now sits in this House as its representative, namely, Mr. J. A. Descarries.

About that time, on the 10th of January, 1910, Le Devoir made its first appearance. It was founded precisely with a view to the propagation and defence of the principles of nationalism. Many and generous were the subscriptions, a fact that accounts for many members of this House becoming and still remaining shareholders of that excellent newspaper.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU (Trois-Rivières) (Translation): On what side of the House are they found?

Sir HERBERT AMES (Text): Has it paid any dividends?

Mr. LAMARCHE (Translation): The member for Saint Antoine inquires whether Le Devoir has paid any dividends? I may say that the paper was not founded as a dividend producer but solely with the object of diffusing light among the people and defending certain principles.

We next come, Mr. Speaker, to the period of agitation against the Naval Bill. Messrs. Monk and Bourassa stood together on the same platform in defence of a common cause. It was customary at those popular meetings to take a standing vote on certain resolutions known as "resolutions of St. Eustache" because they were adopted for the first time at St. Eustache, in the county of Two Mountains. I shall now read the text of those resolutions:—

The Naval Bill condemned, Canadian autonomy, the true Imperial unity; resolutions adopted at St. Eustache on the 17th July, 1910.

As citizens of Canada, loyal subjects of His Majesty King George V, we stand ready to defend with our blood our country and the rights of the British Crown in Canada in the same manner as our forefathers have done in 1776, against the English subjects of His Majesty, in 1812, against the armies of the American Republic, and as we have done in 1885 against our own fellow countrymen who had revolted.

But, believing in the greatness and efficacy of the principles of decentralization and autonomy solemnly proclaimed and recognized for over half a century by the authorities of Great Britain and Canada, we are opposed to any change of policy which would draw us into distant wars, foreign to Canada, so long at least as the autonomous colonies of the Empire have no share with the Motherland and on equal terms in the sovereign power, which controls the Imperial army and fleet, treaties of peace, and alliances, foreign relations, the Government of India and of the British possessions.

We sincerely believe that the policy of concentration and so-called Imperial unity of which the Naval Act is a first milestone, will be productive within the Empire itself of misunderstandings, rivalries, and conflicts, that will endanger the peace and union of the many dominions, nations and races who are proud to-day of their allegiance to the British Crown.

Canada has never been for Great Britain the cause of any conflict and we believe that a policy of peace, aiming at the moral and material development of the country, is what is needed for Canada, to ensure its growth and cohesion, and, as a consequence, to enhance the glory and promote the safety of the Empire.

As free citizens of a democracy, we claim the right to express openly our opinion on this question as on all matters affecting the future and the interests of Canada. We recognize the right of the majority of the Canadian people to give a new bearing to our relations to the other parts of the Empire, provided it is with a full knowledge of the case.

But we protest against any attempt to prevent the Canadian people or any of its component groups from freely and openly discussing this serious problem.

We repudiate the statements made at Toronto last December by Mr. Alexandre Taschereau, Provincial Minister of Public Works, who falsely represented that the population of Quebec is willing to accept blindly any policy for the naval defence of the Empire and we censure those members of the Provincial Government and Legislature who by their vote on the 2nd of June last have endorsed those statements.

We censure the Dominion Cabinet and the parliamentary majority who have forced upon Canada this new Naval Act, cast the country into the vortex of militarism, only lately denounced so vigourously by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, imperilled the peace we enjoy and diverted to the manufacture of deadly weapons and to the preparation of bloody wars millions of dollars which were intended for the development of the country's agriculture and transportation facilities.

We likewise censure the position taken by Mr. Borden and those members of the Opposition, who, with him, have clamoured for the adoption of a policy no less subversive.

We claim that Parliament had no right thus to encumber Canada's future with a policy which was never submitted to the people whose part it will be to pay the blood tax and bear the burden of military expenditure.

We approve entirely the courageous and loyal stand of Mr. Monk and of those few members who, true to their mandate, have shown the dangers of such a policy and claimed for the Canadian people the right to speak its will before its representatives saddle it with such a heavy burden.

Those resolutions, Mr. Speaker, were carried at, to say the least, 25 public meetings in different parishes of the province of Quebec.

Mr. LAVALLEE (Translation): The hon. member stated that those resolutions had been adopted in 25 counties of the province of Quebec. Is he in a position to name the counties?

Mr. LAMARCHE (Translation): If my hon. friend will only read to-morrow's Hansard, he will find that I did not state 25 counties, but 25 different parishes, and I believe that estimate is very conservative.

At any rate, if the question is of any interest to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallée), I may say that I am not in a position to state that those resolutions were adopted in his county, but what I do know is that had it not been for the Nationalist propaganda, Le Devoir and Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne, the charming features of the member for Bellechasse would never have graced these precincts.

At that date, Mr. Monk was held in disfavour by many of the big wigs of the Conservative party, particularly by representatives of certain English-speaking constituencies, who requested that he be read out of the party. The annoyance even impaired Mr. Monk's strength and he had to seek in a milder climate a new lease of health. On his return, the Conservatives of the province of Quebec prepared in his honour a demonstration which took place at the Monument National; I had the honour of presiding over the meeting. Again Mr. Monk in a great speech emphasized his stand in relation to his party on the question of Canada's contribution to the Imperial armaments.

Shortly thereafter, an event occurred in our province which resulted in placing back into favour those who only yesterday had been ostracized; that was the victory at the by election of Drummond-Arthabaska. I shall not stop to narrate the events of that electoral campaign, Hansard of that year gives all the details. But I assert without any hesitation that it spells the victory of the principles of Nationalism over the Naval Act of Sir Wilfred Laurier and over the equally "subversive" policy of Mr. Borden. It was a struggle not soon to be forgotten and for my part still unforgotten.

A few days after that memorable victory, a large meeting was held at Montreal, at the Ontario skating rink. The attendance is estimated to have been over fifteen thousand. I see in this House men who were present. A standing vote was called on the following resolution:—

> This meeting acclaims the result of the election in Drummond-Arthabaska as the triumph of the principle of Canadian autonomy. This victory is a manifest endorsation of the position taken by Mr. Monk, the member for Jacques-Cartier, on the Naval Bill and that of those members who have supported him.
>
> It is an indication that the people wish to be consulted before being launched into a new policy of Imperial militarism. This meeting approves and endorses the verdict rendered by the electors of Drummond-Arthabaska, emphasizes the determination of the Canadian people to defend the rights of the British Crown in Canada, asserts its readiness to support all measures that may be found necessary and efficacious for the defence of Canadian territory, but holds as subversive of the principle of Canadian autonomy and of true Imperial unity, any policy which aims at forcing upon the nation, which has no voice in the councils of the Empire, any portion of its foreign burdens and of its military defence outside of Canada—the only part of the Empire upon which the Canadian people can exercise a political and constitutional action. (Prolonged cheers.)

The resolution was adopted almost unanimously, there being only four dissentient voices. Very important addresses were delivered by Mr. Monk and his friends. The meeting was presided over with great skill by Mr. L. E. Patenaude, the organizer of the election, and to-day the Minister of Inland Revenue, in the Cabinet.

Subsequent to this victory of Nationalism, the elections of 1911 came about. If it is meet, Mr. Speaker, that two of my compatriots should step to the wall to be shot for high treason, I ask equal justice for all, and if they be guilty, it is only fair that their accomplices be visited with a like punishment.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, before this House, that about twenty members from the province of Quebec, those who make up the majority which keeps the Government in power, were elected in 1911, not only on their proclaiming, with Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne, the principles of Nationalism but after having pledged themselves solemnly to uphold those same principles on the floor of the House of Commons. I will go further, Mr. Speaker, and claim that if Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne be guilty of high treason, there are equally guilty those who, although not members of this House, have by word or act, endeavoured to spread and secure the triumph of those principles which are being denounced as wicked and disloyal. I would make no exception, not even in favour of men who, being unable, through insufficient knowledge of our language to speak publicly in favour of the Nationalist candidates, contributed generously out of their purse, because it is no secret that the lists of subscriptions to the

electoral funds of the candidates I have alluded to, have been filled with the names of the most eminent among the leaders of the Conservative party.

The position taken by the representatives of the people in this House is none of my concern. By their electors will they be judged. I would however render a public homage to him, who, faithful to his convictions, preferred to resign his office of minister of the Crown: I allude to the late lamented Hon. F. D. Monk, ex-Minister of Public Works.

Never did I receive greater pleasure from any statement in this House than I did when the Prime Minister (R. L. Borden) loyally declared that in resigning, the Hon. Mr. Monk was actuated by sentiments of high honour. My object in this is not to flatter the Prime Minister, but because I recognize in him, and gladly so, a man of loyalty, honesty and distinction.

The more readily do I call attention to those qualities of the hon. the Prime Minister, qualities that distinguish the true statesman, as I did not join the group who one day started a movement in Israel and who led by wise and prudent councillors, came to Moses and requested that he no longer be chief of the tribe, because he could not lead them soon enough to the Promised Land, the land of power.

The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) appealed the other evening to the Postmaster General and to the Government to suppress Le Devoir.

The hon. member for Frontenac, has stated, if my memory serves me rightly, that Le Devoir gave expressions to pro-German sentiments. I do not know whether the hon. member for Frontenac has read the articles of Le Devoir in the original or if his information is gathered from worthless, unfair and incorrect translations circulated in certain parts of the country, but I am in a position to state that since the birth of Le Devoir never was a line or a word written in its columns, which directly or indirectly could be interpreted by any intelligent and fair-minded reader as expressing any wish on the part of the paper or its editor other than the complete victory of the Allies over Germany. Whosoever states otherwise has been misinformed by malicious people or by persons whose knowledge of one of the two official languages of the country is defective.

For my hon. colleague's satisfaction, I hunted up precedents and found an analogous case. I will tell him how and why

over half a century ago, a French-Canadian paper was suppressed. It is to-day the same story. It happened about the year 1806, under Governor Craig. An English newspaper of Quebec, the Mercury, thought fit to persist in wanton attacks on the French-Canadian inhabitants. The following is a sample:—

> This province is still too French for a British colony. Whether at peace or at war, it is necessary for us to put forth all possible efforts to put a stop to the increase of the French-speaking population and to their influence. It is but just that after a possession extending over forty-seven years, this province be a British province.

In order to meet the attacks of the Mercury, a newspaper edited in French was founded at Quebec under the name of Le Canadien. Its founder and editor was Mr. Pierre Bédard, member of the Legislative Assembly and at that time the recognized political leader of French Canada. The Governor had taken upon himself to differ from the popular assembly, which desired to debar judges and public officials from sitting in Parliament. Because of its criticism of the Governor's position, Le Canadien was suppressed by the high official's order, and its editor Pierre Bédard was sent to jail along with Taschereau and Blanchet, who were suspected of having something to do with the paper. Panet, Bédard and Taschereau were deprived of their military rank and expelled from the militia, just the same treatment as the hon. member for Frontenac would have Mr. Armand Lavergne submitted to. The dispute, however, was carried to London, and the Colonial Office sided with the assembly and censured the Governor. The Solicitor-General of the United Kingdom even said that the suppression of a paper on similar grounds would not have been tolerated in England. The prisoners were set at liberty and Bédard was later on appointed a judge of the Superior Court at Three Rivers in which office he continued to serve his country loyally.

Should perchance the hon. member for Frontenac succeed in having Le Devoir suppressed, it is very likely that we should have to go back to England to be taught again the true meaning of free speech.

In reading over that article in the Mercury, written over a century ago, one is struck with the analogy between the pretentions of certain bigoted groups of that period and the nightmares that constantly haunt the brain of my hon. friend the member for Frontenac and his undying

fear that a French-Canadian republic will one day flourish on the shores of the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa.

My English-speaking fellow-countrymen, for whom I have much regard and esteem, will allow me to tell them that among my compatriots the idea is prevalent that not a majority, but a considerable number among themselves, desire ardently the complete stamping out of the French language in Canada. They are wrong, Mr. Speaker. Instead of seeing in the French language a menace to Canadian nationality, they should on the contrary look upon it as an element of strength. The expanse of our great country is sufficient to allow the descendants of the two great races, French and English, to live side by side, pursuing their respective ideals, exercising their respective genius, working toward the same goal which is the greatest good of the nation, in accordance with those principles of equity and justice bequeathed us by the Fathers of Confederation.

It must, of course, be acknowledged that we have outdistanced our fellow-countrymen of British origin in the natural growth of our population. This would indeed be an inopportune time to blame us for this fecundity, when in many countries, notably in the United States, race suicide is branded as a plague.

The dream was entertained in certain quarters that one day we could be submerged under the waves of an indiscriminate immigration. Experience shows that your national characteristics brought into close contact with this cosmopolitan element, hastily assimilated, have suffered thereby, while ours have remained absolutely unimpaired.

Can we, I repeat, be blamed for having stood these hard tests? Some amongst you had been led to believe that a race can be pent up in a reserve as Indians, and that its rights and privileges disappear as soon as it transgresses its confines.

The French race in America is too deeply rooted in the very soil of the country to allow for a single moment of the thought that it can be uprooted or its growth in the least stunted.

The task may be likened to an attempt to check the natural growth of a giant tree by the building of a stone wall. You may perhaps encroach somewhat on its shade, but its roots will interwine underneath; you may lop off its branches and cut away its boughs, still they will grow, because the sap in its arteries flows from below abundant and full of life, and some day overcoming the obstacle its branches will shoot upwards interlocked in a victorious embrace.

Our English-speaking colleagues in the House of Commons, whom I hold in high esteem, are poorly acquainted, in my opinion, with the French population of Quebec and little understand its aspirations. They believe they can safely judge our people from the occasional politicians they meet, who for the most part, in their anxiety for power, are poor exponents of the true sentiments of the people. They believe they know us from reading with complacency in certain of our newspapers the flattery which is dosed out to them in proportion to the pittance allowed to that press by the Government. In those papers, more harmful than beneficial to their compatriots, the leading articles seem to have been written with a fork on an over-full bread-pan. Behind the noise of their loud but hollow patriotism, is generally esconced the mean selfishness of their shareholders.

If you would know the French-Canadian, dig down into the deep layers of the population, come to him, live his life. Some English-speaking members of this House, among others the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) have been in close touch with the French-Canadian and they bear witness to the fact that he is respectful of the rights of minorities and deals out equal justice to all.

Our ambition, Mr. Speaker, is not to grow beyond bounds nor take a dominant position in the country. We rather aspire to improve our position in our sphere, to develop according to our ideals and in harmony with our English-speaking fellow-citizens, provided we are allowed a living place under the sun. We wish above all to continue to deserve the praise, of which we are proud, that of all the Canadian provinces, the province of Quebec has best of all understood and lived up to the basic principles of Confederation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a further word on an important statement contained in the speech of His Royal Highness. The Government purposes to apply to the Imperial Parliament for an amendment of the Canadian Constitution allowing the House to sit beyond the legal term without an appeal to the electorate.

I, for one, am absolutely opposed to the suggestion. I can see no reason that justifies such a radical change in our Constitution. The reason is put forward that a general election in Canada would imply

certain hardships for the Empire. Since the war, Cape Colony and Australia have held their general elections. The Empire is none the worse for it and has made no complaint.

Only a few months ago, the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) thought it in the country's interest to have polling booths in the trenches in Flanders. To-day, for motives of his own, elections are no longer desirable. As for me, it is my opinion that the proposed amendment is a mere expedient and that the true motive for the Government not wishing to account to the people, must be found in the fear of the coming day when, in the English-speaking provinces as well as in Quebec, there will stand revealed before the electors the political combination which has been in existence for the last five years, whereby representatives elected on platforms diametrically inconsistent have made an alliance in order to share the power and its spoils.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, above the Canadian Parliament, above even the Imperial Parliament, I recognize the sovereignty of the people. I have been elected by the people for five years, and whatever be the laws that may be passed, you shall, Mr. Speaker, at the expiration of those five years, receive my resignation as member for the county I have the honour to represent.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, it affords me pleasure, in my capacity as a humble member of this House and as a former occupant of the Speaker's chair, to congratulate you upon your appointment to that higher office. You have reached this position at a comparatively early age, and I have no doubt, judging by the evidence that has already been furnished to the House during the short time you have occupied that position, that you will maintain the high traditions of your position.

We are called together in a session of more than ordinary importance. The country at this time is passing through a critical period. Never, perhaps, in its history has Canada been called upon to bear the burdens that are now placed upon it. It is bearing those burdens cheerfully, and it will do its duty, I have no doubt, to the extent that is required and expected of it.

Canada is the premier nation of the British dominions, and as such it has thrown upon it a responsibility which it should not neglect. If the Government gauged properly the public opinion of this country at the outbreak of hostilities precisely eighteen months ago to-day, when Germany invaded Belgium and Luxembourg, it was fortunate at that time in having at the head of the Liberal party and of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House, a statesman of the high standing, the long experience, the wise views, and the exalted patriotism of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who now leads the Opposition. Peopled as this country is by those of various origins, various creeds, various nationalities, working out together the salvation of this country on lines that appeal to the majority, what would have been our position during the last eighteen months had the right hon. leader of the Opposition sought to adhere to the letter rather than to the spirit of our Canadian Constitution? Had he taken the view that was laid clearly before this House this afternoon by my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), that Canadians had no obligations to the Empire beyond the limits of Canada, that Canada's duties had been clearly laid down in the Militia Act by the old legislature of Canada, confirmed by the British North America Act, what would have been the position of Canada to-day in the eyes of the Empire and of the world? We should have been rent into two camps, one for and the other against participation in this great war. Fortunately, the right hon. gentleman, with his views, which are well known in this House and in this country, did not hesitate for one moment to declare that the Government had his entire approval in the action it had taken—with, of course, the customary reserve only that a leader of the Opposition must take.

Eighteen months have elapsed since Germany began this terrible war, the worst in all history. What crimes has she not committed since that time! The world stands appalled, aghast; mankind is staggered by what has been accomplished in eighteen months. The audacity of the Hun knows no limit, as we see illustrated in what we learn to-day, that a captured vessel has reached the shores of America all the way from Africa. Those who have followed history somewhat closely are aware that the course that Germany has followed has been of long preparation. I well remem-

ber, being then about ten years of age, when the terrible conflict was waged between France and Prussia in 1870. That was the beginning of the laying of the foundation of the present great crisis. France at that time had at its head, unfortunately, the last of the Bonapartes, a man who was seeking more the interests of his dynasty and the repelling of the advancing tide of republicanism in France than the stabilities of the nation. He threw France headlong into the unfortunate war of 1870, when everything failed except the courage of the French soldier and the heroism of the French nation. The courage of France in the days from July to September, and the heroic defence put up by her under the inspiring genius of Gambetta and others, is now a matter of history. But the abandonment of France at that critical moment by the nations of Europe, and unfortunately by the British Empire, enabled Germany to take the first great step in the vain attempt she is now repeating at mastery extending not over Europe only but over the whole world. France was crushed, and Germany kept on in her attempt to achieve what Caesar failed to achieve, what Alexander failed to achieve, what Napoleon himself failed to achieve, and what William II will certainly fail to achieve.

The position of the Canadian people was that of a law-abiding, peace-loving group of citizens, British subjects, inhabiting a country far removed from the scene of conflict. In our own province of Quebec we have led the pastoral life as our fathers did before us, and as I hope our people will do again when this terrible conflict has been put an end to and peace has been finally achieved. The outbreak was terrible; it was as sudden as it was unexpected. It was so unexpected that when it occurred the president of the French Republic and the premier of that country were absent from France upon an official visit to Russia. The crime committed at Serajevo, in Herzegovina, on the 23rd of June, led to the ultimatum by which Austria gave Serbia forty-eight hours to submit to the most humiliating conditions ever placed before a free nation. Then followed the precipitation of Germany in insisting that the conflict be limited to Austria against this small and weak nation, while her refusal to consider Serbia's offer to submit the question of dispute to any impartial tribunal or to any other nation in Europe, showed the evident purpose of the Germanic military power to bring on this conflict.

The conflict has been described in this House graphically and eloquently by both leaders. Other speakers before me, not only this session, but last session, and in the session of August before that, have said all that can be said on that subject. My principal object in rising to-night is to repel some of the aspersions which have been cast on that unfortunate province from which I come. I wish to say a word for the province of Quebec during the present crisis. Not that that is particularly required, because the loyalty of the province of Quebec goes far back in the history of this country. It seems to be unknown to many that even as far back as 1763, less than a year after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, which handed over half this North American continent to the British Crown, General Murray organized in Quebec a regiment of French troops, recruited in Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec, for the purpose of patrolling and establishing law and order in the wilderness which is now the great province of Ontario. This French regiment, organized by General Murray and commanded by one of his officers, was charged, within a year of the territory coming into British possession, with the pacification of this immense country. This means, as every school-boy knows, that from the start the French, who had been loyal to the Crown of France so long as the flag of France floated over this country, transferred their allegiance from France to England, as if by magic. It was in 1763, therefore, that the French people of Quebec were first called upon to assist the British Crown in Canada. It seems a waste of time to recall these things now, but it is just as well that I should mention them after hearing the frank and honest statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for Nicolet. Unfortunately, it may not have been understood by the majority of hon. gentlemen in this House, who, I am sorry to say, have still many things to learn so far as the French language is concerned. In 1763 Governor Murray resorted to the French pioneers of this country to maintain British rule in Canada. In 1776, thirteen years later—it seems incredible—the British authorities in this country called upon the French-Canadians to save what remained of British rule in North America from the English-speaking subjects of His Majesty the King of

England in open rebellion in the States to the south. In this you have the second evidence of the loyalty of the people of Quebec to the British Crown. In 1812 they were again called upon to stand by British institutions, this time not against British subjects in rebellion, but against American revolutionists who invaded this country. They took Montreal almost by magic, and were preparing to capture the whole of the province of Quebec, when they were held up at Chateauguay by DeSalaberry, as Brock held them back at Queenston in Upper Canada, Ontario having by this time secured a sufficiently large number of United Empire Loyalists to do its share in accomplishing what the French of Lower Canada had done in previous years. In 1776, when Montreal fell, and became a prey to the American army, a couple of Canadians, De Lanaudière and Bouchette, took Guy Carleton, the English Governor, in a canoe down the St. Lawrence to the city of Quebec, placed him in the fortress of Quebec, and with their countrymen surrounded the fortress and the British flag, and saved the British Dominion when the gallant Montgomery and his American troops invaded and climbed the citadel and fell with the snowflakes which descended on that fateful Christmas night.

In 1885 the province of Quebec was put to another test, a test which was, perhaps, even more severe than the ones which I have mentioned, because the people were far removed from the early days of conflict. Many citizens of Quebec had left that province to settle in the northwestern part of the country. The members of this House from the northwestern provinces will be the first to recognize the value of the French Canadian pioneer in the Northwest. A year or two ago I had the pleasure of visiting at St. Boniface the oldest priest in the world, a man ninety-four years of age. I had the pleasure of meeting near the Archbishop's palace an old nun ninety-two years of age. They had gone to the Northwest, not in a Pullman car, not on the double tracks of our Canadian railways, but in a birch-bark canoe. They had gone there in the old days when the Northwest was first opened up to settlement, and, like Lord Selkirk's early pioneers, had implanted the seed of what has now become the great West of Canada. In 1885 there broke out in the Northwest an unfortunate rebellion. Many of the leaders who participated in this rebellion were of French origin; most of them were

descendants of people of the province of Quebec. Naturally the sympathies of the province of Quebec went out to these people of their own blood and kin. They had heard that these men had grievances which had not been remedied; and the sentiment of the people naturally sided with those who had grievances to lay at the foot of the Throne. But when open rebellion broke out, when these people in the Northwest made an attack upon the British flag and upon the constituted authorities in that part of the country, the people of the province of Quebec, the boys of the 65th Battalion of Montreal, led by a former Speaker of the House, and by Major Dugas, who was known to the bulk of the people in the Northwest, and the 9th Battalion of Quebec, went gallantly to their duty, to fight their own countrymen, men of their own kin, in upholding British institutions and British law and order in this country. General Strange, who led these boys, related later how cheerfully they assumed the task which had been laid upon them; how they sang their rollicking songs—those songs that the old chasseurs, the old pioneers, the old missionaries in other days listened to with so much delight, and which were so characteristic of the early development of this country—how cheerfully these boys pulled the cannon through the muskegs, and finally got into the western prairies and reached the scene of conflict. That was the last instance upon which the French in Quebec were called upon to give any evidence of their active participation in warfare.

Then this great war broke out, and a hostile attack was made upon France, our former mother country; France, who has done so much for this country, who has left here the imprint of her genius; France, who left in this land 60,000 settlers, who now number nearly two millions of people, scattered broadcast over the continent. You will find them from the Arctic ocean to the gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific; you will find them in all callings, from the humblest to the highest. I must say, Mr. Speaker, to the credit of the English-speaking majority of the Canadian people, that the French were able at one time to produce a citizen who could occupy the position of the King's first adviser in this Dominion of Canada. When this war broke out we in the province of Quebec had a double object in view. We saw that France was about to be crushed;

we realized that the elimination of France from the map of Europe and from the civilization of the world would be a misfortune which no one would recognize more readily than those of the English-speaking race. We felt that if England were attacked we were attacked; that the defeat of England meant the defeat of Canada, and that there was nothing to do but to go into the conflict. We are in the conflict now, we are in it for good, and we are in it to win.

Some difficulty was experienced in the province of Quebec with regard to recruiting, and upon this point I wish to say a few words. The hon. member for Nicolet this afternoon, in the frank and honest statement which he gave to the House, related one of the causes of the difficulties which have been experienced in connection with recruiting in the province of Quebec. He described very clearly and in a very interesting manner the history of the Nationalist movement in this country. He read a resolution that was adopted at a large meeting at St. Eustache, in the county of Two Mountains. The late Mr. Monk commanded the honour and respect of all members of this House, no matter what their political opinions were. If nothing else could be said of Mr. Monk than that he resigned his office on a question of principle, he would be entitled to respect. The statement which was made this afternoon gave us an idea of the difficulties that we have to contend with now so far as recruiting in the province of Quebec is concerned. The Nationalist movement was conceived with the idea of being the antithesis of the Imperialist idea. The Imperialist idea is that a subject of the British Crown in Canada is a subject of the Empire at large; that what strikes the Empire strikes Canada; that the duty of a British subject in Canada is the duty of a British subject in the Empire; that the defence of the Empire is a duty imposed on the citizens of Canada. That is the Imperialist idea. The Nationalist idea is that Canadian British subjects have no duty towards the Empire outside of Canada. The hon. member for Nicolet very clearly defined this. As he read in French the resolution adopted at St. Eustache, which explained the last campaign carried on in the province of Quebec, I shall give this resolution in English, so that our English-speaking friends can understand better the basis of the alliance that was formed during the last campaign, in 1911, between the Nationalists and the Conservative wing of that party. The village of St. Eustache seems to have been happily chosen for the place of inauguration of this movement. It is situated in the riding of Two Mountains, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Ethier). It is an historical point in the province of Quebec. Its old church still stands, bearing the scars of the British cannon which fired bullets against it in 1837, when the patriots of that period were fighting for the institution in Canada of responsible government. Canada is pretty well agreed to-day that the action taken at that time was inspired by high motives, and the course of the men who sought in the province of Quebec to obtain by means of arms—and in this many of them gave up their lives—what they had failed to obtain by constitutional methods, has been ratified by the judgment of history. Those who study the past of the French race in this country, who read the lives of Lafontaine and Cartier, will find in the lives of these men, in their actions, in their work, the germs of the inauguration of responsible Government and British institutions in Canada. This village of St. Eustache was chosen by Mr. Monk and his followers, some of whom are now advisers of the Crown in this House, for the inauguration of this campaign.

Mr. Bourassa has just published in the province of Quebec a book entitled, "What do we owe to England?" It has not yet had the honour of a translation into English, but I suppose we shall soon see it translated into that language, when our English-speaking friends will have an opportunity of better understanding the position taken by Mr. Bourassa as explained this afternoon by the hon. member for Nicolet. Mr. Bourassa explains in this book that at the time of the adoption by this House of the Naval Bill, which I had the honour of putting to the House, and which was adopted nemine contradicente, Mr. Monk was not present in his seat. He afterwards declared in the House that had he been present he would have called for a division; but Mr. Monk, having been in failing health, had gone for a trip to the United States, and, on his return, Mr. Bourassa explains to us, he waited upon Mr. Bourassa and asked him to join him in this Nationalist campaign against this Government's naval proposition. Mr. Bourassa explained that he was willing to go into the campaign provided that certain guarantees were given to him that the

policy of both political parties would be attacked; that the policy of the Liberal party he condemned outright and that he condemned the policy of the other party as none the less nefarious—both the policy of a Canadian navy and the policy of contribution. For this reason he wanted to have his position clearly stated, and he requested the privilege of drafting himself the resolution which was to form the programme and the policy of this new party, to which the hon. member for Nicolet told us this afternoon twenty members now sitting in this House owe their election in the province of Quebec.

This resolution, adopted in the historical village of St. Eustache, on classic ground, at a large meeting attended by prominent men, some of whom are now ministers of the Crown, others of whom are simple supporters of the Administration, it is well worth while to read and to give a moment's attention to. It will enable me to show the difficulties that we have had to contend with in the province of Quebec, when one of the great political parties of Canada, as far as they could possibly do so, instilled into the minds of the people of the province of Quebec, who are not a warlike people by any means, the doctrine that they owed no duties to the British Crown outside of Canada—that it was so stated in the British North America Act and in the Militia Act. That is precisely the position that Colonel Lavergne now takes—that, though he is now a member of the militia of Canada, he has no duty to perform outside of Canada. Let me read the resolution:

We, citizens of Canada, faithful subjects of His Majesty, King George V, declare that we are prepared at the cost of our lives to defend the soil of our country and the rights of the British Crown in Canada, as our fathers did in 1776 against the English subjects of His Majesty, in 1812 against the armies of the American Republic, and as we did in 1885 against our own fellow-citizens in rebellion.

Confiding in the grandeur and efficiency of the principles of decentralization and in the autonomy solemnly proclaimed and recognized for more than half a century by the authorities of Great Britain and of Canada, we are opposed to any new policy which would carry us into faraway wars foreign to Canada, as long, especially, as the autonomous colonies of the Empire do not share with the Mother Country on a footing of equality, the sovereign authority vested in the army and in the Imperial Navy, the treaties of peace and of alliance, foreign relations, the Government of India and of the possessions of the Crown.

We believe sincerely that this policy of concentration and apparent Imperial unity, of which the new naval law is but the first instalment, will produce in the heart, even of the Empire, misunderstandings, rivalries and conflicts which will endanger the peace and the union of the various countries and the people of all races, who to-day are proud to obey the English Crown.

Never having been for Great Britain or for the Empire the cause of any conflict, we believe that a policy of peace and of moral and material development is necessary in Canada for its growth and its cohesion and further for the glory and security of the Empire.

Free citizens of a democratic country, we claim the right of expressing openly our opinion on this question, as well as on all others which affect the fate and the interest of Canada. We recognize to the majority of the Canadian people the right to determine upon any new policy in our relations with the other parts of the Empire, provided that they act in full knowledge of what they are doing.

But we protest against all attempts to remove this grave problem from the free deliberation of the whole of the Canadian people and of each of the groups which compose it.

We disavow the declaration made in Toronto in December last by Mr. Alexandre Taschereau, Provincial Minister of Public Works, who pretended falsely that the people of Quebec are ready to accept blindly any policy of naval defence of the Empire, and we blame the members of the Government and of the legislature of the province who ratified this declaration by their vote on the second of June last.

We blame the Dominion ministry and the Parliamentary majority who imposed upon Canada this new naval law, launched Canada in the vortex of militarism, denounced erstwhile with so much energy by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, endangered the peace of Canada and diverted toward the construction of murderous engines and bloody war, military preparations, millions destined to the development of agriculture and of our transportation routes.

We condemn equally the attitude of Mr. Borden and the members of the Opposition, who, following him, have asked for the adoption of a policy none the less nefarious.

We affirm that Parliament has no right to pledge the future of Canada in a policy which has never been submitted to the people who are called upon to pay the tribute of blood and to bear the yoke of military expenditures.

We approve without reserve, the courageous and loyal conduct of Mr. Monk and of the few members who have remained faithful to their mandate, who have pointed out the dangers of this policy and claimed for the people of Canada the right to express their will before their representatives imposed upon it this heavy burden.

This is the charter, these are the conditions under which was born the so-called Nationalist party. The Conservatives of the province of Quebec had, at that moment, given up all hope of overturning the Liberal Administration which had done so much for Canada. Seeing that there was a majority among the people of the province of Quebec favourable to reciprocity, and that there was no hope of overbalancing the scale otherwise, they resorted to this policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I love free debate; I love free discussion; I would not be a

Liberal if I did not stand for free speech. This question of the participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire is a question which every Canadian has a right to decide for himself. That is the stand we have taken in this country; that is the stand that the Liberal party has taken; and I am sure that it is the stand the majority of the people of Canada will take, because we want Canada to remain during the war, as she was before the war, a free country where all stand equal, and where the right of free speech is untrammelled. But, being of that mind, that sentiment, and that spirit, we of the Liberal party did not hesitate to go to our compatriots in the province of Quebec to ask them to overlook the letter to be found in the Militia Act and in the British North America Act; to overlook the stand which was taken in the past by Cartier and Lafontaine, by Macdonald and by Campbell, as cited by my hon. friend from Nicolet, and by Sir John A. Macdonald himself in the early days of Canada. Then Canada did not have the population it has to-day; she did not have the resources she has to-day; she did not have cast upon her the responsibilities which she has to-day. In those days the people of Canada did well by the Empire in defending the integrity of this country, in developing its resources, in opening up its immense avenues for the increase of the population. We were contributing towards the Empire.

But on the fourth day of August, when Great Britain entered this war, she entered not an ordinary war like that of the Soudan, when Sir John A. Macdonald refused to Canadians the right to participate. At that time Sir John was probably fully justified. In that and other wars, there was no reason why Canada should participate. The doctrine that when Britain is at war Canada is at war is good in principle, but it is not always necessary to put it into practice. But in this war, when the principles of humanity were at stake, when civilization itself was threatened to be turned back a thousand years, when the Huns, as the Germans are so properly described by Kipling—though in the past Germany has given great things to civilization—when the Germans had so far forgotten themselves as to do what they have done within the past few months, there was no other duty laid upon the people of this country than to assume their share of the burden. We have assumed that share. The right hon. the leader of the Liberal party went to his countrymen in the city of Montreal and opened a campaign of recruiting. He had with him on that occasion some of his former colleagues, and others, including the present Postmaster General (Hon. T. Chase Casgrain). They had to reason with some of the French Canadian people because of this doctrine which the Nationalist party had instilled into the minds of the people of Quebec, that they had no duties to perform towards the British Crown outside the limits of the province of Quebec. We have to contend with that argument to-day.

My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) attended a meeting the other night in the Monument National, one of the largest buildings in Montreal, for the purpose of helping Major Asselin of the 150th Battalion, which is largely recruited, I must say, from the ranks of the Nationalist party, to appeal to French Canadian youth. Mr. Bourassa and those who accompany him are all clever men; those of the Nationalist party who occupy seats in this House have shown that they are clever men; and I hope that before this debate finishes they will give an instance of what they can do in this House compared with what they are able to do on platforms in the province of Quebec. Major Asselin appealed to the audience in Montreal for recruits for his battalion. He declared that he himself had been the founder of the Nationalist party. Major Asselin was the man who, in 1903, established the Nationalist party. Its principles summarized were three: autonomy in Canada, the autonomy of the province within the Dominion; and complete liberty in all matters affecting the Empire. That, in substance, was the programme of the Nationalist party.

When Major Asselin addressed the meeting in Montreal, he was interrupted repeatedly by many young Nationalists in the audience, who offered objections which he had to answer. The first and chief objection was to be found in the speeches in support of this resolution, and this resolution, from what Mr. Bourassa says in his book, was supported by Mr. Nantel, a former Minister of the Crown, by Mr. Coderre, an ex-Minister of the Crown; by the present Secretary of State (Mr. Blondin), by the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Patenaude), by the members for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet), Montmagny (Mr. L'Esperance), Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rainville), Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), by the leader of the present Opposition in the province of Quebec, Mr. Cousineau, and

by Mr. Sauvé, the Conservative member for Two Mountains. This was the stand taken by these gentlemen at that time. They may say that the times have changed, and that they have reasons now why they should join the majority of the Canadian people, because the majority of the people support Canada's participation in this war. But they have not said so yet. In the splendid speech, which I am sure was a treat to the House, delivered here the other evening by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) they were invited to explain their position, and I think they owe it to themselves, to this House, to the electors of their province, and to the electors of the Dominion, not to allow the province of Quebec to lie under a false imputation in the crisis through which we are passing.

Major Asselin, I am sorry to say, had to meet another objection relating to the province of Ontario—and here, in the city of Ottawa, I know I am treading on dangerous ground. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish you to realize that I am sincere when I state that I want England to win this war, because the victory of Britain means the salvation of Canada, while the defeat of Britain would be our ruin. We are here to advise and support the Ministry in its war measures. The speech from the Throne states that that is the chief object for which we have met, and it enunciates the ideas which prevail in connection with this war. I may as well read one or two paragraphs as an introduction to what I may have to say later. The concluding paragraph of the speech is this:

> The high courage, the splendid heroism, and the unalterable determination which have marked the united efforts of all portions of His Majesty's Dominions, during a year of unprecedented strain and effort, justify our supreme confidence in the triumph of our cause and in lasting affirmation of the principles of liberty and justice throughout the world. I commend to your earnest consideration the measures which will be submitted to you for aiding in the great purpose, and I pray that the Divine blessing may rest upon your counsels.

It is because I want the province of Quebec to do its full share, as I know she will do once she realizes the gravity of the position—though I do not admit that up to the present she has not done all that was required of her—that I wish to convey to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the House, the difficulties we have to contend with. I have outlined the policy that was laid down by our opponents in the campaign of 1911. We have now to face another difficulty.

The Nationalist party, and I must say that not only they, but the Legislature of the province of Quebec, the hierarchy of the province of Quebec, the newspapers of the province of Quebec, and the province of Quebec itself, rightly or wrongly—and I hope it is wrongly—are under the impression that there is a minority in the province of Ontario which is not being fairly treated. The province of Ontario is abundantly and well represented in this House. There are men in this House who can easily guide public opinion in the province of Ontario, and it is to them that I address my remarks in the hope that they will bring about some kind of settlement of this unfortunate state of affairs, so as to help us in the province of Quebec in the noble and patriotic work which we have undertaken of recruiting the quota which that province will contribute under fair conditions.

I do not want to say who is to blame in this unfortunate bilingual school question; for it is an unfortunate question, and should not exist in this free country of ours. I am told by some people that it is a question between the French and the Irish. I am free to speak for both, because, being a Frenchman by my father, I am also of Irish descent. My mother's parents came from Sligo in the North of Ireland, and Carrick-on-Suir in Tipperary. My grand-uncle, Edward Twomey, first representative of the county of Drummond in 1834 in the old legislature of Lower Canada, was the only Irishman who voted with Dr. O'Callaghan for the ninety-two resolutions presented by Papineau, upon which were based the constitutional institutions we now enjoy. I ask the Irish people to be merciful to the French, as they themselves have asked for mercy very often in their conflict, which I hope now is about ended. It was with pleasure that I saw yesterday that Ireland up to a day or two ago had given under the voluntary system 87,000 young Irishmen to the cause of liberty—given them freely under the inspiration of Redmond and of Carson, and of the orange, and of the green, to fight for the Empire. And in this contest we know that Ireland will do what she has always done, what the Scotch have done, and what the French Canadians will do if they are given an opportunity. The Irish people of this city and of this province—I will begin with them—should not forget what the French Canadians in the province of Quebec have done for the Irish people. The Irish people

of Canada have had some worthy representatives in this House. The most eloquent man, probably, who was ever heard within these walls, Thomas D'Arcy McGee, and who on that memorable night in March, 1869, a few moments before he fell under the cowardly bullet of an assassin, delivered one of those eloquent speeches which has given his name to history, and who spoke nearly opposite to where I stand now, was a representative of Montreal, and the French Canadians largely contributed to his election to this House. The present Chief Justice of Canada, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, who represented the county of Quebec, and who at that time was by long odds the foremost Irishman in Canada, as he is to-day one of the best—I do not want to hurt the feelings of others—was elected to this House for many long years by the French county of Quebec, in which there were very few Irish people. Mr. Justice Curran, who represented Montreal Centre, and was the champion of the Irish people for a decade in this House, was the bosom friend of the French element of his division. These are the facts we have to submit for the consideration of the Irish people of this city and province. Let me go a step further back, to 1848, when Ireland presented one of the most pitiful chapters in her history, when those who had to leave the old soil through famine came up the St. Lawrence, after many long and weary weeks of sailing, and became the pioneers of many Irish families in this country. Many never went beyond Grosse Isle, where they were ministered to by that humble young priest of that day, Abbé Taschereau, who subsequently became the first cardinal prince of his church in Canada. These are things which Irishmen in the province of Ontario should not forget, and I speak to them as one of their own.

Is there not some way of bridging over this difficulty? Is there not some way in which the Conservative party of Ontario can give us a hand in this matter, and put an end to this state of affairs, under which mothers of families have to spend nights guarding a school down in Lower Town, and two or three thousand children troop to the City Hall clamoring for their teachers to be paid. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) represented the extreme views of the province of Quebec. I ask again is there no way of bridging over this difficulty?

I hear the pretence made, and the argument set forth, that this is an English-speaking province. So much the better. I know enough of the spirit of the English people, and enough of the principles of the British constitution, to know that there is no injustice that can not be remedied under British rule. Those who imagine that British rule in Canada can be maintained only by the existence of one language, are far from the mark. In Phillips square, in the city of Montreal, one of the noblest monuments of our city is erected to King Edward VII. the Peacemaker. He was imbued with the true spirit of the British constitution, and, like many of his nationality and spirit, had a broad conception of the duties which kings and statesmen and public men have to fulfil. Parliaments exist for the purpose of solving difficulties. We are here not to increase the difficulties and dissensions among the various classes of the Canadian people, but, if possible, by all means to promote their happiness and prosperity. We want this young nation to rest upon a solid basis, and to stand for all time to come. We want to be imbued with the true spirit which animated the fathers and upholders of the British constitution. We do not want it to be said that we of the province of Quebec alone uphold the true spirit of the British constitution. We saw how King Edward VII. brought about the entente cordiale between France and England. Dear knows they had been wide apart for many centuries. They had waged war upon each other, and each in its own sphere had battled for the mastery of the world. England obtained final success in commerce, in trade, in navigation, in colonization, and in the dissemination of civilization throughout the world.

But there was one thing which she could never wrest from the French nation and which remains until to-day in the city of Paris, la ville lumière, that it remains the city of light, the home of art, of literature, of science, of refinement, of all that is agreeable to those who love civilization and the higher products of the human mind.

Edward VII, at whose picture, which adorns these walls, I often gaze during these debates, laid the basis of the present great fight which is being put up by the Allies. After the defeat of France in 1870, when she had been crushed, and the German Emperor had been able, in the palace at Versailles, to place upon his head the crown of the emperors of Germany, when he went back and created the North German Confederation for the sole purpose of obtaining a mastery of the world, which he could not have obtained except by wrest-

ing from Albion the sceptre which she held, Edward VII, with his foresight, saw that the future of the British Empire rested on the bringing about of an understanding with France, and he accordingly laid the basis of the present agreement between those two great nations. Why cannot the same thing be done in Canada on a smaller scale? Why cannot the French-Canadian children in the province of Ontario be allowed to learn French, as our boys and girls are bound to learn English? I have often wondered what would happen in this House if the fifty French members from the province of Quebec were to exercise the privilege which the constitution confers upon them of addressing this House in the French language, of carrying on their business in the French language, of presenting their motions in the French language, and so on. I know that the majority in this House appreciate the act of courtesy that the majority of our French members perform every time they rise, with some misgivings, to speak a language with which they are not perfectly familiar. We want all Canadians, as far as possible, to know two languages. Canadians on the battlefields of Europe have shown that on the average each of them is worth two men. I would like the average Canadian to be worth at least one man, and there is no educated man in Europe to-day, or even in the United States, but boasts of two languages. Some time ago, merely for the purpose of information, I wrote to the ministers of the various provinces of Canada to ascertain to what extent the speaking of French was being carried on in this country. The Minister of Education for British Columbia replied that it was treated as a foreign language—that the students of the higher schools could learn Greek, or German, or French. I suppose the German language will be discarded after this, and Greek is somewhat out of date. But how useful our friends from British Columbia will find the French language when they go abroad, and I know that the people of that province are of a high class, who have travelled and who appreciate a good thing when they see it.

I have ascertained that in the Northwest Provinces the people are getting on fairly well by an understanding arrived at in 1903 by this Parliament. The majority of this Parliament wisely acceded to the request made by the minority to allow in Saskatchewan and Alberta a system which the people had found best suited to their own purposes. As the sections
9 p.m. of the Northwest Territories Act in regard to the school question had been changed to suit the conditions prevailing there, this Parliament very wisely at the time when they granted the constitutions of Saskatchewan and Alberta, gave the minorities in those provinces the right to have the schools which they thought were best suited for them. In Manitoba—I do not dare speak of the school question, I have heard so much of it—an understanding was arrived at, and as it was not altogether acceptable to the minority, they were advised by His Holiness the Pope of Rome, a man who is competent to speak on such matters, to accept the share of justice given to them and to strive for more.

It is to the credit of the Maritime provinces that they have produced in the educational line the foremost men in Canada. I shall only mention three: Sir William Dawson, Principal Grant and Principal Falconer. Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have long since removed from the arena the troubled question of education. They have come to a wise agreement among themselves on reasonable terms. In New Brunswick there are to-day 100,000 French-Canadians, or close on one-third of the population. The English-speaking people are leaving that province —I do not know why, because they have been favoured with all that is necessary to make it a prosperous country—but the lure of the West has taken away a large number of young men who may ultimately come back, I hope, wiser than when they left; but if they do not come back, others will be found from other parts of the Empire to take their places, because New Brunswick is destined to become one of the greatest provinces of the Dominion. In 1873, the unfortunate school question in New Brunswick was discussed in this House and a very stormy debate took place, but ultimately the people of New Brunswick, in their wisdom, came to an agreement on the question. In Nova Scotia the same thing has happened.

I wish to repeat what the hon. member for Nicolet said of the Premier this afternoon. We respect the Premier of Canada; we know him to be an honest man; we know him to be a man of conviction and of principle. Of course, he is the leader of a great party and the leader does not always lead; he sometimes is the mouthpiece of his party. In this unfortunate school ques-

tion, which is a difficulty for us at the present moment as far as recruiting is concerned, I would ask him, if he were here to-night, to state to our friends of Ontario in a few words how this difficulty was bridged over in Nova Scotia, and the difficulty would be put an end to.

I have said that I do not intend to place the blame on any side. In all these controversies many things have been said on one side or the other which should not have been said; but, Sir, there is one thing that you cannot take away from a man, and that is what he has received from his mother. The French will continue to speak French no matter what legislation you pass. The same thing is the case in Scotland. In Wales the people are going back to Welsh. In the trenches the soldiers are creating a new language. In South Africa the Dutch are speaking their Dutch. Out of the four hundred million subjects of the British Empire, forty or fifty million speak English, while the other three hundred and fifty million speak the languages which are theirs, and the French of Quebec will continue to speak French. But we do not want this unfortunate state of affairs to continue, that one of the official languages in Canada is to be quarantined in the province of Quebec. Why should it be so? Is this official language, which extends through all parts of Canada, not to be recognized anywhere but in the province of Quebec? We should not forget that this is a federation of provinces. Each province has, it is true, within its own sphere, the rights allotted to it under the constitution; but there are things which provinces should do in the interest of the whole. The province of Quebec to-day is trying to overcome the objection laid before it of its men having to serve beyond the confines of the province in the interest of British institutions. We ask the people of Ontario if there is not a way by which this difficulty can be bridged over, and, if so, it will help us immensely in the province of Quebec.

I do not want to impose upon the good nature of the House, but there are words of wisdom to be found sometimes in these old Hansards, which we never read or do not read often enough.

Within a year of his death, Sir John A. Macdonald, the greatest man that the Conservative party ever produced in this country, the man who was truly, with Cartier, the architect of our Canadian federation, delivered a memorable address. This was one of the last important speeches that he delivered in this House, and in it he bequeathes to Canadians of English or of French origin, of English or of French speech, a political testament which I should like to see treated after the old French fashion. In France, when an important speech is delivered it is ordered to be posted on the door of every mairie in France, so that every elector may be able to read it. This custom was established before the newspaper existed. If these words of Sir John A. Macdonald which I am about to quote were taken to heart by Canadians of English speech and by all inhabiting the several provinces, no such difficulty would exist as the one we have now to contend with. The quotation is a little longer than I am accustomed to make, but hon. members will see that the words are particularly applicable to the crisis through which we are now passing. I quote these words, not for the purpose of stirring up difficulty, but for the purpose of smoothing out difficulty, for the purpose of bringing about a better understanding among all Canadians, so that we may be able to fulfil our share of the great duty that rests upon all people of British allegiance. The occasion of Sir John A. Macdonald's speech was the bringing before the House by Mr. Dalton McCarthy, one of the brightest stars in the political firmament, of one of the most unfortunate questions which could be brought into debate. I must state in fairness to the House that it followed a very acute campaign which had been carried on in the province of Quebec following certain events in the Northwest Territories. The campaign in Quebec had its echoes in Ontario. Dalton McCarthy, not being able to attack the British North America Act and its guarantees, proposed to amend the Northwest Territories Act for the purpose of eradicating French from the journals of the legislature of the Northwest Territories. Sir John Thompson opposed it. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was then in the House, naturally opposed it. Edward Blake, one of the great men of Ontario, and other leading men opposed it. They opposed it on patriotic grounds, on constitutional grounds, and in the interest of the country. They said that it was an unfortunate question to be taken up at that time. They took the very wise stand that in a few years from that time these territories would be formed into provinces and could then decide what was best in their own interest. This view prevailed in this House. These words of Sir John Macdonald's will remain

to his honour, and I want to read them in order to bring about, if possible, a better understanding:

It is quite true, as the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake) said, that a small spark might kindle a great conflagration, and we will be wilfully, on a question of sentiment—on a question of feeling, which does not deserve to be dignified by the name of sentiment—hazarding the future of the country, arousing the feelings of race against race which I hope had been for ever buried in 1867, and ruining the credit of Canada in foreign countries. Aye, and in the Mother Country too. For, what credit can we, financially or otherwise, hope to obtain if it is known in England, if it is known especially on the stock exchange—the most fearful and timorous of all bodies—that the two races which inhabit Canada are drawn up against each other, on matters of sentiment, feelings and prejudice, which are more important and less easy to be soothed than mere material questions. It will stop the development of this country. It will prevent its future progress, and if this country should fall from the proud position it now holds in the eyes of the world, it will be because by our own insensate conduct we have destroyed our credit, destroyed our prestige, and ruined our future. In the few remarks I made the other night I intended to have called the attention of my hon. friends from the province of Ontario to what was the action of the province of Upper Canada in 1793, but I was tired, and held it over for another opportunity. I will call attention to it now, to show what was the feeling of the people of Upper Canada a century ago. By a very unwise measure, although introduced by a very great man, Mr. Pitt, in 1790, the old province of Quebec was divided into two—Upper and Lower Canada. It was thought that matters would be simplified by keeping the French in one corner of this vast country, and the English in another, and they divided the province of Quebec into two provinces. From that unwise measure come most of our troubles. The legislature met in 1791 at Newark, afterwards Niagara, and was composed of Englishmen. They were severed from the French, but they had a colony of French on the western frontier of the province of Canada, what is now the county of Essex. These Frenchmen were few in number, but their rights were protected at the second meeting of the legislature of Upper Canada. The province was a small one and poor, and could not afford even to print the proceedings of its legislature; but its people regarded the feelings of their fellow countrymen. Let me read the resolution, which is still in manuscript. The original volume will be found in our library. This is the order of June 3, 1793:

"Ordered, that such Acts as have already passed, or may hereafter pass the legislature of this province, be translated into the French language for the benefit of the inhabitants of the western district of this province and other French settlers who may come to reside within this province, and that A. Macdonald, Esq., of this House, member for Glengarry county, be likewise employed as a French translator for this or other purposes."

Are we, one hundred years later, going to be less liberal to our Franch Canadian subects than the few Englishmen, United Empire Loyalists, who settled Ontario? No, Sir. This resolution would cast shame on men who tried to deprive our French friends in the province of Ontario of the privilege given them a hundred years ago by a body of men altogether speaking the English language. There may have been among them one member from that western district, of French origin—perhaps Monsieur Baby—

Who, I believe, was an ancestor of the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain).

—who for years was the sole represntative in the province of Upper Canada of that portion of the French race who were living in Upper Canada. Are we going to be less liberal? Forbid it, Mr. Speaker, in the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in the name of the progress of this great country, I appeal to all our friends in this House, without reference to party, to forget what may be an inconvenience when they go back to their constituents on both sides, to forget that for a moment, and to merge everything in the great desire to make Canada, French and English, one people, without any hostile feeling, without any difference of opinion, further than that which arises from the different literatures and the different strains of mind that run always in different races, and which severs the Scotchman and the Irishman from the Englishman as much as it severs the Frenchman from the Englishman Let us forget this cry, and we shall have our reward in seeing this unfortunate fire, which has been kindled from so small a spark, extinguished for ever, and we shall go on, as we have been going on since 1867, as one people, with one object, looking to one future and expecting to lay the foundation of one great country.

That, Mr. Speaker, was one of the last declarations made in this House by the man who was foremost among all the Conservatives that Canada ever produced. We are passing through a crisis at the present moment. We are passing through a critical period in history. I invite the members from Ontario to ponder these words of Sir John A. Macdonald. I ask those who are not of my own political persuasion if, in the interests of the Empire, whose success they have at heart, in the interests of our common country and of our common cause, which we want to see triumph, they can find a way out of this difficulty? I do not wish to trouble the House by reading the resolution of the Quebec Legislature on this subject, but I shall read the letter of the chief inspector of the Protestant schools in the province of Quebec, in which he declares that no difficulty of this kind has ever occurred in that province. Although some of my friends may have read this letter, I may as well give them the benefit of it; it may assist them in solving the difficulty. It is signed by J. C. Sutherland, Inspector of Public Protestant Schools in the province of Quebec, and dated December 23, 1915. It is a public letter headed, "Ontario School Question," and

addressed to the editor of the Quebec Chronicle:

Sir,—In the admirable letter of Mr. J. G. Scott to the Toronto Mail and Empire, reproduced in your columns a few days ago, there is only one very significant sentence. Mr. Scott asks:

"How would we feel if our instruction were not in English?"

There are very few English-speaking people who realize that if the same principle of provincial control of education, and the same prejudice against the language of a minority, prevailed in this province as prevail in other provinces, the language of instruction in our Protestant school would be French and not English.

In the Dominion at large, as well as in some parts of our own province, it is not as well understood as it should be that we, the English minority of Quebec, enjoy almost absolute home rule in our educational affairs. The organization, discipline and administration of our schools are determined by regulations of the Protestant committee. It is that committee which decides what subjects and languages shall be taught in the Protestant schools. In the other provinces all these matters are subject to general school laws and to departmental regulations. Yet, as the Confederation debates of 1865 plainly show, the one anxiety of the Fathers of Confederation was to provide a safeguard in the constitution for the Protestant minority of Quebec. They alone were supposed to be in danger from the handing over of education to provincial control. Hence article 93 of the British North America Act—that article which has caused so much trouble in other provinces in the last 48 years, but which has never had to be invoked on behalf of the Protestant minority of Quebec. It is a "scrap of paper" which has been most honourably respected by the Roman Catholic majority of Quebec, and I think it is the just duty of us Protestants to frankly acknowledge the fact.

As one born and educated in Ontario, but for many years now a resident of this province, I have long endeavoured to study this question with a spirit of detachment from local prejudices of any kind, and without losing any of my regard and appreciation of the great and progressive spirit of my native province, I hold that the chief source of difficulty in the ever recurring school question, in Ontario and other provinces which modelled their educational systems upon that of Ontario including all the western provinces, is the fact that the principle of centralization is carried too far. Curiously enough, in view of the World War, Ontario derived that principle of extreme centralization from Prussia. The founder of the school system of Upper Canada was Dr. Egerton Ryerson. When laying the foundations of the system and they were most noble in general, Ryerson visited various countries, being absent on this mission from November, 1844, to the early part of 1846. The Rev. Chancellor Burwash, in his life of Ryerson "Makers of Canada" series, says that Ryerson was chiefly impressed by three systems, those of Prussia, Ireland and Massachusetts, and that in "Prussia he had seen the advantages of strong and wise central direction and authority." (P. 168).

But "strong" centralization of the Prussian model is too apt to develop into what is in reality very un-democratic "stringency."

That is the position in which we now stand. We want to place the province of Quebec where she should stand, where she has always stood and where she will stand as long as this country stands. And this country will stand as long as Quebec stands, because Quebec is the keystone of the arch of Canadian Confederation. Without Quebec there would never have been any Confederation, and the day that Quebec goes out of the Canadian Confederation will see the end of that Confederation. Quebec is the connecting link between the Maritime Provinces and the west of Canada. Providence has given over to the custody of French-Canadians in the province of Quebec the gateway into this great country.

I had the opportunity some weeks ago, in the Russell theatre, of addressing an immense meeting for the purpose of inviting French-Canadian citizens in Ottawa and vicinity to enlist in the 77th Battalion, which is now, I understand, recruited to its full strength. The invitation came to me from the Canadian club of Ottawa, and I accepted it. I learned with pleasure from Colonel Street that the enrolment from the French-Canadians of this city, notwithstanding the grievances which, rightly or wrongly, they now complain of, was sufficiently large to permit the formation of one whole French-Canadian company in this battalion. I was called upon that evening to speak in company with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, whose eloquence this House is familiar with, and whose broad views are known on all these subjects. I felt at ease in speaking to my countrymen in this locality. By a strange circumstance, I had not spoken in the Russell theatre for eight years. Eight years ago, following an invitation which had been extended to me by His Excellency Lord Grey, I attended a meeting in the Russell theatre at which the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada was present. We had met that evening not for the purpose of speaking of war, not for the purpose of calling upon our countrymen to face the stern realities of a serious conflict, not for the purpose of calling upon every man to consider in his own conscience and in his own heart what were the duties that he owed to himself, to his family, to those that were dear to him, to his country, and to the flag that protected him. We were met for the purpose of launching a movement which had for its object the perpetuation of the third centennial of the foundation of the city of Que-

bec. We were met to establish upon the Plains of Abraham, upon these sacred acres wherein is vested the heirloom of the British race on this North American continent, confided to the safekeeping of the French-Canadian residents of the province of Quebec, one sublime symbol of the union which should and did unite at that moment the various classes of the Canadian people. We were gathered there that evening for the purpose of asking Canadians, one and all, regardless of their speech, regardless of the altar at which they knelt, regardless of their political views, to give their support to this worthy object. We were united that evening for the purposes of peace, to commemorate not what had been done in war but an achievement of peace, on those sacred acres on the Plains of Abraham, where Wolfe died victorious but where Montcalm met with an equally glorious death in defeat, and where to-day the memory of both is commemorated in the common monument which is the common glory of the two races whose blood now mingles so freely in Flanders and in France. We asked the people of Ottawa that evening to join this movement, and they joined in it freely, as did the whole of Canada.

The present King of Great Britain thought it his duty to come over from the other side with a British squadron for the purpose of attending the celebration of this centennial and of consecrating this ground in the city of Quebec to the great memories which it recalled and will recall for all time in the minds of Canadians. Did we in the province of Quebec take the narrow view that the celebration which was intended to be brought about in commemoration of Wolfe's victory was the humiliation of the French race? That it meant the French defeat? We did not, we had broader views, we looked beyond, we saw that the hand of Providence had decreed that when France was about to pass through the blasts of the French revolution, the germ which had been cast upon the North American continent should be freed from the dangers which had struck the parent tree. And the decree of Providence has been realized to the letter. These 60,000 men whom fortune handed over to the safekeeping of British institutions are now 2,000,000. They overran the whole continent of America. They will speak French to the end of time, because it is the sweetest language known to human lips. But, for the purposes of business, for the purposes of education, for the purposes of constitutional government, they will speak English; they will be glad to learn English, they will be glad to spread it wherever they go.

Some fifteen years ago I went with one of the most genial, one of the most kind-hearted members we ever had in this House, at that time a Minister of the Crown from western Ontario, into his constituency, one of the most prosperous, one of the most enlightened, one of the most intelligent, and, I must say, one of the most liberal constituencies in that part of the province. I received a royal welcome, as I have always received in all parts of Ontario where I have had the opportunity of meeting the people of that province They felt, probably, that I came from a sister province, and so I was given a much better and more hearty reception than I deserved. At the conclusion of the meeting the mayor of that city rose and told me how sorry he was that he had been unable to find in that town, or in that county, a person who would undertake to say a few words to thank the speaker who had come from the province of Quebec in the French language. The mayor of that city gave us a dinner after the meeting; he presented me to his charming wife and young ladies, who informed me that they were about to take the trip to Paris that all ladies anticipate taking, and which should be taken by all those who can afford it, if for nothing else than its great educational value. But they were going to Paris without the knowledge of French. I met them two or three years afterwards. They told me they had learned how useful a knowledge of French would have been, and said how gladly they had set about learning it. That is the state of affairs now.

We would like to have the people of the province of Ontario enjoy the advantage we have in the province of Quebec, of knowing both languages. Why should we decree in any province of Canada that a man should be confined to only one language? What great advantage is there in an argument such as that which appeared to-night in the Ottawa Journal, a paper edited by a former fellow-craftsman of mine, a man for whom I have great respect, a man of good standing, a good Conservative, a good writer and a good Canadian? Why should he use such arguments as this: Quebec has been given the largest territory of the Dominion; Quebec has been given Ungava—where, of course, nobody will ever go to settle; why should not

Quebec be satisfied with that? Why not speak French there and leave us alone in the English-speaking provinces? this is an English country, the English language must prevail in this country. Are these arguments that are worthy of the twentieth century? Are these arguments that are worthy of this day, when the French and British races are fighting side by side in Flanders and in France for their very existence? When the blood of these two nations is being mingled why should we have to say as Major Asselin said: "Overlook what is being done to our people in Ontario, forget these things, think only of British institutions, think only of the flag under which you live, think only of the cause for which you are fighting, overlook these things; better days will come shortly, as they have come in the past."

Some eighteen years ago, I had the honour one day of addressing a meeting in one of the eastern counties of Ontario with one of the brightest minds that Ontario ever gave to this House or to this Dominion, the late Hon. Sir George Ross. He was at that time Minister of Education in Ontario. He was a bright man, a distinguished man, a great Canadian. His name will live in the annals of his province. I spoke with him in a village of Russell county. He defended the bilingual schools for one hour upon the public hustings. He saw the advantage it was to the Frenchman to learn English and to the Englishman to learn French. What an immense advantage would it not be now to our boys from Ontario who are fighting on the other side if they only had the French language to carry them along?

I was reading the other day a circular issued by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in one of the bulletins of that department, to the effect that Canadians should be up and doing to capture the foreign trade of Germany after the war. This circular started out by saying that to correspond in Russia two languages were required, the Russian and the French. What about the citizen of Ontario? What trade is he going to capture in Russia if he neglect French, if he is afraid to study, to learn or to use French? We live on the north part of the western hemisphere. What correspondence can we carry on with the South American Republics in the English language? In Argentina, in Brazil, in all these other places in South America, the language prevailing is the French or Spanish language. What correspondence can you carry on in Belgium without French? Your French letters will be understood in Italy, in any part of Europe; French being the complement of an education.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) did me the honour last year of coming to me and saying: "Marcil, I want to enjoy an hour of relief and rest; give me the name of a good French author." Why should you deny the children of Ontario these advantages and these privileges? Why should you hem in education within such narrow bounds and such narrow limits?

I had the honour, at the opening of this session, of attending the state dinner at Rideau Hall. It is all that remains to me of my former glory. I was made a member of the Privy Council of Canada, the reward that is in store for you, Mr. Speaker, when your term of office expires. I am speaking now from the seat of our unfortunate friend Dr. Béland. That is probably the reason that his incarceration is so long in Berlin—because he is a member of the Privy Council of Canada. When I attended this state dinner, the menu card given to us was printed in the French language. When you went to Rideau Hall under the Minto régime, under the Grey régime, at the present time, meeting an aide-de-camp, a lady in waiting, their Royal Highnesses themselves, the former governors and their wives, why, it was but elementary etiquette for them to speak French. They were always glad to speak French. The better class in England speak French. It is universal there. The better class in the United States speak French. Why should this commonplace argument, this backwoods argument, be used, that Ontario is an English-speaking province and we must not speak anyhing but English? I do not look upon Ontario in that light. I look on Ontario as the premier province of this Dominion. I look on Ontario as the province that should give us a lead in those things. It is a province that is different from ours, professing a creed which is different from ours; but it is her duty, as the biggest of the family, as the greatest British province in Canada, to give to the people of the province of Quebec an example of broad-mindedness and toleration.

Do you think you can prevent the French-Canadian from going into the wilds of New Ontario? You know that the French-Canadian axeman or woodman has opened up half of this continent. You know that

he stands second to none as a settler. You know that wherever he goes he will have a home at the end of twelve months. The French-Canadian axeman, with his numerous family, will go with his axe, will go into the wilds, and give up ten, twenty, thirty or forty years of his life, if necessary, in order to hew out a resting place for himself and his family. You find him along the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs, at the very entrance to this country; along the Intercolonial railway, in places where English settlers would not stay; along the Transcontinental, in the hardest parts of Quebec and New Ontario, where he is now electing members of Parliament. You will find him along the shores of Baffin's bay, and on the borders of the Arctic ocean. You will find him in the Yukon, where Mercier was 20 years before gold was ever discovered. You will find him in all parts of this country, where there are heavy tasks to be done. You will find him a man of sentiment, who may be misled sometimes, but a man who is sincere in his feelings. Once he has proved his attachment to a creed, or his attachment to an idea, he will stick by it for life.

In the province of Quebec the French-Canadians had faith in the Conservative party in the old days. They kept Sir John A. Macdonald in power for a whole decade against his own countrymen. They kept him in power, with Hon. Senator Sir Mackenzie Bowell, then grand master of the Orange order, on one side, and the Hon. Hector Langevin on the other. They kept that trio in power, because they had faith in the Conservative party. They had faith in the Conservative party after Confederation, because in the British North America Act they had a guarantee of the protection to which they were entitled as British subjects, the protection which Amherst said they would have when he signed the treaty of the capitulation of Montreal. They had faith in the Conservative party; they stood by Cartier and Macdonald, until they found they had been misled by others who came after them, and unfortunate occurrences took place here and there in the various provinces. New channels were formed, and other conditions presented themselves, and a change was made.

They stood loyally by the present leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition for many years they stand by him still, and they will continue to stand by him; but they will stand above all to this country to the last. What Sir Etienne Tache, who was Prime Minister of this country when Confederation was brought about, said, is as true to-day as it was then; as true as it was in 1849, when the English merchants of Montreal signed a manifesto favouring annexation to the United States because their business had been interfered with: "the last man on the British North American continent who will defend British interests and the British flag will be a French-Canadian of the province of Quebec."

Other conditions may arise; you may have in the Northwest, in ten, twenty, or fifty years, we know not what—a new population entirely recruited from various parts of the world, with new interests. We may have the same difficulties when this country has 50,000,000 or 75,000,000 of a population as they have had on the other side of the line. No great nation is without its difficulties, but there is a place where British interests are anchored forever, and that is the province of Quebec. They are anchored there because we have an interest in maintaining them, because we are intent upon keeping them; and we are intent upon keeping them because, under them, we have the freedom to exercise all the rights to which we are entitled, and because we get the protection which we had the right to expect, and which has been given us to the full.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, to the credit of the home Government, that our difficulties in the province of Quebec have never been with them. From the home authorities we have received justice flowing over. Our misunderstandings have been with our own countrymen in this our own Dominion of Canada. Is it because we do not know each other as well as we ought to? Many times I have regretted that the habitant of Quebec could not come oftener into communication with the citizen of the province of Ontario. How easily they would understand each other, and how well things would get along if they could do so. At the present time they are united for the purpose of seeing this war through.

Charges have been made against the present Administration of a most startling character in connection with munition and other contracts. The French-Canadians, as taxpayers in Canada, naturally have an interest in these important questions, and they expect that the Government of Canada will realize its duty to the full in the interest

of the country and of the cause for which we are fighting. We expect the Government, before this session closes, to give the representatives of the people here a full account of their stewardship which they promised when $150,000,000 were freely voted. We are prepared to vote more. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the practical side of these questions. You have heard a great many speeches dealing with that side, and, Mr. Speaker, you may hear some more. I have tried to take up another side of the question, which is perhaps a sentimental side. But the men of my race very often look quicker on the sentimental side than on the practical and business side. I shall leave the hard-headed men and the representatives of the Anglo-Saxon race in this Parliament to deal with the question of shells and munitions. But I do appeal to them to say whether it is not right and fair that an end should be put, by some means or another, to this wrangling among ourselves in this country, especially at the present time when union is so necessary among all classes of the Canadian people. I wish to be fair to the Nationalists who are still in the House; I do not want to bear a grudge against any man, or to have any man bear any grudge against me. They may have a reason to give to this House why they have changed, why they now invite the citizens of the province of Quebec to enlist. But they owe it to this House to make that declaration, and I insist upon that declaration being made in the interests of those who are now sharing the responsibilities of recruiting. I insist further, Mr. Speaker, that our ministerial friends who are now to the right of you, with whom we are now sharing the responsibilities of carrying on this war, and who will have to face the people as we will have to face them, give the reasons which they ought to give to this House.

I have no intention of dwelling at any further length on these matters. I desire to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for having listened to me so patiently. I conclude by asking my hon. friends from the province of Ontario, if for no other reason than for the sake of the good cause, if for no other reason than to help us in our recruiting campaign, to try and bring about a suspension of some kind of some of these regulations which have caused so much trouble among the small French Canadian minority. Even if the suspension be just for the war, it will have an immense effect not only in the province of Quebec, but with the French all over the Dominion. If they do that, and if our Nationalist friends will help us put into the minds of the people of Quebec the idea that Canadians inhabiting this country have greater duties than are confined within the limits of this Dominion, it will help to bring recruiting in Quebec up to what it should be; although I maintain that Quebec, all things considered, has done remarkably well. Fifteen thousand men or more have gone from the city of Montreal. In Quebec a committee has been formed with the Lieutenant-Governor at its head, with the Archbishop of Quebec as its honorary president, and with Sir Lomer Gouin and all the members of his Cabinet assisting in an active campaign throughout the province. The clergy have been instructed to announce these recruiting meetings from their pulpits, pastoral letters from the bishops have been read in all the churches, and the cures have been instructed by their bishops to exert all the pressure they can to make the people realize that the fight that is now on is a fight for civilization, a fight for humanity, a fight for freedom, and that it is the duty of the Canadians of French origin to be first and foremost in that great fight.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I will not ask the leader of the Government to allow me to move the adjournment of the debate just now. I know he is good natured, but I want to hurry along the business of the House. He and I have to do a good deal of the night work in this House, and in order to make a fair equilibrium I will speak a little later to-night than I should do under other circumstances.

After the magnificent and eloquent address of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Marcil), I am afraid my broken remarks will appear somewhat stale and uninteresting. What he said about the loyalty and devotion of the French people will, I am sure, find an echo in the heart of every man in Canada who knows anything of this country, and I am sure that the interests of the French speaking people of this Dominion will not suffer so long as they have such eloquent and able representatives as my hon. friend. I have read the Speech from the Throne, which, while not rich in quantity, is quite meaty in quality. To my mind, the Government has placed the issues upside down. They ask us first to consider whether the term of Parliament shall be extended; after they

have seen what Parliament has done with that, they will or will not attend to war measures. To my mind, Sir, the first duty of the Government should be to provide for the great need of the moment—the vigorous prosecution of the war in which we are engaged. After that, we might have discussed intelligently whether or not it would be wise, under the circumstances, to usurp the rights of the people by saying that we will remain here as members of Parliament for a longer term than that which the people have given us. But, as the Government has to my mind placed their issues upside down, I will take the Speech as presented. Let me just read to the House the words in which the extension measure is proposed, and the reasons given therefor:

> The life of the present Parliament expires in the autumn of this year, and, under existing legislation a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

What a change has come over the spirit of the dreams of the members of the Government! On two different occasions the country was led to believe that the Government were lingering shivering on the brink of an appeal to the people. So thoroughly did the Government make up their minds that this was necessary that without any authority they went to the expense of printing the ballot papers and other forms, and to the further unwarranted expense of sending men across to the Old Land with them. I think no further argument need be used to convince the people that the Government at one time at least, thought that there would be no distraction or confusion caused even by an election in the trenches. I look around for the reason why they have changed their minds, and reading farther on in the Speech I find it:

> My advisers are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people—

Sir, the wishes of the Canadian people bore in on this Government in the form of telegrams and letters and personal remonstrances in such weighty quantities, and in such thundering tones, that those who were going to hold an election even in the trenches discovered that an election in this country would cause distraction and confusion all over the Dominion. I am glad that even in this Government we can have a conversion, and I am now in hopes that before we get through with this debate our Nationalist friends will also be really converted.

The Government is asking us for an extension. At the present time I will not discuss per se, as the lawyers would say, whether that extension ought or ought not to be granted, but when the resolution is formally presented to the House, I will be prepared to take that position on it which I think the circumstances warrant, and which my judgment will dictate. For the present, I want to point out to the count and the members of this House that we must not treat this question of an extension of our own term of office lightly. It is not a small matter to ask the Imperial Parliament to change the constitution of the Dominion of Canada. We have just heard the eloquent address of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), in which he discussed the spirit as well as the letter of the constitution. Those of us who come from one of the big provinces, and I am speaking now of the province of Ontario, must remember that the constitution provides certain guarantees for the smaller provinces in this Dominion; as, for example, the question of the formation of the Senate. We must not forget that the minorities in Canada have certain rights guaranteed to them under the constitution. We must also remember that it is a delicate thing to begin changing the foundation of our country's constitution, even in this war; because there is likely to be a suspicion in the minds of some that if it be easy to change the constitution in this case it may be just as easy to change it in some other essentials of more vital importance, thus bringing something that may not be wanted in this Dominion.

Mr. ROGERS: You mean of less vital importance?

Mr. GRAHAM: I mean of more vital importance to the individual. This is not a matter to be dealt with lightly, and when people say, "We must not have an election, change the term of Parliament," I say in reply, the circumstances may warrant it. The serious position in which we find ourselves in the great conflict in which we are engaged may possibly constitute a reason for changing the constitution; but it must be understood throughout the length and breadth of the land that we are not discussing this question lightly, because it is a serious matter to change the constitution under which this young country was formed, and by the provisions of which minorities are protected and guarantees

that must not be broken are given to the smaller provinces. If necessary, I shall be prepared to discuss the matter when the resolution comes before the House, but I think it is not unreasonable to suggest now that the Government, when they present the resolution, have ready the programme which they intend to give to the House. If we are to take to ourselves an extended term we ought now to be able to tell the country, before the press discusses the matter much, what we intend to do with the extra time that we are adding to our term. In what way do we intend to employ the extra days which we are arrogating to ourselves, and what value is the country going to get for the extra salary that we are voting ourselves? I do not think it is unfair that the people, early in the session, or even before the resolution is brought down, should have some information on this point.

The next item in the speech is provision for the war. There is no man on either side of the House but is prepared to vote heartily for anything necessary in connection with the prosecution of the war. We have always taken that position; we propose to do so in future, and there need be no question about that.

Certain objections have been taken to criticism. There can be no real objection to criticism. The Government, through the Prime Minister, has invited us to criticise. Of course, when a man criticises you, you can not be the judge of what the critic is to say. I can not be the judge if he is criticising me. But when our expenditures are being doubled and trebled, when little regard is being paid to the value of money as long as we can get what is necessary for the war, criticism ought to be invited and administered. In the Old Land criticism of the most virulent type goes on day after day, and that in the face of the fact that the Government has taken a portion of the Opposition into its ranks. The British people are supposed to be united in the Government, and if criticism there is invited and indulged in, how much more necessary is criticism in this House, and how much more readily ought it to be invited when the Government managing this great undertaking is all chosen from one side of politics and when half the people belong to the other? The people of Canada will laugh at any person who winces under criticism, or who says it is undignified or verging on disloyalty for the action of the Government to be called in question at this or at any other time. True, I say, we must not lose sight of the great fact that, no matter what our differences or our criticisms may be, or what errors or worse may have been committed, the prosecution of this war ought to be our first consideration. I was reading the other night something of the work of the censors, of which I believe some hon. members spoke. The newspaper business has been curtailed a good deal, perhaps necessarily so; but I have often wondered what the censors thought of that interview or letter given out by Mr. Holt of Montreal.

10 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: Sir Herbert Holt.

Mr. GRAHAM: After the speech of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) I am almost afraid to mention the word "Sir." Although that interview was a strikingly caustic criticism of everything connected with the war, the censors, so far as I know, have said nothing about it. Perhaps it was overlooked; but we who are members of the press in a smaller way are pretty well tied up, and sometimes I think large things are overlooked and small things are kept out of the press which would be of absolute interest to the people and could do no possible harm to the great cause in which we are engaged.

This is the first time I have ever mentioned a personal matter in this House, and so far as I am concerned, I think it is unworthy of notice; but since my silence might be misconstrued and some hon. friends, particularly those around me, might consider that I had left undone something that I should have done in the way of speech, I wish to refer to it. The Solicitor General the other evening when the Shell Committee was being discussed, intimated that I was connected with one of the companies which had been spoken of by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I admit the soft impeachment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The soft shell.

Mr. GRAHAM: I hold a few preferred shares in the Canada Foundries and Forgings. My common shares were sold long ago at a very low price. I became interested in this company long before there was any war . There was an old established company, the James Smart Mfg. Company, doing business at Brockville before some of the members of this House were born. A few years ago there was formed between two plants at Welland and this one at

Brockville an amalgamation called the Canada Foundries and Forgings. Being a resident of the town of Brockville, I was asked to take a little stock, and when a vacancy occurred later I went on the board. When war broke out I was director in the company and had been for a long time, and for that I have no apology to make to any person living. There are only two things for a man who lives as I do to do, if he is to remain in public life: he must have some business outside, or he must be crooked. Now, I do not intend to stay out of public life, and I do not intend to become crooked if I can help it. Accordingly, I am going to remain in business outside this House. As long as that business is legitimate, it is nobody's business but my own, and instead of my connection with this company being derogatory to me, I am proud of it and proud of what this company has done in connection with the manufacture of munitions. Let me say—and I am not doing this to advertise— that this company has no connection with the machining of shells about which we have heard so much, that portion of the work for which $5.70 was paid, but which is now being done, I am told, for $1.75. The company in which I have a very few shares does the forging work or the initial stage in the manufacture of shells; and if such companies as that did not undertake the work there would be no shells made in Canada and no machining to do.

When the question of shell-making was proposed in Canada—and I am speaking of what I know—comparatively few, yes very few, particularly of those who could do the forging, would have anything to do with the proposition at all. They had never done any of that kind of work, and did not know what it might mean, and, besides, not many of them were equipped for the work. The question was brought up at our board by the manager: Shall we undertake this work? Some of the directors were fearful as some of the other companies were, but as a public man, and having the interest of the Allies at heart, I said to the company: I would not belong to a company of manufacturers at this stage in Canada if it was not prepared to take a chance and do what the Government wanted it to do and try to make these shells. I should have been heralded all over the Dominion of Canada as a man unfit to be in public life if, in my position, I had not used whatever influence I possessed to cause the company with which I was connected in a small way to undertake its share of the work. They did undertake it, and they did it well. Since then other companies have come in. I think I am safe in saying that the deliveries of the company with which I am connected are not under criticism by the Munitions Board. The quality has never been under criticism by either Shell Committee. And I believe so long as shells are wanted in Canada this company, having made a splendid record in its delivery, will be sure to have work to do even if some of the slow coaches do not have work. I never asked the Shell Committee for an order—never saw the Shell Committee about an order. But as a small shareholder in this concern I am proud of the part that the company has had in the business, and of the interest and enthusiasm shown by every member of the company to meet the requirements of the Munitions Board and give them shells as rapidly as possible.

Some say that the prices are too high. I do not know what the prices are. The company never made a price themselves, but accepted what was given them. They are prepared to meet the Munitions Board at any time and discuss prices—I understand they have done so from time to time.

I will not detain the House longer on a personal matter. But let me say, as I see it, every man who is producing anything at this period of our history is producing something for the Allies. On our farms, in our factories and in our shops, every man in Canada who is in business and producing anything and is doing his business properly, is making a product, a portion of which is going to the Allies. Every farmer, every merchant, every artisan is doing something to help along the cause. Next to the supplying of men is the supplying of munitions and food for the army as the one great requisite at this time.

Now, you ask me if I have any criticism to make of the Shell Committee. I have. At this moment not one time fuse has been delivered to the Shell Committee or the Munitions Board. The original mistake that was made, I believe, was this: The Government, through its Munitions Board or in some other manner, should have taken an inventory of the manufacturing establishments of Canada that were able to turn out munitions. I think I would have gone further. After tests had been made and costs ascertained fairly well, any company that would have then refused to assist should have been under pain of

having its shops commandeered and at least a portion of its plant put to work in making supplies for the Allies. The manufacturers of Canada should have been brought into one great organized group so that the best results could have been secured. If the manufacturers had been properly organized and if orders were properly placed, the output of supplies could have been increased by from forty to fifty per cent.

Let me deal briefly with another matter. Up to the present time war orders to the extent of $2,000,000,000 have been given to the United States manufacturers. Here is the list of some of them:

Company. Material.	Gross Amt.
Ætna Exp.—Explosives	$ 30,000,000
Amer. Can—Shells	41,000,000
Amer. Car & Fdy.—Shells	7,000,000
Amer. Loco.—Shells	50,000,000
Amer. Steel Fds.—Forgings	18,000,000
Amer. Wool.—Cloth	30,000,000
Baldwin Loco.—Shells	143,000,000
Bethlehem—Miscellaneous	300,000,000
Can. Car & F.—Shrapnel	146,000,000
Crucible—Miscellaneous	17,000,000
Curtis Aero.—Aeroplanes	15,000,000
DuPont—Explosives	200,000,000
Driggs-Sea.—Miscellaneous	40,000,000
Elec. Boat—Boats, etc	100,000,000
Gen. Elec.—Materials	69,000,000
Hercules Powder—Cordite	25,000,000
Lackawanna Steel—Steel	10,000,000
N. Y. Air Brake—Shrapnel	20,000,000
Pressed S. Car.—Cars, etc.	15,000,000
Studebaker—Harness, etc.	20,000,000
Westing. A. B.—Shrapnel, etc.	18,000,000
Westing. Elec.—Rifles, etc.	94,000,000
Total	$1,408,000,000

Other figures given increase this to $2,000,000,000. I do not wish to be too critical, but this I do say, that what ought to have been done on behalf of the people of Canada—for we are not a separate people, nor neutral, we are of the Allies—was to collect the facts about every manufacturing establishment in Canada capable of turning out any kind of goods for the Allies and put that establishment at work. The surplus orders could have gone to the neutral countries. As it is, the large orders have been going to the United States and the surplus coming to Canada. Some orders are being executed in Canada today that have come to our manufacturers via New York. That is not as it should have been, and I criticize the Government that they did not at the outset, or at least when the matter was brought to their minds, group our manufacturing establishments and see to it that they were employed to the full before any orders were given elsewhere. I do not think the war office in Great Britain is without blame in this matter. It may be selfish to say so, though I do not think it is—we are part and parcel of the great Empire, we stand shoulder to shoulder with the rest doing our best and ready to do our very utmost in every particular, and from the war office down to the Munitions Board in the Dominion of Canada, their policy should have been to see that the Canadian manufacturing establishments had the preference—other things being equal—in everything that they can manufacture.

I spoke of fuses a few moments ago, and here is a criticism in that respect. Mr. Flavelle, the chairman of the new Munitions Board, criticises some Canadian manufacturers for non-delivery, and in the next sentence he says: we have far too many shells anyway. So that, from Mr. Flavelle's standpoint, as we are manufacturing too rapidly, it would be a relief if the orders were delayed. I do not take that view; one of these days time fuses will come on with a rush. At the present moment the Russians have a surplus quantity of time fuses, and I cannot see why, with proper organization and proper effort, our shells could not be loaded with Russian fuses, because they are all going to be devoted to the same purpose, anyway. I criticise the Shell Committee for the delay which occurred in the giving of orders for the manufacture of fuses. My hon. friend the Solicitor General the other night said that some fuses had been delivered. He was right, and he was wrong; sometimes he is both in the same sentence. What are known as the number 100, or concussion fuses for the high explosives, have been delivered in very small quantities, but I was told a week ago that not a single time fuse has been delivered either in Canada or in the United States. Surely a little foresight would have impressed upon the Shell Committee the fact that unloaded shells were absolutely useless and that as soon as the time fuses on hand in Great Britain were used, our shells would be unavailable for practical purposes until some person furnished new fuses. Orders have been given in the United States, but the plants are just being organized there for that purpose. The largest plant on the continent of America is being organized now for the manufacture of fuses. It is a wonderful plant; I have been through it, but it was not organized soon enough. It was when shells were first asked for in Canada that the Shell Committee should have looked around in order that they

might have obtained completed, not partially completed, shells. This is being remedied in a way; but the Munitions Board are hinting that they do not want any more shells, or, at least, any rapid production; that we must hold back the manufacture of shells in Canada until the deficiency in fuses is made up. That may be a week or a month, and that may have delayed the conclusion of this war for six months. While men are being called for and are needed, to my mind what has caused a great deal of difficulty up to the present time, particularly with the Russians, is the lack of munitions and equipment. We in Canada have fallen down in this respect, and unless a great effort is made to rush the manufacture of fuses, we may by this one error have deterred the conclusion of the war for some months—which is a very serious matter. An order for time fuses has been given in Canada, and I see no reason why a company in this country cannot organize an assembling plant and operate it here just as well as any company in the United States. I am told that the company which is taking up the work in Canada is going to do more than assemble; it is going to manufacture many of the parts as well.

Another matter which may present a little difficulty is the lack of steel. I am told that the production of steel for the manufacture of shells is hardly up-to-date, and that our Canadian manufacturers are unable to supply it in sufficient quantity. I do not know whether or not that is correct, but I am so informed by a man who seems to be pretty well up in the steel business. It may take a little time to straighten that out, but that shows that there was hardly enough foresight in connection with the purchase of steel. Large quantities of steel should have been purchased some time ago, for two reasons: first, to have the steel on hand, and, second, to get it at a lower price than that at which it can be purchased at the present time.

I am not speaking for the manufacturers of Canada; the fact that I hold a few shares in one company does not make me a manufacturer any more than the holding of two bank shares by another hon. gentleman would make him a banker. But ever since this war began, manufacturers in Canada have been inclined to think that their interests have not been protected as well as they might have been by the Government. One year ago I asked the Prime Minister if he would lay on the table of the House certain correspondence that had taken place between the Manufacturers' Association, or an officer thereof, and himself. The Prime Minister told me that the correspondence was confidential and that he could not bring it down unless the persons concerned agreed. The House prorogued, and I did not see the correspondence. But this was in the correspondence, Mr. Speaker: The manufacturers of Canada complained to the Prime Minister that when they attempted to sell goods to whoever was the purchasing power at that time, they were not allowed to sell direct; they were invariably approached by middlemen who wished to sell for them. Upon being asked to do so, they prepared a number of instances, and sent them to the Prime Minister. That was a year ago, just after the outbreak of the war; up to the present time that correspondence has not been made public, but that is the gist of what was in it. The legitimate manufacturers started out with what they thought was a grievance: that they were compelled to sell their goods through middlemen. When I say middlemen I do not mean an ordinary representative or agent; I mean the kind to whom the Minister of Militia referred the other day, when he said that the moment war broke out men swarmed up and down throughout the Dominion of Canada professing to have the privilege of placing orders and of getting percentage thereon. This took place in every city; case after case came up, and the manufacturers complained. I say that the manufacturers still have a grievance against the Government. That there were middlemen is now acknowledged by every body; this condition should not have existed at any time, much less in a serious time like this. The legitimate manufacturers have a grievance, against this Parliament in part, that they have been accused of doing something which might be considered dishonourable in connection with the manufacture of these munitions. On behalf of the legitimate manufacturers—not the mushroom companies organized for the purpose; not the middlemen who were going around the country endeavouring to give or to get orders, but the legitimate manufacturers who at their own expense put in all the new machinery; who did not, like the United States firms, get an advance of money, but who put up their own money—on their behalf I say that an investigation ought to be held to clear the good name of the men who are legitimate manufacturers in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Will the hon. gentleman give the names of the firms to whom money was advanced by the Munitions Board? I never heard that allegation made before; even the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) did not make that allegation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will give my hon. friend privately the name of the company.

Mr. BENNETT: But this is public.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, no, it is not. It is between my hon. friend and myself. I know it to be true, so there is no question. I did not say they advanced money to friends in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: It was worse than that; the hon. member said that the board advanced money to an American firm.

Mr. GRAHAM: I say that in one instance of which I know the Munitions Board advanced money to an American firm for a particular product, which I will explain to my hon. friend. I say that the Canadian manufacturer got no advance. I am not whimpering about that. But I do say that the good name of the manufacturers having been brought in question, I believe I am uttering their sentiments when I ask the Government to give a full investigation; and if it is found that any manufacturer in Canada has done anything dishonourable in connection with the manufacture of munitions, I will vote to make him disgorge what he has got dishonourably. It has been said that this investigation could not well be held without interfering with the British authorities because the money is supplied by Great Britain. In supporting that argument the South African war is taken as a precedent. In the first place, we have the word of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that a portion of this money, at least, that is being expended will be paid by the Canadian people. So that element is removed. But I want to give you one or two authorities which I think you will agree are reliable. I will give you the authority of the hon. gentleman who has just left the House in reference to this matter. Mr. W. F. Maclean of South York—and this was when there was no question but that the money being expended was all furnished by the British Exchequer and no part of it by Canada—said:

> This is a new doctrine of responsible Government. It seems to me that a minister must be held strictly accountable for everything he does as head of a department, and I will not sit here quietly and allow a new doctrine of responsibility, or rather lack of responsibility, to be submitted without repudiating it. Reasons may be given for not bringing down the information asked for, but not the reasons given just now.

I give another authority which I think ought to be of the highest importance at the present moment; in fact, I think it ought to be indisputable.

Mr. ROGERS: What is the date of that?

Mr. GRAHAM: March 3, 1903, at the time of the discussion on the South African expenditures. I will give another authority which makes it quite clear that the Government ought to be responsible for what it does. Mr. Hughes, of Victoria, now Sir Sam Hughes, Minister of Militia, said:

> The fair name of Canada is at stake. There are very serious scandals in connection, not only with these oat and hay purchases, but also the purchase of horses.

Sounds familiar.

> I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that when our Government gives instructions to its officers, paid by the Canadian people, the people of Canada are going to inquire into the actions of these men. I hope that the right hon. the Prime Minister will come off his high horse—not one of those horses bought for $40 and sold for $150—and give the information asked for.

If I had time, I should just like to edit that a little and bring it up to date. How well it would sound! I could have the horses, the hay, the oats, almost everything in it. That was the opinion of the present Minister of Militia in 1903, when there was no pretence that any part of the money that was being expended was Canadian money. But in case you might waver at these authorities—because I admit there may be some even in the Government who would not take that last authority, and I do not think any member on the Government side would take the first one—

Mr. ROGERS: You might give us the answer that General Hughes got.

Mr. GRAHAM: General Hughes did not get the information, because there was no part of the money being expended that was Canadian money, it was all coming out of the British Exchequer; but this time part of the money is our money, and we ought to know what is being done. Let me give you a higher authority to which you will all submit. As the Minister of Militia says, this is the balance wheel of the Government; while he and others may be erratic,

the Prime Minister is the balance wheel. Here is what he said in 1903:

> Either the Minister of Agriculture was doing this as a Minister of the Crown or he was not. Was he doing it as Mr. Sydney Fisher, providing his own clerks, and as a matter of private business between himself and the Imperial Government. If that be the case, we would not press the motion. But if he was doing this as a Minister of the Crown, and not as Mr. Sydney Fisher, but because he held the position of Minister of Agriculture we do not see any reason why all the information should not be laid on the Table. I do not think the hon. the Minister of Finance has suggested any. If I understand the position of the Minister of Agriculture, he was acting as Minister of the Crown of Canada on behalf of the Imperial government, using the officers under his control who are paid out of the revenues of this country; and therefore I cannot understand what objection there can be, from any reasonable standpoint, to bringing down the papers.

Mr. BURRELL: That was after the war.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend's reason would be that the war is in progress?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, there are a good many things that enter into that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not see why, as I said before, we should allow anybody to break into the treasury because it is war time.

Mr. NICKLE: Do I understand you to argue that if this money were all British money an inquiry would be out of order?

Mr. GRAHAM: I was not arguing that. I was arguing that the men now forming the Government, in 1903 insisted that although it was all British money, still this Parliament had a right to investigate anything its officers or ministers had done. But in this case, it being admitted that it was at least partially Canadian money, that is all solved, and there is no excuse, I think, constitutionally, etiquettically, or otherwise, why the Canadian Parliament should not order an investigation at the present time.

Now I come to the question of recruiting. The recruiting in Canada, I think, has been going on at a marvellously satisfactory rate. We are compared to other countries —and herein I may collide with some of my good friends—in the matter of recruiting and in some other ways. But these other countries have not the conditions that we have in the Dominion of Canada. They are not attempting, as we are, to furnish the Allies with food, to furnish them with clothing so far as we can, and to furnish them, to a large extent, with munitions, as well as to furnish them with men. And we must take into consideration the fact that men are needed on the farms if we are to keep up the production, that men are needed in the factories, and, further than that, that our business, in a measure, must go on as usual, so far as possible, unless commercially we are to fall down; and if Canada falls down commercially and financially she will be a burden on the Allies instead of a help to them. The recruiting, taking into consideration all the conditions, has, I think, been marvellous, and I have the utmost faith in the people of the Dominion of Canada, that as the days go by and the necessity is pressed home upon them they will rise to the situation and contribute every man they possibly can to aid in this great work. It has been said that the young native born all over the Dominion have not enlisted as did our young friends from across the sea. At first that was absolutely true. The young men from the Old Land were sons of military fathers. Some of them had served in the militia themselves. They had been brought up in an atmosphere where war was not a new thing, and the moment these young men heard the call they knew what it meant, threw down their employment, joined the colours, and rushed to the front. I say from my place in Parliament: All honour to the British-born who were the first to enlist in large numbers in the Dominion of Canada. But now as to our own young men. They have been brought up in an atmosphere of peace; their conquests were to be conquests of commerce, conquests of peace, conquests of industry, and they had never thought of war. It took some time for it to be brought home to them just what the call to arms meant, just what was the necessity for the call. But, Sir, as they have been reading and thinking and finding out, the patriotism of the young man of Canada has come strongly to the surface. It has been found that his heart is in the right place, and today the native born Canadians are flocking to the colours and enlisting as rapidly as we can possibly expect them to enlist.

My hon. friend, who spoke a few moments ago, discussed the difficulties of recruiting in Quebec. I may be pardoned for discussing them for a few moments also, though I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that recruiting difficulties, if difficulties there be, are not altogether confined to the province of Quebec. In reference to the province of Quebec, let me say in all kindness, and I am looking right in the

faces of certain hon. gentlemen whom I have in mind—that this Government came into power having no personal service to the British Empire outside of Canada as one plank in the combined Nationalist-Conservative platform. I think that is putting it mildly. The resolution, which has been referred to, said no service of any kind, neither of money nor of men, but a little later there seemed to be a deviation from that, though I have never heard any further explanation of it. At any rate, I will give them the benefit of the doubt, and put in one word that plank in the platform on which they were elected, a plank of no personal service to the British Empire unless in the Dominion of Canada. Now it may be true that they have repented, but if those twenty-one men had not taken that stand the probabilities are that the present Government would not have been in power. If those twenty-one men had been Liberals they would not have been in power surely.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Does my hon. friend think that that cuts much figure in Ontario which is where the Liberal party got its death blow?

Mr. GRAHAM: We got it in a few places, and worst in Ontario, but I may remind my hon. friend that two members from Ontario were elected having as their plank "no Canadian Navy," and that Mr. Bourassa went into their constituencies and gave that plank to them. I say again that if those twenty-one men were on this side of the House this Government could not last twenty-four hours. That being the case—I am not going into that any further; I refer to it merely as a premise to what I am going to say—it is not sufficient for the Government to say: we are all right now. The best recruiting that can be done in the province of Quebec can be accomplished by those twenty-one men going throughout that province where they went in 1911, and telling the young men they were wrong, and that personal service was requisite for the young men of Canada. It will not do for them to merely stand up in this House and say so, because many young men would not hear them. I will give the House a little personal experience I had. I know the French-Canadian character perhaps as well as any English-speaking member of this House, because I associate with them a great deal. I was in Montreal a few weeks ago and had a conversation with three or four very bright and highly educated young men, none brighter in the Dominion. We began discussing the question of recruiting, and they strongly demurred to what had been said in the Ontario newspapers. I was urging recruiting as strongly as I could when one young man turned to me and said: "Here is the other side of it, Mr. Graham. In 1911 I was a youth, 17 years old, just at an impressionable age. At the door of the church, which I attended, a gentleman who is now a minister of the Crown, argued most strenuously that we were not required, either by loyalty, by the British North America Act, or by anything else, to take part in any war, outside of fighting, if necessary, on our own shores for the defence of Canada. That impressed me as a young man, and the impression has not left me. Now, I see that man, holding those views which have never been repudiated, taken into the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and I ask myself, can that man be serious in asking me to recruit in 1915?" That was the argument put up by the young man; I am not going further into it, but in all kindness to the Government, and to those gentlemen who support it, I say that the only way by which the harm that has been done in Quebec can be undone is for those gentlemen to go through the province as they did in 1911, and, instead of advocating no personal service, to impress upon the young men the duty and privilege of personal service, and, as far as possible, take back what they said in 1911.

Now, I come to another thing which I believe hurts recruiting in the province of Quebec, and that is the remarks made by the Ontario newspapers. I can speak freely on this matter, being associated with the press myself. Nothing is to be gained in the work of recruiting by abusing anybody. You cannot get a young Canadian, if he is worthy the name of a young Canuck, to do anything by abusing him; but you can lead him to do anything if you can show him it is right to do it in the first place. In Ontario, where we boast so much of our loyalty that we have to carry Union Jacks to be expressive enough sometimes, criticisms have been made in certain newspapers concerning the attitude of Quebec, which are hindering recruiting in the latter province in a degree second only to that I have already referred to. I adjure the press of Ontario to stop this carping, and to remember only this one thing: that we are not French, we are not German, we are not Scotch, we are not English; we are citizens of the

Dominion of Canada, prepared to fight for the great cause in which we are so deeply interested.

Sir, in Ontario, we have our own troubles regarding recruiting. I go into a farming community to recruit and am met with the question right away, "What should I do?" As one man told me, "my sons have all gone West but one, and either I have to reduce to a minimum the production of my farm, I have to keep him at home, or else you will have to provide me with labour. What am I to do?" Really, Mr. Speaker, although I did what little I could for some months in Ontario, I was in a quandary in that case. I think that the time has come when some pronouncement ought to be made by those in authority as to what is the duty of a young man in those circumstances. I have had young men in Ontario tell me: "We would be willing and glad to recruit, but here is the situation: if I go, I leave my father absolutely alone on a 100-acre farm and production will stop." In those circumstances I am not so sure that the man is not entitled to stay at home. We must keep a level head in this matter, and try to do what is best in the circumstances;; and if it be better for a man to continue to produce to assist in feeding the Allies, it is very questionable whether he should enlist for he might be doing just as valuable work on his farm.

I have gone to a workshop—I am entering into details because I have practically done nothing else since August but attend recruiting and patriotic meetings—and discussed the matter with the manufacturer. He said to me: "We are manufacturing shells or clothing or boots, as the case may be; here is our order; it is a rush order, what are we to do? My son is ready to go, or so-and-so in my factory wants to go, but if they do I must get some one else, or production must stop." I made this proposition: "Cannot some person who has advanced beyond the military age do that work?" I was taken into a foundry where they were doing a lot of work. The men were pushed, for it is very exacting work.

This man said to me: "These young men are getting out these forgings; no old men could do this work; if I let these young men go I curtail the output of my establishment, which the Munitions Board says I must speed up." You see there are very great difficulties in the way.

There are other difficulties, and this is a question which has been put to me within the last week. The men who go to the front are not sure of the financial standing of their families while they are gone. I am not saying this in spirit of carping criticism; I just wish to bring it to the attention of the Government and before the hon. gentleman who is managing the Patriotic Fund. A man with a family is asked to enlist. He immediately wants to know whether his family will be protected. He is told that the Government provides so much in various ways and that the Patriotic Fund provides so much. But under the present arrangement if the Patriotic Fund falls down, that man's family also falls down. That is not the way to get recruits, and it is one of the difficulties that must be overcome. I am in favour of the Patriotic Fund in as large amounts as can be secured from the very liberal people of Canada, but I do say that it is the duty of a government engaged in a great national war such as this to be able to say to every man who goes to the front, and not only to say it but to guarantee the carrying out of their promise, that that man's wife and children will get a certain stated amount while he is gone. There should be no question of the Patriotic Fund entering into the amount that will be guaranteed that man's family while he is gone. The present arrangement is against recruiting, and I give this criticism in all kindness to the Government. It would help recruiting all over Canada if the Government would fix a sum sufficient to keep a soldier's family, and if the soldier was guaranteed that the Government stood behind the pledge to give that sum. The soldier would then feel that his family would not be dependent upon the kindness of neighbours whose bowels of compassion might dry up, and leave his family without the money he thought they were going to get.

I have another remark to make with reference to the various funds, and I say it advisedly. There are too many people passing the hat. I do not mean that I would advocate any lessening of effort, but I think it is time the Government concentrated the efforts and the givings of the people into certain well-defined channels. Let me give a little personal experience. I have spoken at various towns on behalf of recruiting and the Patriotic Fund. In one place I found the town divided into two camps; one was working for one fund, and another for another, and they were actually quarrelling with each other, spending their energy fighting each other instead

of spending it collecting money for this great purpose. In another place, and this happened in more than one town, I was asked to speak at what might be called an opposition meeting. There were two camps organized for money-raising purposes, and each was trying to get its meeting in ahead of the other. A minister of the Crown and myself quite innocently nearly got into a mix-up over it. I think it is high time the Government took the direction of the collection of all funds into its own hands so far as possible, and then have the spending of those funds carried on through well-defined channels, so that the people would know when a person came collecting money he or she was duly authorized, and the money would go where it was intended to go.

There is another point. I think it is a mistake that the wives of the soldiers who have gone to the front should be treated in a patronizing way when they are getting their money. I know families who are proud in spirit, and entitled to be proud in spirit, for they are among nature's noblemen and noble women, though in ordinary circumstances. Ladies with the very best intentions, with a heart bubbling over to do something, would visit these homes, and without knowing it, would leave the impression that they were peddling out a charitable pittance to some person who for some fault of their own was on the municipality or the Government. That is not the way funds should be distributed. Every man who goes to the front is earning his money more than we who are at home, and his family is entitled by right to that money, and no person has any right whatever to treat that soldier's family as if they were getting a charitable dole to which they were not entitled. These soldiers' wives are not on the charity of the people. The people of Canada owe them a debt of gratitude. They do not owe the people a dollar. There should be some arrangement by which these soldiers' wives could feel the equal or superior of those who visit them at their homes and bring them the money. But that is not the case at the present time. Men have told me that they would not enlist so long as their families were going to be patronized and treated as if they were on charity by reason of some act of omission or commission performed by the soldier.

There is another thing I would like to say with reference to passing the hat. The Minister of Militia is not here, but I will point out what I mean. Nearly every battalion, I am told, needs a few things that the Government does not provide. Why should not the Government provide these things if they are needed? Why should any company be asking a citizen to give them a kitchen with which to do the cooking for the men?

Mr. REID: I think the Government supplies the kitchens.

Mr. GRAHAM: No. I thought I had in my possession here a clipping from somewhere, but I cannot find it just now. It was to the effect that in the county of Lanark, not far removed from here, a vote came up in the town council of Perth, or it may have been the county council. The suggestion had been made that the council make a grant for the supply of a kitchen to a local battalion. The proposal was carried on a tie vote. Those opposed to the motion said that they were not opposed to doing everything possible on behalf of their country, but that they believed it to be the duty of the Government to supply kitchens.

Mr. REID: The Government are ordering a lot of these kitchens.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to tell anything out of school, but men are being canvassed for these kitchens.

Mr. REID: I am surprised.

Mr. GRAHAM: So was I. The Government ought to supply them. If they are supplying them, the battalions do not know it. I say that honestly, because within the last week a certain public man was asked for a contribution towards a kitchen, and he contributed, notwithstanding he thought that the Government ought to supply the kitchen.

Mr. REID: They do.

Mr. GRAHAM: Possibly the Government does not know these men are being canvassed. I say the Government should concentrate and bring together these funds, and let the people know that the Government is supplying the necessities. Then the Patriotic Fund could be reserved for comforts, for looking after those who suffer in disasters, or through the dozen and one things that may happen to the families or to the soldiers, which cannot be provided against in any statute you may pass.

In regard to a few lessons from the war, I think one of the first lessons we have learned is that the farmers of Canada have succeeded by a super-

human effort in increasing their production during the past year. If you go into some of the homes in the province of Ontario—and I suppose this is true everywhere—you will find that the men there, at the request of the powers that be, work longer hours and harder than they have done for a long time in order that they may produce more. This is also applicable to the manufacturers of the Dominion who have shown that they can speed up and compete with any people in the world. I criticised the War Office a few moments ago, but I am not surprised that Great Britain thought we could not do anything in this country in the manufacturing line.

I remember not so very long ago reading a document which the Prime Minister placed upon the table of the House as coming from the First Lord of the Admiralty, to explain why we could not make ships in Canada. Two of the reasons given were: first, that it required very firm ground on which to have the shipyards established; and, second, that it needed cranes of 150 tons capacity to handle the ships. These were two reasons given by the Admiralty itself, and when the Government of Canada endorsed them, of course, the War Office thought that we could not make shells or anything of that kind. They would not bother with people who had not earth strong enough to hold up a ship and who were not able to build cranes of 150 tons' capacity. They took us at our word, and perhaps that is the reason why they said to Russia and France: Go to the United States; Canada says she cannot do anything. I will not discuss that point any further, but I will just point out when a man starts on a wrong road where it is apt to lead him. The Government never thought, when they accepted these reasons for not being able to build ships in Canada, that so soon Canada herself, through her manufacturing establishments, would give them a direct denial and would show the people of the whole world that in Canada the artisans and mechanics and manufacturers could do anything that could be done with machinery anywhere.

Another thing that we have learned from the war is that the naval policy of this Government is of no use in time of stress. Had the policy of the right hon. gentleman who sits at my right (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) not been repudiated by the Government, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) would not have been in such trouble as he was on the British Columbia coast. That brings me to the question of submarines. I am going to discuss it from another angle, because I am trying to discuss everything at some angle from which it has not been viewed previously. I am not going to argue that too much money was paid for the submarines, or that they were no good. I am going to take Sir Richard McBride at his word and follow his statement up with evidence from the Minister of Agriculture. First I will ask the question: were the submarines needed? Yes. Why were they needed? Because British Columbia, on its coast, was naked of the first vestige of defence. I think I agree with Sir Richard and the Minister of Agriculture on that point. Why was it naked?

Mr. REID: The Rainbow was there.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the hon. gentleman will read the speech of the Minister of Agriculture he will find that the Minister said it was somewhere else. The coast of British Columbia was naked, because the Minister of Agriculture said so. Sir Richard McBride's action in buying two submarines —his not to reason why, his but to rush and buy—must be taken by the Government as proof that the submarines were needed. If they were not needed it was an awful thing to buy them without any authority. They were needed. But lest you might think that Sir Richard had gone astray and got excited and did not really know the situation, I would like to give another proof that the British Columbia coast was naked,—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Be decent.

Mr. GRAHAM: —disrobed altogether of anything that she ever had in the way of defence.

An hon. MEMBER: Ready for swimming.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want to quote the Minister of Agriculture to be sure of the ground on which I stand.

Mr. BURRELL: Be sure you have the right date.

Mr. GRAHAM: At page 328 of Hansard —I am going to quote the latest speech of my hon. friend because it expresses most truly his present state of mind—the Minister of Agriculture said:

I know perfectly well that my hon. friend would be quite willing to talk for half an hour if necessary, but I do not think it is necessary at all. When a man is in serious

danger of his life and finds that a rifle is the only weapon he can get to save his life, and it is a question of whether the rifle is going to cost $10, $15, or $20 he is not very much concerned whether he is going to pay $10, $15 or $20; he is going to get the rifle in order to save his life. I cannot understand my hon. friend into giving credit to the situation which existed in British Columbia at that time. He ought to know, as every man in this House should know, that at the particular time at which this transaction took place the declaration of war was a matter of hours, that there was no time to enter into lengthy negotiations, even if we had disputed the price of these boats. It was a matter of necessity to get them. I know what the condition of things in Victoria and Vancouver was at that time, and I know how seriously alarmed the people were. It was a matter not only of possibility, but of probability that the German fleet on the Pacific were liable at any time to steam in and shell the two cities of Victoria and Vancouver.

That is what the right hon. the leader of the Opposition said in 1910 might happen, that a certain outbreak might occur, and that if the coast of British Columbia and the Atlantic coast were not provided with ships with which to protect themselves, cruisers or battleships might get into their harbours and destroy them before protection could come from the Imperial Fleet. But my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture—and he is more responsible to British Columbia than any one else—pooh-poohed that.

Mr. BURRELL: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Unless this submarine purchase may be called a deviation, he repudiated the policy that meant protection for the Pacific coast, and he adopted the policy of contribution, which would leave the coast naked, as it was left when war broke out.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not want to make a speech, as I have made one already. The hon. gentleman always tries to be fair, and I am sure he wants to be fair now. I never was in favour of a policy of contribution. In the dispute that took place in regard to the defence of British Columbia,

11 p.m.

I think my hon. friend will find me on record as stating that the Laurier policy of a fleet unit split up on each coast without a dreadnought was no policy at all, and that if my right hon. friend had adopted the policy proposed by the Admiralty in the first place, of a fleet unit on the Pacific coast, he would probably have received a good deal of support.

Mr. GRAHAM: We find support for anything we do not do and no support for anything we do. My hon. friend's action in joining this Government, which promised to repeal the Canadian Naval Service Act, and with it everything connected with the construction of ships, can be construed into no other meaning than that up to the present moment, unless the submarine purchase may be called a deviation, he has steadfastly adhered to a policy that means ships for the Imperial Navy and no Canadian ships on the Pacific coast.

The policy by which this Government got into power by the vote of a part of Quebec was: No naval protection to the coasts of Canada. That included British Columbia. And if British Columbia was found naked and is naked to-day except for these two submarines, it is not the fault of the men who sit on this side of the House, but of those who sit on the other side, including the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), who, owing to the alliance described here to-day by one of the Nationalists, dare not support the Canadian navy, but promised to repeal the Naval Service Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Has not the policy of Sir Robert Borden, to strengthen the navy in the North Sea, had the result of taking every German cruiser from the sea so that it is not necessary to have cruisers?

Mr. GRAHAM: The last German cruiser driven from the sea was so driven by the Australian navy, and we should have one like it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. Has not the policy of strengthening the great fleet in the North Sea had the result of clearing the ocean of all foreign cruisers, with a result that it is not now necessary to have cruisers?

Mr. GRAHAM: As to cruisers, the cruiser that the Minister of Agriculture meant was probably the Emden. If he had had one ship of the Sydney class in Victoria harbour and a couple of torpedo boats or submarines, would not he have felt safe?

Mr. ROGERS: It was all right; we had the Rainbow there.

Mr. GRAHAM: The fact is that this Government, by its own misconduct, was caught with British Columbia unprotected. I know my hon. friend will say—and I wonder he did not say it before—that the vessels could not have been completed in time. True; if what is called the Laurier policy, now called by common consent the Canadian Commonsense policy, had been carried out there would have been in October, two

months after the war broke out, one cruiser and one torpedo boat destroyer. You say, that was two months too late. But if this Government had not tied itself hand and foot to a policy that meant no protection of our coast by Canadian ships, they could have operated under the Laurier policy, and before then could have had submarines by the score. They could have had submarines built in Vancouver or Victoria under the Naval Service Act. But, instead of that they promised to repeal that Act. In this House the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) in answer to a question by Mr. Mondou as to whether it was the intention of the Government to repeal that Act, said, in effect: Yes, eventually we are going to repeal the Naval Service Act and in its place we will introduce another Act and policy and on that we will appeal to the electors of the Dominion. They did reverse the Laurier policy, but they could not get rid of the Naval Service Act. And it was under that Act that the Minister of Agriculture put the two submarines.

I think we have learned from this w- that if Canada is to take her place among the nations of the world, if her people are to remain manly and are to retain the independent spirit which now they have or ought to have, there is only one course for this Government, and that is to accept its lesson in humility and prepare to have the number of ships built for Canada that are necessary on either coast.

Mr. REID: The hon. member was a member of the Cabinet at the time tenders were called for ships under the Laurier policy. Why were not those contracts let?

Mr. GRAHAM: That has been explained so often—

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman has never explained.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have explained it twice in this House myself. The matter is plain—no matter what the other Government did or did not do, the contract was ready to sign, the money was on deposit. But this Government returned to the contractors the money that guaranteed the construction of the ships. This was done because they had terms with the Nationalists, as they themselvse admit and as was very frankly stated to-day, under which they had promised absolutely that in return for the support of the Nationalists in Quebec, the Naval Service Act would be repealed.

[Mr. Graham.]

I am surprised that a British Columbian, knowing the feeling that existed in British Columbia over the Japanese question, should be willing as a Canadian to rest supinely and say: I will be protetcted by Australia, but above all I want to be protected by Japan.

The situation is a little humiliating but I hope the lesson has been learned and that we shall proceed as a young nation to do the work of a nation, as we provide men on the land, equipping and providing them munitions, so at an early date we shall provide for Canada a navy of her own to protect our trade routes in time of peace and do its share in protecting our coasts in time of war.

We have learned to know ourselves better than we did before. Whatever may be our difficulties we have discovered that the heart of the Canadian people is rising to something nobler than the making of money. I think I can say we are all one—though perhaps some of our friends the Nationalists see things through different spectacles—in our devotion and loyalty to the British Empire. We believe the destiny of Canada is to remain in the British Empire and to work out its own salvation as an independent people within that Empire. We have learned to respect one another's views more than we did at one time, and I think the lesson learned by us all will bear fruit in the future and will help to make us more united people than we have been in the past. One thing has struck me as very important, and as something that might well impress itself on our minds and that is the levelling process that has gone on throughout the Empire owing to this war. There was a time when we rather turned up our noses at the aristocrats of the Old Land. We thought that they were living on the reputation of their ancestry. But now that the testing time has come we find the aristocrat shouldering his gun and marching side by side with Tommy Atkins or with the colonial soldier, and doing his share in the trenches. When the history of the war is written no differences will be made between Tommy Atkins and the aristocrat who stood side by side in the war. That will weld the nation, it will help to draw the common people and the aristocrats closer together, and to bring Canada closer to the heart of the Empire than she has ever been before. We in Canada, notwithstanding our disputes and our differences and our ideas as to methods, ought never to forget that, as in the past, one of the great duties we

have to perform in the future is to continue the work of creating and maintaining harmony and of welding all the different races in this our great country. We who are of any particular descent, whether it be Scotch, Irish, English, French, German, or anything else, cannot stand up and say that we only are the salt of the earth, and thank the Lord that we are not as the people who came from other countries are. We are Canadians, and we must be careful, in our criticisms of each other—yes, in our criticisms of how the war is proceeding—that we do not utter a word that will in the future make it more difficult to weld the races in the Dominion of Canada, whether they come from France or Germany; from Ireland, Scotland or England. We have in Canada many races; they are truly loyal. We ought to be careful not to use any words in the heat of passion or in the heat of discussion, even of this momentous question, which in the years to come we shall be sorry that we ever uttered. We shall have to remain as neighbours; our great duty, Mr. Speaker—a duty which, if performed, will reflect the greatest credit on our nationhood—is to make this country a happy place for people to live in, no matter where they come from; to let those who come here know that when they arrive in Canada they have come to a country where all men are free and equal, and where the only essentials to success are honesty and uprightness of character and the treatment of one's neighbour as one wishes himself to be treated.

Let it be understood the world over, let it be understood throughout the British Empire, let it be understood by friend and by foe, that until victory perches on the banner of the Allies, Canada, from the East to the West, from Charlottetown to the Yukon, will stand by the Empire as one man, united in a great common cause.

On motion of Hon. E. L. Patenaude, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.17 p.m.

Wednesday, February 2, 1916.

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Eleventh Annual Report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Tenth Annual Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Detailed Statement of the Remissions of customs duties and the rebate thereof, under section 92, Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, through the Department of Customs, for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Hon. Mr. Blondin.

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the desirability of immediately withdrawing the order for the collection of certain debts due to the Government by certain western homesteaders.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are in the last stage of a long debate upon the Address which has lasted now for nearly three weeks, and the intervention of a motion of this kind, unless it be of paramount importance, will not contribute towards getting through with the business of the House economically and rapidly. It does not seem to me that, whether we discuss this question now or next week, it will make any difference to the intrinsic merits of the case, nor will it make any difference to its progress. Until the debate on the Address is concluded, we are precluded from doing any other business. I would therefore counsel my hon. friend to allow this matter to lie over until we have finished the debate on the Address, and when business will become more normal. I say this simply in the interest of the despatch of the business of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The matter is one of urgent importance, and it is for my hon. friend to decide whether or not he should wait a day or two days more. It may be that the urgency of the matter is such that my hon. friend feels he is justified in interfering with the course of the present debate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If any real progress could be made, I would have no objection, but I do not see that there can. As the matter will simply have to come up at another time, the discussion will be duplicated.

Mr. KNOWLES: When the matter is proceeded with, the onus will be on myself to show that it is urgent. I was asked by telegraph to take this matter up. I accept the counsel of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in a very kindly spirit, but in view of the urgency of the matter, and in view of the very short time that I purpose taking, I would like to avail myself of the privilege of Rule 39, which says:

If objection is taken, the Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places.

I am sorry that my hon. friend does not have sufficient confidence in me to think that I would not first be assured that it is necessary to bring this matter up now. I realize, as he says, that we are nearing the end of the debate, but this discussion will take only a very short time and the matter is one of most urgent importance.

Mr. ROGERS: Go ahead .

Mr. KNOWLES: On Monday of this week I made some remarks on this subject, as reported in Hansard, page 449, and possibly if I read that part of my speech it will be the most expeditious way of treating the matter in hand. My remarks were:

After having got that wire of mine—I do not say that it influenced their decision—but having got that wire, they decided that they would only take half of it this year. But, you will be sorry to know that a man who is so unfortunate as to have a judgment against him, and the sheriff goes after him, must submit to having it all taken from him.

This being, of course, in regard to a seed lien debt. (Reading):

The poor chap who is in difficulties, and whose possessions the sheriff is seizing, is placed in a most unfortunate position; the Government is taking every cent that is due by him, they are exacting their pound of flesh from him. I am going to prove it. Here is a letter from Mr. Charles H. Beddoe, superintending accountant, Department of the Interior, addressed to the sheriff, saying, that if a seizure has been made this concession to let half of the thing go until next year does not apply, but that he must take every cent out of the poor fellow who has a judgment against him. The letter is as follows:

"Ottawa, Jan. 8, 1916.

"J. Rutherford, Sheriff,
"Moosejaw, Sask.

"Re Dominion Seed Liens and Liens for relief.

"Dear Sir,—In reply to your favour of December 30, regarding the above, I beg to advise you that the ruling of the department in regard to seizures, is, that the full amount of the Government's indebtedness must be provided for in full."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member to rule 39, paragraph C:

[Sir George Foster.]

The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session.

The hon. member is discussing what he himself said the other day in the debate on the Address, and consequently I would ask him to conform his remarks to the rule.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will endeavour to conform to that rule. I will read therefore from a copy which I have, and not from Hansard:

"While the Government is satisfied to collect one-half of the seed grain account in all cases where the security is in no way impaired, and the crop not interfered with, this does not apply where seizure has been made. Therefore, I would like your office to see that the total amount of indebtedness is collected. Unless in cases where half or part has been paid I will then advise you of the balance owing, which must be collected and remitted to this office.

"I trust that you will regard the above instructions as being specific and entirely satisfactory to your office. Thanking you for your co-operation, I am,

"Your obedient servant.
"(Sgd.) Chas. A. Beddoe,
"Superintending Accountant."

I will endeavour, both in letter and in spirit, to observe the rule that I shall not renew the subject of a formed debate, although I have not noticed that rule observed very closely in this House in former years.

In the course of that occasion the Solicitor-General (Mr. Meighen) rose in his place, and, while I am not permitted to read his exact words, I may say generally that he stated that I was in error in believing that that was the condition; that there had been a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of instructions, and that no difference was being made between the man whose crops were seized, and the man whose crops were not under seizure. I told the Solicitor General, at the time, that I took his statement with a grain of salt—but that is not in Hansard, and so I could not read it even if the rule did not forbid. However, I took it with such a large grain of salt that I spent some money telegraphing to ascertain whether the statement thus volunteered by him was based on facts, or was simply a statement volunteered for the purpose of glossing over, in a more or less fair way, the charge made against the department. I sent the following telegram:

Ottawa, February 1, 1916.

John Rutherford,
Sheriff, Moosejaw.

Did Dominion Government countermand Beddoe's instructions requiring full payment where seizures made? Reply.

W. E. Knowles.

I received the following answer last night:

Moosejaw, February 1, 1916.

W. E. Knowles,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Beddoe's instructions to collect full payment of liens where seizure made not countermanded.

J. Rutherford,
Sheriff.

I look upon that as requiring two observations, the first of which I shall merely make and not elaborate upon. It is unfortunate that statements by a Minister of the Crown should be found on investigation to be not worthy of the reliance that we should like to place upon a minister's statement when he undertakes to correct an ordinary, everyday member of the House, like myself. But it will be useful for us, as a means of estimating in future the value of the statements volunteered by the Solicitor General.

My second observation is that this is a matter of the greatest public importance and of the greatest urgency. I represent a district 240 miles east and west on the main line of the C.P.R., and 175 miles north and south, from the international boundary to the middle of the province of Saskatchewan. In that territory there are thousands upon thousands of settlers. I am the representative here of a hundred thousand people. It is of the utmost urgency that these homesteaders, who were assisted by the Dominion of Canada a year ago, should not now have such pressure brought to bear upon them as is brought to bear by this order of which I complain. I rise to urge the Government to countermand its drastic instructions by telegraph, and also in the most speedy manner possible to restore to the unfortunate homesteaders any money that has been taken from them by reason of those instructions. The Solicitor General has admitted that this is quite in order. He rose in his place, and he said that the department disapproved of the action taken, and he said also—though he was inaccurate in that—that instructions had been given to the contrary. Having agreed with me, that to require the re-payment of 100 per cent of the seed grain debt on the part of those who had executions against them, is unjust, it is the duty of the Government, without the loss of an hour, to relieve the people of the drastic measures brought to bear upon them.

The majority of these people are beginning in that western country; they are the pioneers of homesteading. In 1914 they had no crop; practically no crop at all. In 1915 they had a crop. The debt of a homesteader to the Government may run from $200 to $400. When the Government collects a seed grain debt, there is no exemption, and the sheriff cleans up as clean as possible. The consequence is that many will be left to face the cruel winter weather without a dollar to buy fuel. It is all very well for hon. members of this House, in this well-heated place, and with lots to eat and lots to wear, but it is vastly different in a homesteader's home, where a dollar means more than a hundred dollars does to a member of the Government, or probably to the average member of this House. If it was wise for the Government to make advances to these men; if it was wise for the Government, under the legislation passed, practically to go into partnership in order to furnish them the necessary seed, and to afford them relief in relation to fuel and provisions, it is a fortiori desirable and wise that the Government should now refrain from squeezing them, and that it should rather seek to afford them opportunity to continue as desirable homesteaders. The weather in the West, as hon. members no doubt are aware, has been extremely cold. Following the daily telegraphic weather reports, I notice that in my own town for two weeks past the thermometer has been at from twenty to thirty, and even to thirty-five degrees below zero; and during that time it has not once been above zero. Under these conditions, it is of the utmost importance that the Government should act wisely and reasonably in regard to these seed grain loans. If it is well to give a twelve months' extension to the wealthier farmers, who have no executions against them, a fortiori it is well to give an extension on half of the amount due by the poor men who have executions against them. I urge that the Government should telegraph countermanding these drastic instructions, and, as speedily as they can get the cheques written, refund to the homesteaders anything they may have taken from them over and above one-half of the seed grain loans. I move that this House do now adjourn.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): I am surprised at the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) bringing this matter up on a motion to adjourn the

House, on the ground that it is a question of urgency. The question has already been dealt with by the department. The hon. gentleman is absolutely wrong in stating that the Government are imposing a hardship upon these people whose grain and chattels have been seized by their creditors. The Government has nothing to do with these seizures. Originally, as I am informed by the seed grain branch of my department, it was the practice of the Government to collect half of the indebtedness to it from those whose goods were under seizure by their creditors for other debts. Under legislation which the provincial governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta placed upon the statute book, our loans were made a prior claim, and when seizures were made under the provincial Act by other creditors, of course the Government had to take some steps to protect the treasury. Therefore, while we could justly have claimed the right to enforce payment of the total amount of our lien, we only collected one-half the amount from those under seizure. But the Solicitor General explained the matter the other day—I was not in the House at the time—and his explanation was absolutely correct. Owing to misinterpretation by Mr. Bruce Walker of the instructions he had received, they reversed the original policy and were collecting the full amount of seed grain indebtedness where seizures were made by other creditors. This having been brought to our attention, I asked the seed grain branch this morning to furnish me with a memorandum in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman the other day. The hon. gentleman had not the courtesy to send me notice that he was going to bring this matter up to-day, and so I am not able to reply to him with all the information I might have brought down. However, I desire to tell him that his fears have no justification whatever. This is the information I received:

> The practice was to collect one-half of the seed grain indebtedness where seizures were made. In the early part of September, on instructions from Ottawa, this practice was departed from and collections in full were made. An extract from a ruling, the original of which I have not before me but which I understand was from the Solicitor General, says:
>
> "Whenever it is brought to the knowledge of the department that seed grain subject to lien is seized, an officer should then at once notify the sheriff or bailiff seizing and the execution creditor, if possible, or his solicitor, of the Government's claim, and the notice should state not only that the Government had a claim and the amount of the claim and what it is for, but should set out explicitly that the grain should not be interfered with until the Government's claim was paid."

I understand that, owing to the representations made, the original practice of collecting only one-half has been reverted to. The Solicitor General was, therefore, absolutely correct in the statement he made the other day. (Reading):

> Where full payment was insisted upon, the hardship to the farmer on account of the Government's action would in many cases be more imaginary than real; in fact, in some cases the farmers have expressed their thanks for the Government insisting on getting full payment. Suppose a farmer's crop was valued for $200 and it was seized for a claim of $200 due to a machine firm, the department having a lien for $200 for seed grain and provisions; when the seizure was made, departmental officers would step in and take the full amount of its claim, leaving the machine company nothing. In the general course of events, the department would likely render some assistance to the farmer until his next crop was gathered, so that he would in that way be in a much better position than if the machine firm's claim had been satisfied, and the department did nothing in connection with his unpaid obligation to the Government.

That is the view the department has taken. As this memorandum states, we have received thanks from some of the men who were seized upon, for the Government's insisting upon its claim. But it was only in a few instances that the claim was satisfied in full before the machine or other creditors came in. The hon. gentleman asks that a telegram be despatched to-day countermanding these orders. I may say that these orders have been countermanded some days ago. If the gentleman who has informed the hon. member for Moosejaw was not in possession of that information when he sent the wire to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I do not know why he was not. At any rate, those instructions were sent out from Ottawa several days ago.

Mr. McCRANEY: May I ask the hon. minister, on whose representation was the extension of time given for the payment; one-half this year and one-half next year, of the seed grain lien. was it on the representation of farmers, of boards of trade, or of machine men, and wholesale houses.

Mr. ROCHE: It was upon representation made by different interests, largely by farmers, who stated that owing to their other indebtedness they were not in a position to meet all their liabilities, and they asked the Government to be more lenient with them and to extend the time for payment. I think we received requests of a similar

character from boards of trade. Having received these representations, the Government came to the conclusion that, in view of all the circumstances, it would be well to collect only one-half this year.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: If I gather correctly what the Minister of the Interior said, he intimated that, in his method of collecting for seed advances, his department was following a precedent established by the Department of the Interior on a former occasion.

Mr. ROCHE: I said nothing about that.

Mr. OLIVER: I am glad to be corrected, but I want to say that the department was not following a precedent set on a former occasion.

Mr. ROCHE: I did not refer at all to any occasion prior to this year.

Mr. OLIVER: Very well, then; I will take the liberty of referring to it. Never on any former occasion did any government of Canada take the position that this Government has taken: that of demanding that the first grain the settlers sold out of their new crops should be taken as payment of the Government's lien.

Mr. ROCHE: Would the hon. gentleman inform me what method of collection was resorted to by the province of Alberta in 1908, when advances were made in that province?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not aware of what was done by the province of Alberta; I am talking only about what was done by the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ROCHE: I may inform the hon. gentleman that they collected by way of levying taxes, and that they collected nearly all during the first year.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not disputing what my hon. friend said, but I do not see that it has any bearing upon the point that I have made. The Government has now taken an entirely different attitude towards the collection of these seed grain liens than ever was before taken by any government in Canada. The minister suggests that the Alberta Government did this or did that. They certainly did not collect as this Government has collected: by demanding that the first load of grain that a man takes to the elevator shall be taken to pay the seed grain lien, and before he has an opportunity of buying an ounce of provisions or a stitch of clothing for his family. Such action never was taken by the Alberta Government or by any other government. My hon. friend said that the Alberta Government collected by taxation. Certainly they collected by taxation, but that is a very different matter. By that method they gave a man opportunity to get the money before they took it from him, but this Government authorizes every elevator company, every railway company, everybody who has the handling of the farmer's grain, to take that grain from him when he offers it for sale.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman knows that we have a lien on the grain.

Mr. OLIVER: Precisely. The Government has a lien on the grain, and because it has a lien on the grain it has a lien that takes precedence over every other right. This is the very reason why the Government did not need to take the action that it has taken in this case in order to secure its interests. In the case of the homesteader, the Government holds a lien upon his homestead; in the case of the man who has his patent, under provincial legislation this Government holds priority of right over any other judgment against his property. The Government are not, therefore, under any necessity of taking from the farmer the first dollar that he gets and that he needs for the requirements of his family; yet they have done it. And the Minister of the Interior stands up in this House at this time, when men are freezing to death in the West for lack of fuel, and says that the taking of the whole of the lien from these farmers is not a matter of urgency. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of very great urgency, and that the Government would be well advised to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Moosejaw, and to wire, in terms that will not be misunderstood, that, in the first place, they are not going to require the whole of the payment from the man who is unfortunate, and, in the next place, that they will not insist that the first load of grain that comes in shall be used to pay the lien.

Mr. ROCHE: Will the hon. gentleman explain what security the Government would have after the farmer sold his grain?

Mr. OLIVER: The Government would then have no security on the grain, but they would have security on whatever property the farmer had.

Mr. ROCHE: Not for a relief lien.

Mr. OLIVER: The Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan have passed legislation giving this Government priority of right over mortgages on farms representing indebtedness on the part of the farmers who have received seed grain. Under these circumstances why should the Government be so insistent on its pound of flesh? I have no fault with the Government making collections as promptly as is reasonable, but, as the hon. member for Moosejaw pointed out, what was the use of advancing grain to the farmer last summer in order to tide him over the winter and then, when he has the grain, to take it from him? If he was to be allowed to starve, he might as well have starved last summer as this winter; then it would have been an act of Providence, but now it is an act of this Government.

Mr. ROCHE: By way of explanation I may state that the Government has been so dreadfully hard on the farmers that out of the $13,000,000 expended upon seed grain for their relief, we have collected only a little over $1,000,000.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: By the joint action of the Legislatures of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and of the Parliament of Canada, some $13,000,000 were advanced to the farmers of these two provinces for the purpose of providing them with seed grain and the necessities of life. This Parliament authorized the advance. The two legislatures made it posible that the money so advanced should be a first charge against the property of the person to whom it was lent, whether he be a homesteader or otherwise. That lien was embodied in statutes passed by the Legislature of Alberta, and by the Legislature of Saskatchewan. The lien was registered in the proper way in the land titles office. So far as the personal lien was concerned, it gave expression to what the Privy Council has long since held, that a debt due to the Crown has priority over other debts. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) cannot possibly be excused for the statement he has just made, because he belongs to the legal profession, and it was necessary for him to pass some sort of an examination before he was allowed to practice law; and no man who has passed an examination that enabled him to practice law could have knowingly made the observations which my friend made this afternoon. He either did it for the purpose of endeavouring to make political capital against the Government, or else he does not know what he is talking about. He must take either horn of the dilemma, as I shall show conclusively, for there is no middle course open. He complained this afternoon that where property had been seized this Government had directed a sheriff to exercise the prior lien of the Crown and collect the money due for seed grain. It will be observed that he based his remarks upon a seizure having been made by the sheriff. No seizure is necessary to enforce the lien of the Government for the seed grain supplied to the homesteaders. It is only when the farmer finds himself a judgment creditor that the sheriff seizes. It was the unfortunate financial position of the farmer that made possible a seizure by the sheriff, and the question of whether a seizure could or could not be made falls within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. If my hon. friend has a grievance, his grievance is against the Legislature of Saskatchewan that permits the sheriff to seize from farmers in war time. In the province of Alberta the legislature realized that very fact, and at the last session passed a statute providing that no seizure under execution should be made against any debtor, while this war lasted, without the consent of a judge, given on application made and a summons issued. My learned friend cannot possibly avoid knowledge of the fact that the issue of the execution is a matter over which the Legislature of Saskatchewan has control, and that this Parliament has nothing to do with it. It is a matter affecting property and civil rights within the province, and any attempt to exercise jurisdiction by this Parliament would be ultra vires of it. He must know—at least he should know—that if a judgment has been recovered against a homesteader and a seizure has taken place in consequence of an execution having issued, the whole control of that procedure is in the hands of the Legislature of Saskatchewan, over which my hon. friend exercises a very considerable influence, no doubt; and the representations he could make to them as to the harshness and cruelty of this procedure would, no doubt, have a very considerable effect. But those representations should not be made on the floor of this Parliament; they should be made to the Legislature and the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member has based his remarks upon the further fact that, under these ex-

ecutions, the sheriff has seized and sold to guard the interests of all concerned. Then, when the results of a husbandman's labours have been gathered in and the sheriff has gone out and sold the property, both provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, have passed the Creditors' Relief Act. Under that Act, the machine man and the mortgagee, and all persons who have judgments against the unfortunate farmer have to divide, pro rata, the money that is realized from the sale of his grain. In other words, the execution in the hands of the sheriff, which is directed against all the executable property held by the homesteader, realizes a certain sum of money; that money the sheriff puts in the bank, and he cannot distribute it until a certain period of time has elapsed, in order that all creditors may rank equally and get their rateable share of the money so realized from the sale of the goods seized under the sheriff's execution. Up to this point this Government has as little to do with it as the Government of Germany. Surely my hon. friend knows that. I must assume that he has forgotten, at the moment. Then, when the money is in the hands of the sheriff and notice has been given and the various judgment creditors have filed all their claims and are entitled to their ratable distribution of this money, what further have we? We have notice given to the sheriff that there is a Crown debt, and that Crown debt takes priority over all other claims and must be paid in full, and thus prevents a rateable distribution among these other creditors. There is no hardship to the farmer in that except that the Crown is getting paid in full for having supplied the homesteader with that wherewith he can pay part of his creditors, half of the amounts due to them, and the Crown all.

Mr. KNOWLES: Since my hon. friend has such a preponderating knowledge of the law, could he say whether the Exemptions Act would apply against the Crown? No doubt it would against other execution creditors.

Mr. BENNETT: The question whether the Exemptions Act would apply cannot be an issue in this case, because the sale has been made by the sheriff, and the exemptions have been claimed by the homesteader before the money has been realized. That must be apparent to anybody who knows the rudiments of law. Of course, after the exhibition given here this afternoon, I cannot expect my hon. friend to do more than shake his head. Not only is this a fair thing, but it is one that the farmer would like to have put in force. Why? Because he complains bitterly against the machine company, against the mortgagee, against all his creditors who have sold his property under execution. He complained, and properly so, that they were permitted to do this in war time. Now he says: because you have done that, you are not going to get your money; but the people who supplied me with the seed are going to be paid in full, and you people who brought about my misfortune and distress can take your chance of ever being paid. That is the position in a nutshell. Not only did our legislature contemplate the possibility of this arising, but they passed a statute in which they said: You cannot issue an execution against any man under these circumstances unless you first go to a judge and get an order to do so.

I should like once more to summarize this position by saying that the facts that have been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) are such as to warrant the closest scrutiny and attention by the authorities having power to deal with the matter; and I trust that, as a result of the attention directed to it to-day, legislation will be adopted in Saskatchewan to prevent executions being issued against these poor starving settlers in Saskatchewan, as has been done by a Liberal Government in the province of Alberta, in which I live.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF: I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman in his learned dissertation upon the law. But neither he nor the Minister of the Interior has so far answered the question asked by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) as to why the Government has discriminated against the poor unfortunate farmer who has a judgment against him. The well-to-do farmer gets off with one-half his liabilities; but in the case of the man who has been unfortunate and against whom there is a judgment, this Government steps in and says: "You can not get off with one-half your liabilities; you must pay the whole liability"; and my hon. friends on the Government benches think they have given an answer to this question when the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) gets up and gives a learned dissertation on the law! It is not the law we want at the present time for the poor farmer; it is some fair play, it is some

justice and some reasonableness, as my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has pointed out. Never in the history of the past did any Government of Canada take such drastic action as has been taken by this Government on this occasion.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Does my hon. friend say that this Parliament has power to prevent executions being issued or a levy made by the sheriff?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend knows as well as any hon. gentleman in this House that this Government has the right, if they wish, to say that only one-half of the seed grain indebtedness shall be collected. I never heard of a case in the past where the repayment of one-half of the amount of the indebtedness for seed grain was insisted on in the first year.

But I am not here to argue the legal aspects of the case at all. What I want to get from my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is a promise. It appears that the sheriff of Moosejaw did not get the instructions which the Minister of the Interior says were sent. What I want to ask is, will the minister repeat those instructions to the sheriff at Moosejaw to-day by telegram?

Mr. ROCHE: I will make inquiries as to the hour when the instructions were sent and as to whether the sheriff would receive a message in time to-night.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why not send another telegram? Surely the Government are not so hard up that they cannot afford to send another message.

Mr. ROCHE: I am not objecting to sending another telegram. These instructions have been sent out, and they have not yet reached the sheriff. I will see if they can reach him to-night.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would like an assurance from the hon. minister that a message will be sent to Moosejaw to-day in order to relieve these settlers. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has also neglected to answer the question as to whether the full amount has been taken in the past, or at all events since those instructions were sent, or whether he would be prepared to take half or make a refund in those cases of settlers who, unfortunately, had not made their collection.

Mr. ROCHE: We will deal with these cases on their merits, and see that justice is done in every case.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. TURRIFF: I am afraid that that is the way my hon. friend has been dealing with the matter up to the present, and it has not been very satisfactory to the farmers who are not in the position to pay for seed grain. However, the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government, and if they fail to deal with it the responsibility will be on them.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I have just a word to say. I was unfortunately unable to be present when the question first came up. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) attempted to deal with it by referring to the law as it exists in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has just pointed out that he has not touched the real point at all. The point we have been trying to make in this House in two or three speeches that have been delivered has been that the farmers of Western Canada are not getting fair treatment from this Government, and in so far as my observation goes I am prepared to repeat that statement. I go further and say that the farmer in Western Canada has never got a square deal from the present Government. My hon. friend from Calgary referred to the fact that under certain orders in council, or certain provincial statutes passed in the province of Alberta, no one can have an execution issued against a debtor without first going to the judge for the district or to a judge of the Supreme Court. I am surprised to hear that the law of the province of Alberta goes so far. I must confess that, although I am a member of the legal profession, I was not aware that the law of the province of Alberta went so far. However, my hon. friend has made the statement, and no doubt we must take it for what it is worth; no doubt the hon. member knows. In the province of Saskatchewan, from where I come, they did not pass any such moratorium legislation when the war broke out. We did, however, have certain moratorium legislation designed to protect the volunteers and reservists who went to the front to fight the battles of the Empire. I think my hon. friend from Calgary—and I think I know him pretty well—would be the first to object to any such legislation. I believe that the less you interfere in the ordinary course between debtor and creditor the better. In the province of Saskatchewan since the war began a good deal of assistance has been given by financial institutions, and mortgage institutions, to men in straitened

circumstances. What I do object to is the bungling of the Administration that has gone on during the past three or four years.

I took occasion last year to discuss the matter of the distribution of seed grain. In the fall of 1914 circular letters were distributed all through that country stating that every man there, no matter whether he was on patented or unpatented land, could get a supply of seed grain. I know now why it was sent out, I know it was sent out as a precursor to a general election which it was designed to hold in 1914; but in January, 1915, there was a change of mind and for weeks nobody knew who would get the seed grain. That is the effect of bungling administration in some department of the Government.

I have noticed that when a member on this side gets up to champion the cause of the farmer, there is a certain amount of sneering and grinning on the part of hon. members opposite. Now, I come from an agricultural province and one to which I am proud to belong, a province which I think is just as good as the province of Ontario in which I was born. I believe that in years to come the great province of Saskatchewan, considering its area, will produce as much No. 1 hard wheat as any similar area in the world. The province of Saskatchewan is not a manufacturing province; we have our likes and dislikes; we are creatures of circumstance just as are the men who live in the manufacturing cities of Ontario. But I claim that the farmer does not get the sympathy that he is entitled to. The province of Saskatchewan is not a manufacturing province. I do not expect to see the conditions for manufacturing in that province established for many years to come, perhaps not in my lifetime. Probably we could not manufacture at a profit. But I repeat that since this Government came into power the western farmer has not got a square deal. I could give many instances, perhaps not designed, of their bungling administration in Western Canada. Take the dirty seed grain of last year. There are more weeds in the province of Saskatchewan to-day than there ever were in the history of that province, and that condition is largely due to the dirty seed grain that was distributed—I saw it in three different places. I saw bags of seeds with tickets attached to them with the words, "noxious weeds and wild oats." I have been informed that wild oats cannot be removed from seed grain. What was the use of sending out seed grain filled with dirty weeds? From the date of the distribution of seed grain down to the time of collection there has been nothing but bungling in connection with seed grain distribution. My hon. friend from Calgary gives us a dissertation on the law, which every lawyer in the province knows just as well as he does, and attempts to cover up the real facts. The statement I make is that this Government, by means of its Prussian methods of collection for seed grain, is at present throttling the western farmer, and trying to take from the man who has debts to pay the very means of paying them and of existing during the coming winter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend (Mr. W. M. Martin) has used some rather strong language in the course of his remarks. He has stated that the western farmers have never, in his judgment, received a square deal, as he terms it, from the present Government. Now, I have had something to do with this matter of relief to the farmers in the districts of Saskatchewan which were visited by drought something over a year ago. Let us consider for a moment the circumstances under which that relief was afforded, and see whether there is any ground for complaint that the farmers in question did not receive a square deal from this Government. It was shortly before the war broke out—and when we were experiencing financially the full consequences of it—that this matter first came to the attention of the Government, and to my attention as Minister of Finance. It was a time of very great strain. Our revenues were being cut in half. The London money market was absolutely closed and so far as we could see there was no relief to be had in the American market. Conditions, both financially and commercially, were trying in the extreme. If there ever was a time when financial stress was imposed upon a Government of Canada it was during that period succeeding the outbreak of war, when the matter of the drought in Saskatchewan, and the need of the farmers in the different districts affected was brought to the attention of the Government. What was the attitude of the Government? There was no question whatever about the matter of affording relief, although in the case of the farmers whose lands had been patented, it was the clear duty of the Provincial Government, as distinguished from the Dominion Government, to deal with the situation.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: If that is the case, and there is something in what the hon. gentleman says, why was it that in November, 1914, circulars were spread broadcast throughout Saskatchewan and also, I think, throughout Alberta, promising to give seed grain to any man whether he were on patented or unpatented land?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was perfectly manifest to us, dealing with this matter, not from a political standpoint but from the economic standpoint, that in respect of those settlers who had been visited by that terrible affliction of drought, the Provincial Government would not be able to afford relief. There is no doubt whatever that, in strictness, once a patent has been issued to a farmer, he should look to the Provincial Government and not to the Dominion Government for needed relief and assistance. If the Dominion Government is to afford relief in the case of those whose lands have been patented in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, it is perfectly clear that the Dominion Government would have to afford assistance in the case of others in a similar plight in any other province of the Dominion. It is, to my mind, not open to doubt that, once a patent has issued, once the land becomes subject to the provincial jurisdiction, the duty is cast upon the Provincial Government to afford relief if relief is required. I do not mean to say that the Dominion should not, in the case of a visitation of a serious character, from the compassionate motives afford a certain measure of relief, but just as the primary duty rests upon a municipality for giving relief within the municipality, so the primary duty rests upon the province, where relief is to be afforded within the confines of that province to those whose lands have been patented. It was perfectly apparent that the Provincial Government, having regard to the financial conditions prevailing at that time, was not in a position to afford that relief. There was no doubt in our minds that relief should be afforded, and we had no hesitation in affording it, although we knew perfectly well at the time that difficulties would arise subsequently in the matter of collections and that the charges which have been made on the floor of this House would be made with partisan motives. We knew that perfectly well, but, knowing that, it did not deter us from our duty, and we did our duty.

3 p.m.

[Sir Thomas White.]

What did we do? Under the circumstances which I have mentioned, and with the financial situation such as I have described, the Government of Canada advanced a sum of no less than $13,000,000; about $6,000,000 for seed grain and $7,000,000 for relief and fodder. We were not paying our own money; it was the money of the Dominion of Canada, for which this Government, like all governments, is trustee. We had to deal with the matter on a business basis. Personally, I would very much rather that we had done what was done in 1907-8; I would rather have made advances to the Provincial Government and allowed them in turn to make the advances to the farmers. But, as a matter of fact, the Provincial Government did not desire to have it done in that way, for the reason that, not only is there no political advantage to be gained from affording relief to farmers under these circumstances but, on the contrary, it is a political disadvantage to the Government which does it, because, at some time, ultimately, the money has to be collected.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think the Minister is entitled to make that slur against the Provincial Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to make the observation I have made, and I think I am in order. I do not want for one moment to speak disrespectfully of a Provincial Government, but I am expressing my belief that the Provincial Governments did not desire to make this distribution. If they refused, as I am now informed they did refuse to make this distribution, what was the position? The duty of assisting the farmers of the West was cast upon the Government of Canada, and we were not only willing but most desirous of assisting them, we were desirous, in the first place, because we sympathized greatly with those farmers in the drought-stricken districts, and because, in the second place, if there ever was a time in the history of Canada when it was desirable that production in this country should be increased, it was that particular time. We raised, under circumstances of financial difficulty, such as never before had confronted this country, not $2,000,000 or $3,000,000, but no less a sum than $13,000,000. And, in the face of this, the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) says that the Government did not give a square deal to the western farmers.

I ask this House and the country if there could have been any squarer deal. What could this Government have done more than it did? Governor's warrant after governor's warrant—there being no appropriation by Parliament—was passed to enable us to furnish this much-needed assistance to the farmers of Western Canada, $6,000,000 for seed grain and some $7,000,000 for fodder and relief. Under the circumstances which I have described, the Dominion Government furnished all the money that was asked for, all that was required to meet the needs of the situation. Having done that, is the remark of my hon. friend justified, that there was not a square deal, and that this Government acted harshly and oppressively in the matter? What could any government have done in excess of what we did to meet that most trying situation with which we so greatly sympathized?

This money, as I have already said, is money for which we are the trustees of the people of Canada. It is money that belongs to the Dominion which embraces all the provinces. The Government is the trustee for the money and it had to take security for it. As I have said, it is the primary duty of the Provincial Government to deal with matters of this kind, but let me point out that the case is different when patents have not yet been issued. Where patents have not yet been issued upon homestead lands the duty is cast upon the Dominion (and that duty has been recognized not only by this but by preceding governments) to make advances for seed grain to homesteaders. On the other hand, in the case of farmers who have patents, the duty is directly upon the Provincial Government.

It was the duty of this Government to take security and the matter was discussed in this House. We took security for the seed grain along these lines. We took—and of course, it was necessary to get legislation, by the Saskatchewan and Alberta Legislatures to give effect to our intentions—a first charge upon the land of the farmer who got advances for seed grain. In addition to that, we were given by this legislation, a lien upon the grain itself which was raised from that seed grain which we had supplied to the farmers. In the case of moneys advanced for relief, we took a charge next after all existing charges upon the land, and we took a lien upon the product of the seed grain. Now, that was the security which we held in trust for the people of this country. I do not mean to say for one moment that the trust should not be exercised with discretion and good judgment. It should not be oppressively exercised, and I know it was not in the mind of any member of the Government to harshly exercise our powers in the collection of advances which we made for the purpose of affording relief and of enabling the farmer to purchase his seed grain. But, we did hold that security. The crop was grown and harvested—and it was one of the best crops in the history of Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The best.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was the best crop by far, I think, in the history of Canada, and with the exception of last year, I think, the prices were the best obtained for a great many years.

Mr. OLIVER: Not for wheat at the opening of the season.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, the price was around ninety cents a bushel. Now, what attitude should the Government take with regard to the collection of these moneys which are owed to the Government by the farmers who had borrowed from us for the purposes which I have mentioned? Let me in passing call the attention of the House to the fact, that in order to secure these advances for seed grain, we took a lien, in priority to mortgagees. The mortgagees themselves were therefore interested in the payment of interest and in the collection of principal upon the advances we had made, because if the interest was allowed to accumulate, and if the charge was allowed to remain, this would have an important bearing upon the value of their securities which had been taken under the laws of the province as first mortgage securities. The matter came up for consideration, and as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) has stated, various representations were made to us as to what collections we should make from the farmers in respect of those advances. Representations, as he has stated, came from farmers, from boards of trade, and in addition, strong representations came from financial interests which had invested money in the Northwest. The Government was not decisively influenced by any of those representations, but we took them all under consideration. I remember the decision of the

Government as distinctly as if the matter had been discussed yesterday. I discussed it with the Minister of the Interior and with the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who naturally came to me as Minister of Finance in regard to it. What I said then was this: let us do the right, and fair, and decent, and generous thing; we must, on the one hand, be fair to the people of Canada, whose money we have advanced; we must not allow any part of our security to be lost if we are going to be at a disadvantage later in the collection of our advances, because we are the trustees for the people of Canada; but I said: let us do the fair thing. What is the fair thing under these circumstances? Here is a bounteous crop for which a fair price is being obtained. We thought that as these farmers had a hard year last year it would be oppressive to attempt to collect all the advances made either for seed grain or for relief, and we discussed what it would be fair for us to collect, fair to the people of Canada on the one hand and fair to the farmers on the other. What we determined was that in cases where advances had been made both for seed grain and for relief, we should collect one-half of the advance made for seed grain, and allow the advance for relief to remain over; but where advances had been made for relief and not for seed grain that we should collect one-half of the advances so made. That seemed to us, under the circumstances, to be a reasonable arrangement with the farmers of the West, and it means less than one-third of the whole. Although I do not think for one moment that we should insist upon the carrying out of the representations made by the parties at the time they borrowed, yet the fact remains that it was represented to us that this loan was to be a strict loan, and that it would in all probability be paid back within the year. The course that we took was a fair, just and generous course towards the farmers. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has called attention to the fact that the Department of the Interior engaged the elevator companies, and I think he said the railways also, to collect this money from the proceeds of the grain as sold. As I have stated, part of the security held by the Government was a lien upon the grain. Now, if I have a lien upon the grain of my hon. friend from Edmonton, and he sells that grain, what becomes of my lien? That lien has gone; the grain is gone; and I can not enforce the lien on that grain in the elevator at Fort William or at Liverpool. Therefore, if the Government was to conduct this business on a business basis at all, or on the semblance of a business basis, it was necessary for it to take steps to see that, in cases where the farmers were able to pay, its liens should not be defeated, and that is all that the Government did. After all is said and done, and after all the strong talk that has passed across the floor of this House as to the oppression exercised by this Government, as to its injustice, as to its Prussian methods, to use the expression of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin), what is the great outstanding fact at the present time with regard to the advances which the Government made to the farmers of certain portions of Saskatchewan for the purpose of relief and for the purchase of seed grain? The outstanding fact is this: we advanced, under the circumstances that I have mentioned, $13,000,000—every dollar that was asked for, every dollar that was required. We advanced it because we sympathized with the farmers; we desired to help them and to put them on their feet, and we desired to increase production. What is the fact to-day? This oppressive Government, this Prussian Government, has actually collected up to date about $1,000,000, or one-thirteenth of the entire amount advanced. There are some things that do not require to be argued at length, and I purpose leaving my statement just as I have presented it to the House.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon): The Minister of Finance has laid considerable emphasis on the statement that this was a business proposition. In my judgment, he failed to answer the charge of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) that the Government had bungled the seed grain question from the beginning. While I admit the claim of the Minister of Finance, that it was a business proposition, that the Government were handling the money of the people of Canada, and that they should administer their trust fairly to all the people, including the western settlers, the Minister of Finance tells us that the Government had decided in the month of November, 1914, that it would be their policy to supply the western farmer with seed grain, and at that time wheat was selling at a little less than a dollar a bushel. But the Government waited until wheat went up to about a dollar and a half a bushel before they started to buy.

Mr. ROCHE: I desire to correct the hon. gentleman. He made a somewhat similar statement last session, but later I was able to present information that absolutely contradicted him.

Mr. ROBB: Then, perhaps the hon. minister would tell us what they paid for seed wheat?

Mr. ROCHE: I have not the figures before me now.

Mr. ROBB: My recollection is, that it ran about $1.53 a bushel, on the average—it might be a few cents more or a few cents less. I do not know at what price it was sold to the western farmer. Having this in mind, what are we to think of the subsequent action of the Government? They carried out the policy of purchasing seed grain for the western farmer; and then, when the western farmer sends the product of that seed, his crop of 1915, to Fort William, to hold it for an advance on the market, this same Government that had bought the seed wheat at so high a figure, jumps in and commandeers the wheat, fixing a price about 76 cents a bushel under its market value in Liverpool. These facts bear out the statement made by the hon. member for Regina, that this question of seed grain was bungled from start to finish.

But the rights and interests of the people of Canada as a whole must be conserved, and I think that not much fault can be found with the department for seeing to it that this money is collected. I do not see why the western farmer could not pay for his seed grain this year. Surely he cannot expect to be ever in a better position to repay such a loan than he is in this year. I think the Government are justified in doing what they can to collect for the seed grain, without unduly oppressing the farmers. But I submit that the statement of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) that this seed grain question has been bungled is borne out by the facts.

Mr. KNOWLES: I desire to say a word in reply. My hon. and learned friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) offered an observation or two . He did not address himself to the point at issue, but called attention to the qualifications of the person who had brought the subject forward. It may be that I do not know anything about law. Suppose we assume that I am not a lawyer, but only a farmer. If as a farmer I made the remarks I did, and if the hon. gentleman was familiar with the subject, it would not be necessary for him to rise and make an answer based upon the want of knowledge of law of the person who raised the question. I am afraid the hon. member has moved so much among kings and queens, and jacks and knaves, that he hardly knows enough to be civil to a back bencher in this House. I do not stand here on my knowledge of law. I am here representing the homesteader, and there is nothing of which I am prouder. I hope that as long as I behave myself I shall retain their confidence and that, no matter how poor a lawyer I may be, and no matter how great a lawyer, or how great an aristocrat, the hon. member for Calgary may be, I shall still be able to voice the needs of my people. And if the hon. member for Calgary has much more to say, I am afraid I shall have to ask the Solicitor General to tell us again just what kind of a member the hon. member for Calgary is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you if the hon. gentleman is in order in speaking by way of reply on a matter brought forward under rule 39?

Mr. SPEAKER: My opinion is that on such a question as the one before the House, not only the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), but also the hon member for Regina (Mr. Martin), and the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), should remember that paragraph (b) of the rule says:

> No more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion.

The remarks of the hon. gentleman were very interesting, but I will ask him in future to confine himself within this rule.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will observe the rule, Mr. Speaker, and will confine my remarks to a word or two. I desire to explain a matter to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), who is always courteous. I did not send him word that I intended to bring this matter forward, but I did send word to the Solicitor General, as it was with that hon. gentleman that I had the discussion. That word did not reach the Solicitor General, though I sent it to his room about three o'clock. Had I thought of it, I would certainly have sent notice to the Minister of

the Interior, but I saw that he was in his place before prayers, and I thought it was not necessary. After all that has been said the fact remains that the sheriff of Moosejaw, a large judicial district, has not had word that he is to exempt the people from one-half of this indebtedness for the present. Will the Minister of the Interior wire those instructions to-day? Those farmers who had not executions against them escape with the payment of only half. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) may say what he likes, but if I am asking that which is unreasonable or illegal in regard to those who have executions against them then the department is doing that which is unreasonable and illegal in the case of those who have no executions against them. If the Government can legally excuse those who have not executions, why can they not as well excuse those who have? In the face of the hon. member for Calgary, the Government say they are going to excuse these men to the extent of half, but the sheriff of Moosejaw says that he has nothing on his files except the order to collect the whole amount. A telegram is cheap—it will only cost $1.01 with war tax. Will not the Minister of the Interior send a wire—even though he may call it supererogatory—in order to get word to the sheriff in Moosejaw, that the desire of the department is that he should collect from those who have judgments against them only half the debt? I am not trying to make political capital, I am only trying to make it easy for the department to take this necessary action. Will the minister send this wire? And will he refund the money? What I say is not in any contentious spirit, but I only ask the minister will he not be good enough to promise that he will send this telegram?

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. member seems bent on getting a promise that the telegram shall immediately be sent. But instructions have already been sent out—I do not know exactly on what day. I promised the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that I would make inquiries this afternoon and find out when the instructions were sent out, and if they have not had time to arrive in the sheriff's hands by this time, I will see that he is informed. And if the collections have been made in full, we will make a refund of half. What hardship can there be in that, even though a telegram is not sent?

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. KNOWLES: Can not you wire and save time?

Motion of Mr. Knowles to adjourn the House negatived.

TRAIN SERVICE IN THE WEST.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I wish to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railway (Hon. J. D. Reid) to a rather serious condition of affairs that exists in my own constituency. I received to-day the following telegram:

Lampman, Sask., February 1.

John G. Turriff, M.P.

Maryfield-Radville branch of Canadian Northern railway had only one train and one mail in last 25 days; whole district short of food and fuel, no real effort made by railway company to relieve situation. Please get matter before Board of Railway Commissioners and Postmaster General. Advise President Lampman, Board of Trade, what can be done to relieve most serious situation.

Dr. Corrigan.

Lampman is about forty miles northeast of Estevan, on the Canadian Northern railway. I can quite understand that the Postmaster General cannot get mail in there if the trains are not running. After a period of such weather as we have had in that part of the country, where it is customary to carry mail by railway, it is a most difficult matter to get the mails carried in by sleigh after these storms. But I think I can say to the Minister of Railways that there is absolutely no excuse for the railway company having only one train in twenty-five days. That line of railway runs between two lines of the Canadian Pacific railway. So far as I can learn, four days was the longest time that elapsed between trains on the Canadian Pacific line. This stretch of country 150 miles in length has been accustomed to having one passenger train each way every second day, making one train every day, and many freight trains; and you can imagine what it means to that part of the country to have these trains suddenly cut off and to be given a service of only one train in twenty-five days. As Dr. Corrigan says in his message, the people there are short of food and fuel. This is a most serious matter, deserving of the attention of the Department of Railway im-

mediately—not to-morrow, or the next day, or next week. Coal and fuel must be supplied immediately along that stretch of railway from Radville to Maryfield. Both at Maryfield and at Lampman the Canadian Northern connects with the Canadian Pacific railway, and I have no doubt that the Canadian Northern railway is not in a position to send revolving snowploughs there or the necessary steam power to force trains through and bring relief to these people.

Hon. J. D. REID: This matter was brought to my attention a few days ago by the receipt of a telegram addressed to the hon. Minister of Railways, dated January 31, from W. W. Davidson, Mayor of Moosejaw. This telegram was as follows:

Fuel situation in this section of province is extremely critical. Intense suffering is prevalent. Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific completely tied up. Railway Commission on December 4 ordered sixty-five cars per day to be placed at Drumheller for coal, yet within three weeks mines were closed down for want of cars. No substantial quantity coal has been received from this field for three weeks. Movement also very slow on Canadian Pacific railway. Strongly urge you to take this up with Railway Commission that drastic measures may be taken at once to relieve the situation.

When I received that message four days ago, I at once interviewed Sir Henry Drayton, Chairman of the Railway Commission. He told me that he had taken this matter up with the Grand Trunk Pacific, Canadian Northern, and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, and that his information was that Western Canada was experiencing one of the most severe winters they had ever known; that the cold was very intense the snowstorms very severe—so much so that, according to the information which he had, it was almost impossible for any of the three railway companies mentioned to move their trains. This matter had been before him for several weeks; he had his special officers in that vicinity, urging the railways to do everything they could to prevent distress in that section of the country. He showed me the correspondence that he had had on the subject and the messages that had passed between the several companies. The message from the mayor of Moosejaw was so strong that I felt that I should like to do what I could to assist the Railway Commission, and, if possible, to prevent any distress. The first thing I did was to wire the president of the Canadian Northern Railway Company as follows:

I have received notice situation at Drumheller and surrounding district suffering for want of coal. Unless immediate action taken and relief given, loss of life may occur. Difficulty caused by your railway not supplying any moving cars. Wire quick what action you propose taking, otherwise I must bring before Council for their action. I cannot assume responsibility of leaving matter in present condition longer than to-day.

J. D. Reid,
Acting Minister of Railways.

I then called up Mr. Bury, the Transportation Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and discussed the matter with him. I asked him if there was any possibility of the Canadian Pacific railway co-operating with the Canadian Northern railway, and, if the Canadian Northern Railway Company could not get a sufficient quantity of coal out there on account of shortage of motive power or cars, whether they would run trains from Drumheller and get the coal into that locality. Mr. Bury told me over the telephone that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were willing to co-operate in any way they could with the Canadian Northern Company or with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and that they would do and were doing everything in their power to supply coal along the line of their own railway. That day Mr. Bury communicated to me a message from B. C. Coleman, Assistant General Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Winnipeg, as follows:

We have no advice of any kind on Canadian Pacific railway where there is any suffering, or the possibility of any. Schools and churches have had to be closed temporarily in some towns in southern Manitoba, and southern Saskatchewan, but we have been and will be able to prevent any cases of actual distress by supplying our own engine coal where there is no other fuel available. Lethbridge mines have been kept well supplied with cars. The coal has been moved in preference to all other freight, and there have not been excessive delays, taking into consideration the weather. Supply at many towns on Canadian Pacific has been depleted on account of farmers and others driving from Canadian Northern territory in order to reach our railway for fuel. We will, of course, take fuel from Canadian Northern when offered, and have already arranged with them to do so. We cannot help them on Drumheller line. They have plenty engines, and have said publicly that they have the cars. The trouble is due to cuts having been allowed to fill up with snow, the failure of water supply, and the general absence of facilities on newly built branch lines. It is stated on authority Government recorders that taking Western Canada as a whole this is the worst spell of excessively cold and stormy weather it has ever endured since railways built there. There is a great depth of snow, and there has been no thaw from former crust, and the slightest

breath of wind sets the whole sea in motion. Saskatchewan Government should be asked to notify the General Superintendent at Moosejaw, and this office, of any report they get which indicates the necessity for special action, and we will see that there is no suffering provided the locality can be reached over our line of railway. It is hard for the railway company to distinguish between cases where there is a general shortage and places where dealers and others are merely anticipating a difficulty, and if the Government can help in this we will be very glad.

I also wired the mayor of Moosejaw asking him if he could give me the names of any places in particularly urgent need of relief. In addition to that, Sir Henry Drayton had telegrams from the members of the Provincial Government and from the mayor of Moosejaw, and I have before me the whole file showing what he had done. Sir Henry Drayton issued orders that the coal trains were to take precedence over all traffic on the railways. Sir Henry sent a telegram only yesterday to Mr. Drury, the engineer of the commission, urging the Canadian Pacific railway to do all they could, and I have here the reply which I shall read to the House, as it explains the situation so far as the Canadian Pacific railway is concerned. The telegram is:

Montreal, Que., February 2.

From Sir H. Drayton,
Ottawa, Ont.

Referring to your message. Mr. Coleman, our assistant general manager at Winnipeg telegraphs me as follows: "For two years past Moosejaw, Regina, Calgary and Saskatoon have obtained large proportion their domestic coal supply from Drumheller and it is the snow troubles on the Canadian Northern which have caused shortage these cities. This is admitted by the press and has been publicly acknowledged by the coal dealer and is well within the knowledge of Sir Henry's officers on the ground. We agreed soon as Bienfait mines opened up we would take Canadian Northern coal loaded at these mines and would haul to Canadian Northern at Midale. We reached the mines last night and are now getting the switching done. Assistant General Manager Cameron of the Canadian Northern told me yesterday that is would be some time before they could move a car out of Midale as they have cut on line west of there filled to a depth of twenty-two feet. Yesterday to help out city of Regina I started to load up twenty cars Pittsburg coal from our dump at Moosejaw, they agreeing to return this to us from stock of a Winnipeg dealer at Fort William. Five cars this coal to be delivered Regina to-day."

Radville and Bengough are not on our lines.

George Bury.

I mention these facts to show you that not only are the Canadian Pacific railway doing all they possibly can on their own lines, but that an arrangement has been made between the Canadian Northern railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway to co-operate in every way possible to relieve the situation in that district.

The situation on the Canadian Northern railway line is very bad. On January 29, they wired Sir Henry Drayton, and perhaps this telegram will explain the situation so far as their road is concerned:

Winnipeg, Man., January 29, 1916.

Sir H. L. Drayton,
Board of Railway Commissioners,
Ottawa, Ont

Your message date. We are not short of motive power. We are, however, in very bad shape for water consequent upon the very serious weather that has been experienced. In order that you may know just how our water supply is from Drumheller to Kindersley, I give information connection with our tanks working from west to east Drumheller O.K., Mecheche very limited supply account extreme cold. Hanna same. Tank between Richdale and Stanmore frozen up entirely. Youngstown only getting about three thousand gallons per day. Chinook same as Youngstown; between Oyen and Benton frozen up entirely; Alsask keeping up at present but account heavy drain afraid may have trouble. Half mile east Flaxcombe very limited supply. Kindersley O.K. Water supply at points mentioned thoroughly gone over last summer and if had had average winter weather this year would have experienced no trouble. Been necessary to run water cars on every train between points above mentioned. In order to relieve the territory as much as possible we are sending trains north on the Battle river sub via Vegreville Junction but impossible to tell how long we will be able to do that with any success for reason that water supply on Battle river sub is also bad account extreme cold weather. The supply is as follows; Rumsey frozen up; Big Valley tanks O.K.; tanks between Warden and Stettler frozen up; Red Willow getting about one thousand gallons per day. Between Meeting creek and Edberg frozen up. Half mile southbattle O.K. Roundhill lots of water, but cannot use it account its quality as engines foam too badly account weather conditions. Engines have had to have their tonnage reduced as much as seventy-five per cent and water consumption handling such reduced tonnage is equal if not greater than would have been in hauling winter tonnage under ordinary conditions. Reports this morning indicate weather is moderating and you can rest assured that every one is on the job and doing everything possible to meet the situation but this winter is one that is extraordinary in the duration of the cold and its intensity.

I have read these telegrams to show that the Railway Commission and the railways have promised me, as Acting Minister of Railways, that they will do everything they possibly can to relieve any possible suffer-

ing in that district, and that they are now doing so.

I have two or three clippings from western papers which confirm these statements. In the Winnipeg Free Press of January 29, I read:

Coal Famine Relieved—Railway Officials adopt Energetic Measures at Saskatoon.

Saskatoon, Sask., Jan. 28.—The coal famine here has been relieved, due to energetic measures adopted by Canadian Northern railway officials to spot cars at the Drumheller field, cars have been promised all mines there tomorrow. A few cars have been arriving each day here and there is no likelihood of suffering unless the weather takes a decided turn for the worse. The storm here during the last few days has not been severe and trains have been running fairly well up to schedule time.

Snowstorm delays Trains.

The Canadian Pacific railway time-table has been entirely disorganized through the continued snowstorm throughout the country, and system has had to be disregarded. The Imperial Limited from the East, due to reach Winnipeg at 11.15 yesterday morning, was at midnight reported due here about 3.30 o'clock this morning, while the night Imperial Limited will not be there until late this morning. Trains from the west are likewise hours behind time, but an attempt is being made to keep the local service well to schedule.

I have another long article here from the Winnipeg Free Press, dated from Regina, January 28, which as no doubt the hon. member has seen, it will not be necessary to read. In addition to the steps I have described, the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) who, of course, is greatly interested in this matter, was over at the office of the Railway Commission yesterday when I happened to be there. The chairman of the Railway Commission assured him that everything the commission could do was being done; and, in addition to that, I told him that everything that the Government could do was being done and also that the railways were themselves doing everything in their power. My hon. friend was good enough to notify all of the officials interested in this matter that he intended to bring it to the attention of the House this afternoon, and so I have brought with me the whole file on the subject. I have also Sir Henry Drayton's file. Both of these files are at the hon. gentleman's disposal, and I am sure that when he has read them he will be satisfied that everything that it is possible to do is being done to meet the situation.

I only wish to say in conclusion that I regret exceedingly that there has been any suffering in the West; but since the matter was first brought to my attention I have satisfied myself that the several railway companies are doing everything they possibly can to relieve the situation. I understand that the main trouble is on the Canadian Northern railway; but, from the information I have gathered, not only from personal conversations, but from messages that have passed between us, I am confident that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are willing to do anything under heaven to relieve the situation, either by taking coal from the Canadian Northern, or, if necessary, by running their trains over the Canadian Northern line. The correspondence I have had with the chairman of the Railway Commission leads me to the conclusion that he has done everything possible to relieve any suffering that may exist in those districts.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would like to hand this telegram to the hon. minister, and to point out that Lampman is at a disadvantage compared with points like Moosejaw and Saskatoon, where the three roads enter. Yet Lampman is only 25 miles from the Souris coal mine, to which the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern have tracks, so that the railways would only have to run a train a distance of 25 miles to get coal to that point.

Mr. REID: I may say that the chairman of the Railway Commission has sent telegrams to the mayor of Moosejaw and the members of the Saskatchewan Government, asking them to give the names of the places that are in most urgent need of relief, and stating that these cases would be attended to. We have also asked the railway companies to see that aid is sent to these places as early as possible. I may say for the hon. member's information that the Canadian Pacific railway is taking the coal from its dumps at the several divisions in the West and rushing it to the places in need. I am satisfied that, if we get the names of the places requiring aid, the Railway Commission and the railway companies between them, will see that no suffering continues if it can possibly be helped.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, February 1.

The Hon. E. L. PATENAUDE (Minister of Inland Revenue): (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the address of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) I have listened to last evening and read this morning with pleasure. I took a personal interest in that part of his speech where, with apparent surprise, he inquires whether there shall not be forthcoming a reply to the attacks that have been heard in this House during the past few days concerning the dispute which is being waged since 1910-11 in the province of Quebec, and even in a section of the province of Ontario. I am in a position to reply forthwith—and, after all, he must have surmised—that those attacks will not be left unanswered, and I myself will endeavour to deal with them, to the extent that they can be dealt with by a man who claims to profess the code of honour.

In the meantime, he will no doubt accept my very sincere congratulations on the sentiments and ideas he gave expression to last evening regarding the rights of the French language in this country. His remarks on that subject were characterized by a moderation that must strongly appeal to the feelings and judgment of all fair-minded citizens of Canada. In fact, such dispassionate arguments are particularly effective towards bringing about a peaceful settlement of those differences which occasionally crop up in our midst.

I have also listened to attacks based on reports more or less complete, and more or less accurate, and, in certain cases, without anything to rest on but garbled accounts.

It is not in my mind to deny in any way the stand I took in 1910-11. My purpose, on the contrary, is to face it squarely as a man of honour ought to do.

I shall first of all reply to the strictures made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) on the 24th of January, and to be found at page 34 of Hansard.

[Mr. Reid.]

In the course of his speech the hon. member referred to a resolution which was put before the legislature of the province of Quebec during the session of 1910. I remember the circumstances which had prompted it, as well as the different considerations set forth in its preamble. Of course, it is the hon. member's privilege to criticise our motives in introducing that motion, but I think he should have exercised that privilege with absolute sincerity and represented the facts in their true light. It is a rather odd circumstance that, instead of reading the whole resolution, he was careful to suppress three paragraphs, which considerably alters the meaning.

What do they say? Following the first paragraph quoted by the hon. member, and which is to be found included in his speech as reported in Hansard, there are three others which he has not mentioned, but which I shall now read to the House:

> That the minister had no authority of any kind to anticipate in this manner the opinion of the electors of this province on this serious question which at the time was about to be submitted to the Dominion Parliament;
>
> That the numerous protests which have been heard in this province as in many others against the new policy have shown that the Minister of Public Works and Labour has not accurately expressed the opinion of the people of this province;
>
> That neither the Prime Minister nor any of his colleagues have repudiated the statements of the Minister of Public Works and Labour;

It seems to me that in all fairness the hon. member for Pictou ought to have quoted the motion as worded when introduced in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec in 1910, and he would then have been spared all the comments he thought fit to make.

The general scope given to this debate, comprising as it does the peculiar attacks made in this House, as well as in certain newspapers, point to a desire in certain quarters to spread throughout the country and have the people believe the story that there exists in Canada a group of citizens who are not loyal to the British Crown. I say that such a fable ought not to be given currency, and its authors should be censured rather than the men who on each side of this House are endeavouring to fulfil their duty.

Well, let everything be read over that has been said in the province of Quebec during the past year, or during the last ten years, and I do not think that in a single

instance any motive may be found to doubt the loyalty of any group of citizens in the province of Quebec.

The remarks of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) made the other day, and those of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) last evening, lead one to believe that the recruiting in Quebec has flagged owing to the campaign against the Naval Act in the elections of 1911.

If in the province of Quebec recruiting has been flagging, it is due to speeches delivered throughout the province and which have dispirited public opinion and spread the notion that this Government had led the country astray when it had resolved to take a hand in the war now raging in Europe.

At any rate, if the members of the Government deserve criticism and censure, I hold that the Liberal party is not entitled to demand explanation, considering the means taken by them to attain power in 1896. In this connection it may be of some interest to recall the appeal which the Liberal party made throughout the province of Quebec a few days before the elections. The day following nomination day, L'Electeur, the official mouthpiece of the Liberal party in the district of Quebec, published an article of which I will read a few excerpts. The same article was on the next day reproduced in Le Soir, a paper published at Montreal and founded to the sole end of boosting the Liberal cause; it disappeared a few days after the election.

> Do you wish for war? Three millions of dollars for muskets, guns and bayonets—An imminent danger to you, farmers.
>
> One of the whims of old Tupper is an imperial federation between Great Britain and all its colonies, particularly Canada.
>
> One of the conditions of such an alliance would be that in wartime Canada would he called upon to pay its share of the cost in money and in men.
>
> And as England is constantly warring with some country, we would have continuously to pay taxes to contribute the money and draw lots to furnish the men.
>
> In return, England would decorate these shrewd politicians, conferring a baronetcy on this one, a knighthood on another and appointing a third a commander of some order or other.
>
> But the common people would continue to be used as food for cannon.

And lower down:

> Why fight for Great Britain?

And still further:

> Your sons will be sent to Africa and Asia, whence there will be no returning.
>
> Vote for Laurier and his candidates if you wish to see your country enjoy continued peace and yourself free from the risk of having at any moment to depart for foreign lands leaving behind you your wife, your children, and all you hold dear.

That manifesto, published on the eve of polling day in the two leading French Liberal organs, was printed separately and distributed in bunches throughout the length and breadth of the province.

I would not attach too much importance to that article. The Liberal party itself—and I would be fair to them—has acknowledged that it was an election dodge. Le Soleil of the 19th of November, 1915, spoke as follows of the article I have just read:

> "That article headed: 'Do you wish for war?' showed on its very face that it was part of election tactics such as all political parties and papers at all times contrive during an electoral struggle."

And that article of Le Soleil concluded with the following admission:

> That article of L'Electeur during the electoral campaign of 1896, is one of those traps set during the hunt by not over-scrupulous hunters.

I will be told, doubtless, that those facts are of ancient date. Let us come nearer to 1916. With the consent of the House, I will now read the report of a meeting held at St. Hubert, in the county of Temiscouata, by the member for that constituency. It appeared in Le St. Laurent in its issue of the 1st of July, 1915. The heading is: Mr. Charles Gauvreau, M.P., at St. Hubert.

> Mr. Gauvreau, on Sunday, the 27th of June, took advantage of his visit at St. Hubert to deliver an address to his electors.
>
> One of those clear and warm days of the end of June favoured the meeting, which was attended by the whole parish. By the acclamations of the audience, it could be easily seen that the Liberal policy, expounded with eloquence and conviction was commending itself to the electors.
>
> Mr. Gauvreau endeavoured to keep within the limits of a faithful recital of the events that have taken place during the last year and to lay bare the doings of the mountebanks that govern us at Ottawa. He spoke at length on the war and the manner in which it is carried on both in Europe and in Canada, and he put the ques-

tion as to when it may be expected to end. If, according to those who know best, it has barely begun, what then will be Canada's fate? We sent at the start 25,000 troops, said he, and of those, nearly half have been killed, wounded, made prisoners or interned, 35,000 more are now on the firing line and the ranks are being constantly decimated, so much so that a call has been sent out for 30,000 more who will have to be made ready to cross over by the end of July, so that by the end of September 140,000 will have been taken from our midst to go to the front to be killed or be interned for who knows how many years: 140,000 of whom our country will be deprived and whose loss it will feel.

And the expenses are proportionate to the number of departing soldiers. It is estimated that by September the war will cost $1,400,000 a day.

A few days later, on the 14th of October, 1915, Le St. Laurent, published a report of a meeting held by the identical Mr. Gauvreau, at Notre Dame du Portage, some electors from that locality voting in Kamouraska:

Messrs. Lapointe and Stein and Mr. Charles Gauvreau at Notre Dame du Portage.

Messrs. Lapointe and Stein have at Notre Dame du Portage some electors who vote in Kamouraska. In concert with Mr. C. A. Gauvreau, they held a political meeting on Sunday after mass.

Mr. Lapointe, always popular with the masses whom he carries away by his glowing and earnest eloquence in a few minutes passed in review the whole Federal arena: the Laurier Administration with its surpluses, the Conservative regime with its squandering and deficits; the enormous expenditure for the Civil Service, the war tax, which is not destined, as he so truly said, for Joffre or French but for Mr. Bob Rogers; the increase in the Budget and the public debt and the Liberal protests against all these taxes and increases in the tariff with which the country is being saddled by the Tories.

And here we have the same member asking us the other day to go into the province of Quebec and hold recruiting meetings to explain our position. I understood the ex-Minister of Railways also last evening to complain of an abatement in the enlistment in the province of Quebec, as well as in certain other regions. With recruiting speeches such as have been made by the members for Temiscouata and Kamouraska, it is not to be wondered at if recruiting is not as brisk as certain people state.

[M. Patenaude.]

I do not intend to dilate any longer on this subject, but were I inclined to follow these gentlemen on the ground on which they have placed themselves I would only have to turn over the files and get at the reports of their speeches delivered in different parts of the province of Quebec. I might discover things very unpleasant for my hon. friends on the other side of the House; but I wish not to be aggressive, or disagreeable, my sole object being to reply to the attacks to which I was personally subjected. I shall do it in all possible fairness, and I hope that my remarks will be understood in their proper meaning. Such is my reason for refraining from making comments upon the articles and speeches written and delivered in the province of Quebec. I trust that during this session, as well as during ensuing sessions, it will not be found necessary to revert to subjects which carry with them such unpleasantness and require such delicate handling. By the way it does seem to me that if account is taken of the peculiar circumstances and the critical phases of the hour, it had been better to make an end of such discussions, which can result in no benefit for the province of Quebec nor the country as a whole.

In this connection may I be allowed to read a page, which I consider exquisitely written from the pen of the well-known author, Pierre Loti, to be found in L'Illustration of October 30, 1915:

At Soissons.

The basilica itself, as well as its surroundings, is enwrapped in an agonizing silence, broken at intervals by the boom of the cannon. Written on the bishop's dais can still be made out a motto, which amidst such dilapidation reads like an ironical anathema hurled at the barbarians: "Pax et justitia."

As you step forward on the heaps of ruins, you reverently turn aside from the precious fragments of stained glass; you would rather not hear under your foot the small clinking music of crushing glass.... All the gleams of a summer evening, unusual in these sanctuaries, stream through the gaping rifts or through the beautiful Gothic windows which are no longer held by their fastenings. And the double range of pillars recedes in front or you in a vista of white luminosity, like two rows of white stems of giant reeds.

As we leave the cathedral, and take one of the deserted streets, we come to a wall con-

cealed under printed posters, which the shells seem to have made it their task to tear to pieces—posters that press themselves as close together as possible encroaching on their edges, jealous, as it were, of their space, and appearing as if they tried to cover and eat up one another. They have been riddled with shells; but some lines can still be discerned. They must be the most important lines, as they are printed in bolder type, designed to take the eye—"Treason! shameless bluff!" howls one of the bills—"Vile slander, infamous lie!" shouts back the other in huge letters clinging to each other like harlots.... What is the meaning of it all, great Heavens? "Oh, so! all the wretchedness of our petty squabbles of the last election! It has remained posted there, as in a pillory, and still legible notwithstanding the rains of two summers and the snows of one winter!

It seems to me the above quotation is appropriate, as a sequel to certain utterances which hon. gentlemen will remember. I think also that it could well be read in many sections of the country; that it could be reproduced in the newspapers, and that if a little dust were strewn, especially after the clash of our election campaigns, some good would result to our compatriots and our fellow countrymen in general.

I now come to a discussion of the situation as it was to be found at the time of the general elections in 1911 and when war was declared in 1914. I have no hesitation in saying right here that in 1911 I attacked as vigorously as I could the Government and the party that were managing the country. I upheld the platform and views of the Conservative party, save as regards its naval programme. I opposed that platform in all sincerity, because such was my conviction. On the other hand I have no more hesitation in stating to-day that since the month of August, 1914, I put forth every possible effort to help the country and Government in their endeavours to contribute to the defence of a most sacred cause.

Mr. PROULX: (Translation). The circumstances had altered.

Mr. PATENAUDE: (Translation). It is quite true that the circumstances were in 1914 entirely different from those that were to be found in 1911.

Mr. PROULX: (Translation). Previous to 1911 you were not in power.

Mr. PATENAUDE: (Translation). In 1911 I was not in power, but that did not prevent me from having an opinion of my own and the right to express it. Because I am in power to-day, it does not follow that I cannot hold an equally sincere opinion and have the right of expressing it freely. Power alters in no way an honest man's opinion; unexpected happenings in the history of a people, that is what induces statesmen to modify their viewpoint.

When following on the statements emanating from the Prime Minister in 1912, events take place so momentous as those we are witnessing just now, one has to modify his ideas. Nor am I, after all, the only one who has seen fit to change his mind; and since it is desired to open up that aspect of the case, I am led to inquire what has been the policy of the Liberal party, and what have been the very opinions held by the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me? There is some advantage in looking back, in order to find out what has been the platform of the Liberal party during the past few years. I find it expressed in the leading papers of the party. Again I insist on the fact that, in reading these newspaper clippings and excerpts from old speeches, I intend to be neither aggressive nor bitter, but I wish simply to establish certain facts.

On the 30th of March, 1907, Le Canada, the organ of the Liberal party, published the following, on the eve of Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's departure to attend the Imperial conference at London:

> As to Canada's contribution to Imperial defence, the Prime Minister reasserted his statements of 1902, that in so far as he may be able to prevent it, Canada would not, under any pretext, be drawn into the vortex of European militarism.

On the 5th of April 1907, Le Canada again said:

> By contributing to the defence of the Empire, we recognize that the Empire has a right to a sum of money earned by the labour of the colonies. The colony admitting such a right, cannot be acting consistently unless it strive towards Imperialism.
>
> There is no truer statement. We therefore approve of a Canadian policy of abstention from any contribution.

On the 18th of March, 1907, we again read in Le Canada:

We shall never think much of Imperialism, under any form.

Any move, however distant, towards Imperialism or Imperial federation seems to us objectionable.

The Toronto Globe of the 5th of April, 1907, also said:

If it became necessary to participate in the active defence of the Empire, Canadians would be found ready, as in the past; but such an occurrence seems remote, and even unlikely for years to come and, in the meantime, Canadians would rather use their resources for the development of their country, realizing that thus will they work in the best possible manner to strengthen the Empire.

We cannot spend our money in building all at once railways and battleships, and even in the interest and for the defence of the Empire; the extension of our railway system, and all it means, is the most satisfactory policy.

Le Soleil lastly, in its issue of the 19th of February, 1907, stated as follows:

To attempt to draw the colonies into the turmoil of European jealousies would only result in jeopardizing uselessly their development, and draining their resources to no purpose without any certain profit to the Empire."

I shall, I hope, be excused from reading articles from other Liberal newspapers. The reply may be made that such were the opinions of mere journalists. But I say on the contrary those statements expressed faithfully the views held at that time by the Liberal leaders. I say that they reflected the opinion expressed by the leader himself and by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). In July, 1903, at a convention of the boards of trade of the whole Empire held at Montreal, it was declared that Canada although recognizing its obligation to aid the mother country, yet wished to maintain its right to determine for itself the manner of its co-operation. The Nationalist league held a meeting to protest against this declaration; Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux was invited to attend. He replied that he could not do so for purely personal reasons, but in the course of his letter he stated his views on the question and I call attention to the following extract:

Allow me, however, to express my surprise at seeing that the delegates of the Canadian Boards of Trade and particularly those of the province of Quebec, have thought fit to support a resolution which affirms an absolutely false principle, namely: that the colonies are subject to the obligation of participating in the defence of the Empire.

I need not say that the Canadians can in no way be bound by such a declaration. Under what treaty would it be desired to add to the respective rights and duties of the Empire and its colonies? What authority is vested in our boards of trade to permit them to involve the country's future?

The Canadian Parliament alone, has the right to assume such a responsibility and I have no hesitation in declaring that the Drummond resolution in no way expresses the calm and deliberate opinion of the Canadian nation.

On the contrary, the dignified attitude taken last year (1902) at the Intercolonial Conference by the Prime Minister of Canada is that which faithfully represents the people's sentiment.

Such was the platform extolled in the election campaign of 1911, and which affirmed the principle that, unless urged by extraordinary conditions, such as have arisen in 1914, Canada ought not to participate in the wars of the Empire. That policy of the Liberal party we have upheld. Whether we were right or wrong, what stands out clearly in all this matter is that the political principles of which I have just spoken were professed by the Liberal party and its leaders and equally by the Conservative party and its leaders. It still remains true that the extremely important problem of the mutual relationship of the Empire and its colonies is awaiting solution in the future. It will rise again for the coming statesmen to solve in the best possible manner. Possibly our attitude of 1911 may be condemned, as possibly may the Conservative viewpoint. Possibly also the Liberal position may then be repudiated. The question is merely being held in abeyance since the declaration of war in 1914. But after the war is over, after victory shall have rewarded the efforts of the allies, who dare hold that the problem which has divided us so profoundly in 1910 and 1911 will not again be the subject of dispute? And no one can foresee on what lines a settlement may be effected. That is why I cannot abide by the criticism proffered by some hon. gentlemen on the other side.

In 1914 the war broke out, and, as I stated a moment ago, there was an end to all bickerings. However, that may be stating the case too strongly, in view of the opinions which, as late as yesterday, were given utterance to by my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), opinions of a sort

as appear now and then in the newspapers. In that connection, I may be allowed to read an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Monk, at Lachine, on November 8, 1909. The hon. gentleman from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), when addressing this House yesterday, averred, and I surely shall not contradict him on that point, that he held Mr. Monk's memory in high esteem. It may not be amiss to once more call the attention of the House to some extracts of that speech, wherein the matter of the passing by the House of certain resolutions on March 29, 1909, was commented upon. Hon. gentlemen are all familiar with the proceedings which took place and the views which were given expression to at the time. Mr. Monk spoke thus:

> What occurred must be known to all and every one. Matters had reached a climax. Great Britain, it was asserted, was threatened with an unexpected attack. It was agreed between the parties that their respective leaders would arrange as to the terms of a resolution which the House would be called upon to pass.
>
> All the dependencies of Great Britain were to show their readiness to support the Mother Country in that solemn hour, in the face of the impending danger.
>
> It will be admitted by all, I think, that just then was not the proper time for a discussion of the merits of imperialism. Such, apparently, was the view taken by every member of the House, as, following on the interview between the two leaders, the new draft of the resolution was submitted and carried unanimously.
>
> Who would have voiced a protest under the circumstances?

To my mind, whoever has any consideration for the memory of Mr. Monk should endeavour to abide by the advice implied in such utterances. We are free to entertain opposite views as regards the relationship of Canada to the Empire; that is an open question, and no one will demur to such a statement. But it is also a debatable question whether, under the circumstances, it would not be preferable to defer such discussions until after the war is over.

It stands to reason that such wrangling should come to an end when Germany is treading Belgium under foot, is devastating France, and pushing her armies almost to the very walls of Paris, hordes destroying in their wake libraries and cathedrals; when even Great Britain's supremacy is jeopardized, is there a Canadian so bold as to contend that we should remain indifferent to what is going on, and not strive to the utmost towards the triumph of the common cause and of our own interests.

I was called upon a few days ago to make a statement in this House. Let those who made such inquiries glance once more over the papers which appeared a few days after the outbreak of the war. They will find that I went in company with the hon. gentleman from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and a numerous delegation to secure the organization of the 22nd Regiment, which is at present in the trenches: they will find that I was a member of the committee for the organization of that regiment, and that in the meantime I did everything in my power to further the movement. In passing, I am glad to pay a humble tribute of respect to the memory of Major Roy, who was killed in the trenches, commanding his battalion, a unit in the British Army. At the same time, I am happy to mention here in connection with Major Roy's name—as the hon. member for Rouville did a few days ago—that of Captain Guy Drummond, who, though an Englishman, was killed in the midst of a French regiment, which he was endeavouring to rally, giving out in French the words of command. That reminds me of an extract from a letter addressed by Mr. Gillet, at one time a lecturer at Laval University in Montreal, to one of his friends in that city, and which was published in Le Canada, of July 13, 1915.

> That brotherly war wherein you will have mixed your blood in Europe with that of Englishmen, will prove more helpful to the future prosperity of your beautiful country than years of parliamentary debates.

Such are the feelings which fill my soul, as I see French and English soldiers fighting for the same cause, defending the same interests and the same flag.

The Canadian people are nobly doing their duty. New battalions are constantly being recruited, and we have at present under arms 250,000 men, hailing from every section of the Dominion.

Our boys and men enlisted and henceforth were separated from the older or weaker members of the family. These lat-

ter should not be left unprovided. Accordingly the Patriotic Fund was at once organized, and with what result? A keen rivalry developed between urban and rural communities in the matter of contributions. Poor as well as rich, lowly as well as exalted, acquitted themselves creditably.

The citizens of Montreal and Toronto, who quite recently donated $5,000,000 to help carry on the work of the Patriotic Fund, are entitled to special praise.

To secure that result, the citizens of Montreal met and resolved themselves into a certain number of squads between which the work was divided, so as to secure prompter returns.

A hearty welcome was extended to these workers wherever they showed themselves. More particularly, at a banquet given in their honour, the foremost citizens of the metropolis appeared as their patrons. That banquet was presided over by a gentleman well-known to the hon. members of this House, and whose administrative ability and devotion to the British Crown were recently acknowledged by our Gracious Sovereign; I am alluding to Lord Shaughnessy of Montreal and Ashford. At his side one could see the Archbishop of Montreal, who by his presence and his words was anxious to help in the common cause. Allow me, by the way, to mention the glorious part taken by the Sulpicians of Montreal, unassuming priests who devote their lives to the welfare of their countrymen, who have organized numerous benevolent institutions, have within the last year endowed Montreal with a splendid library, and in the course of the last fifteen months, have subscribed $35,000 to the Patriotic Fund.

In looking over the subscriptions of Montreal, it will be found that, out of this enormous subscription of $2,500,000, nearly $500,000 have been contributed by the working-class, by the men who win their bread by the sweat of their brow. That contribution of $500,000 is the mite of the poor man who is also anxious to do his bit in the war. The wage-earner within his limited means is giving as much as the moneyed man with his millions. In all benevolent enterprises it is not so much the amount that counts as the spirit in which it is given.

[M. Patenaude.]

Before concluding, allow me to quote a page from a French author, which I am sure, will be found highly interesting. It will be the summary and the conclusion of my speech. The quotation is from the pen of Mr. Henri Lavedan:

Solemn Hours.

A Day with the Dead.

"The Dead"... Two words that already have lost their old meaning. The only plausible thought they now convey is of the victims of the war. Those soldiers, giving their lives on the battlefield, have, it seems, taken unto themselves, denying it to those who depart this life in vulgar peacefulness, the grand name of death, of which they have become, in a way, the titulars. The trivial act of dying they have exalted to the height of a distinction. For a long time to come, the term will retain the heroic meaning they breathed into it. It will be difficult for the mind to picture death otherwise than in a soldier's uniform, facing the enemy and receiving the last sacrament of fire.

To-morrow our supreme hour in turn may come. While our loved ones, surrounding the couch of their spoiled sufferer, will vie with each other to allay the bitterness of his last moments, we shall recall the readiness and patience of our glorious departed and we shall strive, from here below, to initiate their fortitude. Their example moreover will have sustained us to the end, because their death was vivifying. Their loss of course casts over us a boundless sadness that will not fade away, but our grief is not a gloom that leads to despair and dejection, it does not beget doubt and revolt; it exalteth and appeaseth.

If it be not left to us to do in every way as they have done, we may at least think, believe, decide as they; we may perpetuate in us their healthy ideas and their honest resolutions; remodel our hearts and minds to the image of their own and strive to resemble them. . .Let us come out of ourselves a little and fashion our ideals on those beautiful models; let us follow the path they have hewn out for us; let us make ours their views and practice of life, and in so doing we shall give them that supreme joy, which they have so dearly paid for in advance, of knowing that their life is being continued in our great designs, our lofty flights, and our works. Give them the proud comfort of seeing themselves perpetuated all through the future generations and contemplating eternally the excellence of their labour. The earth holds their bodies only; their countless souls are liberated, and God does not take it all; He purposely leaves a part of it free to operate within us. Let us inhale, as a gift of the Holy Ghost, this flame which flashes out of the soldier's grave and twinkles across the glorious battlefields..."

Mr. M. J. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville): Mr. Speaker, since the inception of this debate we have listened to many very interesting, nay, very eloquent addresses. By the way, I want especially to congratulate the hon. member from Bonaventure on the splendid piece of oratory with which he treated us yesterday, and which, I am sure, has deeply moved the whole House. It shall remain as one of the most dignified and ablest vindications of the rights of an oppressed minority. I dare hope that his effort of yesterday shall bear fruit and be the signal of a great effort on the part of every honest-minded Canadian anxious to have justice, peace and harmony prevail throughout this broad land of Canada.

I also want to congratulate the hon. member from Nicolet, for, though I do not concur in all his views, I am pleased to admit, and every member of this House is no doubt of the same mind, that he is courageous and energetic, that with him convictions go before everything, even before self-interest; in a word, that he is an honest man.

He had some plain, though unpleasant, truths to tell his former companions in arms, but on this side of the House we are all of opinion that it served them right.

As to the speech of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, it was expected with a great deal of interest and curiosity. That interest and curiosity were only natural, seeing that the hon. minister only yesterday was unknown to this House, and that every one was and is still asking what considerations could have induced the Prime Minister to overlook the whole French-Canadian Conservative representation and choose one of his colleagues outside of the House.

I know that the choice of a French-Canadian minister on the Government side is a very delicate matter, that it was so in 1911. It has become a rather intricate matter since the outbreak of the war, considering that the participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire is one of the principal planks in the platform of the Government, and that all the French-Canadian members on the right have been elected because they upheld the opposite principle, that of abstention. But the right hon. Prime Minister had no alternative; he had to fill the ranks of his Cabinet. After much hesitation and wobbling he made up his mind and came to the conclusion that he had better select a man who, never having been very much in the public eye, was not so liable to suspicion. His choice went to the person who had been the Conservative organizer in the district of Montreal, not only since the war, but as far back as 1911. Has the choice of the Prime Minister proved satisfactory to his followers in Quebec? I do not think so. On the contrary, I believe that it has disappointed them and that they cannot account for it, being satisfied that the political principles of the new minister are theirs, that if they have changed so has he, that if they were Nationalists so was he, that if they have disowned their former leaders, Mr. Monk and Mr. Bourassa, he also has disowned them. I almost see them thinking hard to find out the reasons for that choice and asking: "Is it that perchance the Prime Minister might think that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was more or less a Nationalist than we were, that he is more or less a Conservative than we are?"

True it is, they must say to themselves, that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had the honour of presiding over that large meeting held at the Ontario street skating rink in Montreal, a meeting called for the purpose of celebrating the victory of Nationalism in Drummond and Arthabaska, when the cheers nearly brought down the walls of the hall, when the defenders of the cause gave forth for the hundredth time their political creed: No participation, no contribution; we owe nothing to England. Down with Laurier! Down with Borden! Long live Monk! Long live Bourassa! But if he presided, we cheered.

True it is, they must say to themselves, that at St. Rémi the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, in passionate and fiery tones, has preached the Nationalist principles, but we have done the same on several occasions. Who has given him the preference? Is it that the hon. minister is now extolling the duties and obligations of Canada towards the Empire? Is it that he is now willing to give the last farthing, to sacrifice the last man in order to save that same Empire against which we have all exerted our tongues in former days? Evidently not, for now that is also our policy, those are our principles.

Mr. Speaker, the French-Canadian Conservatives are not satisfied with the appointment of the new minister. As his colleagues had done before him in former sessions, the hon. minister has endeavoured to explain what he has done in the past. I bear him no grudge for that, but for his sake I regret that he should have done so.

It would have been better for him, it seems to me, had he purely and simply acknowledged his errors instead of trying to palliate them. A confession could have brought him forgiveness.

He has thought fit to follow another course; I regret it for his own sake, and I shall say this to him: Does he believe for a moment that the people of Quebec can have faith in his statements of to-day? The electors of Quebec still have ringing in their ears the fiery appeals to passions and popular prejudices made by the Opposition speakers of 1911. There is not in Quebec a young man twenty years old who could not quote from memory some of their jewelled sentences uttered at all and every one of their meetings. The people of Quebec take as an insult to them the record of the Conservative members since 1911.

For my part, Sir, I am not in the least moved by what I hear in this House; I do not take the trouble of answering the explanations that are given; I have no need of newspaper clippings to show what was said in 1911. It is sufficient for me to know that the people heard and understood, that they are honest and that they remember.

Therefore I patiently leave the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue trying to arrange his berth, to while away the time he will spend in it. The day of reckoning shall come, and the greater the insight the people will have into the snares and false pretences made use of in order to delude them, the greater will be the punishment.

I state in all sincerity that I had not intended to take part in the debate and that I have been led into it by statements made by the hon. minister who has just taken his seat. Now that I am on my feet I shall take occasion to make two or three remarks.

Several speakers have urged upon the Government the necessity of an inquiry into the various items of expenditure for war purposes and I deem it my duty to deal with that very matter.

A man I hold very respectable and trustworthy has given us information which I feel it my duty to lay before the House.

I am told that the superintendent of the hay presses repair shops has made a profit of twenty-five to thirty-five thousand dollars by paying on an average 25 cents an hour to the employees while he was getting from the Government for those employees an amount of 60 cents an hour, and that he was dismissed after many complaints had been received. It would be interesting to know, first, whether what is said is true or not, and if so, whether the Government propose to compel that man to hand back the amounts which have been embezzled.

I am told also that a large quantity of No. 2 hay has been passed as No. 1 hay; that two of the chief employees at shed No. 25 in Montreal have given instructions to receive some rotten hay without an inspection, and that in a certain case the inspectors have been compelled to accept that bad hay; that several traders had to pay a tip of $1 for every wagon load of inspected hay; that a buyer of hay at Drummondville used to pay six or seven dollars for board in a private family, and that he got from an hotel clerk in that town a receipted board bill for $15, which bill he showed to the Government, who paid his board, besides $5 a day for his services; that an inspector has received from the hay contractors $15 a week for his board, which was paid by the Government; that thousands of wagon loads of hay from which 25 to 30 bales were missing, have been shipped as complete; and finally that a German by the name of Schultz has been kept in the Civil Service for sixteen months as an examiner notwithstanding numerous representations as to the danger of keeping that official on account of his origin, and that he has been dismissed but a fortnight ago.

I think that the statements I am now making to the House could perhaps have some bearing upon the conclusion which the Government shall reach as to whether or not an inquiry should be held.

Now, Sir, let me say a word about that part of the speech from the Throne which relates to the war and to the necessity of securing by all available means the triumph of the holy and sacred cause of the Allies. Not a dissenting voice is to be heard in this House as to the duty of the hour. We must exert all our strength and energy to make final victory a certainty.

During recess I have often addressed my fellow-countrymen at patriotic meetings, and I am glad to say that a large majority of them fully understand their duties and obligations. One and all they realize that it is a question of life or death, not only for England, France and the allied nations, but for Canada also. We realize in Quebec that Canada is eminently the land of freedom, freedom for which we are indebted to the protection afforded us by the British flag. There is not in Quebec a French-Canadian who would be willing to transfer

his allegiance from constitutional England to despotic Germany and to see the province of Quebec, for instance, submitted to the ostracism and tyranny which Alsace and Lorraine have felt for forty-four years under German domination.

There is not a French-Canadian who does not realize that England's defeat would mean Canada's defeat, bringing with it the exacting of a tribute by the victor from the vanquished, the loss of our liberties, of our autonomy, the renewal upon our Canadian soil of all the atrocities which were a factor in the consummation of the martyrdom of glorious Belgium. Therefore, I think that we can fearlessly contend that Quebec has done its duty so far.

In concluding, Sir, let me say that the French-Canadian people have witnessed with deep satisfaction the recruiting of regiments entirely composed of French-Canadians. The French-Canadian race is naturally a peace-loving race, but we would not have been of our race had not the atrocities, the acts of savagery and the iniquities of the German brute stirred up the generous blood which flows in our veins, and had it not urged us to the greatest sacrifices. Our countrymen's answer to the call to arms has been worthy of our extraction and traditions. Our sons, our brothers and our friends have generously enlisted themselves and it is confidently that we saw them go to the front, knowing they will always do honour to the French-Canadian name, that everywhere they will prove themselves the true offsprings of Dollard, d'Iberville, de Salaberry and that host of gallant fellows whose hearts have never known fear. We know that we shall always find them in the path of honour and fame; accounts of their prowess now fill our souls with pride and glory. We have so far done our duty in the province of Quebec, we shall do it to the last to ensure the triumph of the cause of civilization and justice.

Motion of Mr. Alfred Thompson for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), it was ordered that this House do to-morrow resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, it was ordered that this House do to-morrow resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, the House adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

Thursday, February 3, 1916.

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

ESTIMATES FOR 1916-1917.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General, transmitting Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1917, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Mr. Edgar N. Rhodes, member for the electoral division of Cumberland, be appointed chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

He said: As soon as the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne is agreed to, it is customary to elect a Chairman of Committees of the Whole at the commencement of each Parliament. That necessity equally arises when a vacancy occurs in that office. Owing to your election, Sir, to the responsible office of Speaker, the position of Chairman of Committees in this House has become vacant. Mr. Rhodes, the member for Cumberland, has been a member of this House since the session of 1908, if I remember correctly. During that time he has taken an excellent position, and has shown, by his devotion to public affairs, by his knowledge of the rules of the House, and by other qualities which are essential in the occupant of such an office, that he is well-qualified for the position to which I now ask the House to elect him. I have every confidence that should the motion which I now propose meet with the approval of the House, Mr. Rhodes, in the responsible position of Chairman of Committees, will discharge his duties with courtesy, firmness, and impartiality.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion, at the opening of this session, when you were nominated for the Chair, I felt called upon, while assenting to your election, to offer some criticism. On this occasion I can endorse the choice of my right hon. friend without any reservation whatever. The hon. member for Cumberland seems to me eminently fitted for the position to which it is now sought to elect him. He has given proof, on many an occasion, that he is endowed with a just and fair mind—if he will permit me to say so, a mind so just and so fair that I have been sometimes surprised to see him sitting on that side of the House. But, now that he is to sit neither on one side nor on the other, he will have every opportunity to give effect to his better instincts. Therefore it is with great pleasure that I accept his nomination to the office of Chairman of Committees.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR MACHINE GUNS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How much was received by the Government or any department, from private sources to be expended in the purchase of machine guns?
2. Have any machine guns been paid for out of these contributions? If so, how many?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to return the money so subscribed to the donors? If not, what does the Government purpose doing with this money?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. $661,272.45.

2. A very large number of machine guns were ordered during the first twelve months of the war and considerable deliveries have been made. It is inexpedient to state the exact number.

3. It is the intention of the Government to apply to the purchase of machine guns the moneys which have been subscribed and paid in for that purpose.

REVENUE FROM POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What was the postal revenue from the sale of stamps in 1914 as compared with 1915?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The total revenue from the sale of stamps was as follows: Fiscal year ended March 31, 1914, $14,392,510.25; fiscal year ended March 31, 1915, $14,598,267.94.

LETTERS TO SOLDIERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Why are letters from soldiers in active service arriving in Canada free of postage, stamped by the Post Office Department before being forwarded to their destination?

Mr. CASGRAIN: This is to comply with international postal law, which requires postage on letters to and from soldiers when these have to pass from one country to another, otherwise double the deficiency in postage would have to be collected from the addressees.

A MINISTER OF MUNITIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the Government to make provision for the appointment of a Minister of Munitions?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

RELIEF FOR ALBERTA FARMERS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How much money was expended upon relief for the farmers in the dearth-stricken section of Alberta in the years 1914 and 1915?
2. How much was expended for seed grain and seed for stock?
3. How much has been repaid in each case?

Mr. ROCHE:

In the land districts of Calgary, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat:

1. Relief other than fodder for stock, $701,693.46.

2. Seed grain, $1,804,252.41; fodder for stock, $712,271.22.

3. Repaid on seed grain, $225,923.23; repaid on relief, $17,117.73.

INTERNAL STORAGE ELEVATORS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. When was the Calgary internal storage elevator opened to receive grain?
2. What is its capacity?
3. How much grain did it handle from date of opening till December 31?
4. What territory is it intended to serve?
5. How much grain has it handled since January 1, 1915?
6. How much grain has the Moosejaw internal elevator handled in the same period, since January 1?
7. Is it allowed to ship grain to an internal elevator which is not on the direct line of transit from point of shipping to ultimate destination, and still get balance of through rate from elevator to ultimate destination on reshipment of grain?
8. Taking Fort William as ultimate destination, from how many points on the following lines respectively can grain be shipped to the Calgary elevator for storage, so that reshipment could be made which would allow shipper balance of through freight rate from original point of shipment to ultimate destination: Canadian Pacific railway, Calgary and Edmonton branch; Canadian Pacific railway, Calgary

and Macleod branch; Canadian Pacific railway, Kipp-Aldersyde branch; Canadian Northern railway, Hanna branch; and the Canadian Pacific railway, Calgary, Medicine Hat division?

9. If A at Lethbridge ships a carload of wheat to the internal elevator at Moosejaw, and sells the grain in the elevator to B; and if B wishes to reship to Fort William, is B allowed the balance of through freight from Lethbridge to Fort William, or is he forced to pay the local rate, Moosejaw to Fort William?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. August 27, 1915.

2. 2,500,000 bushels.

3. Grain received from August 27 to December 31, 1915: wheat, 59,303; oats, 89,636; barley, 10,917; mixed grain, 25,599; total, 185,455 bushels.

4. The Calgary elevator is intended to serve all territory from which grain can be shipped economically via the Pacific either to the Orient or to Europe via the Horn or through the Panama canal, and for storage purposes, cleaning and treatment. It was not intended primarily for shipment of grain east.

5. Grain received from January 1, 1915, to January 14, 1916, inclusive: Wheat, 75,827; oats, 127,154; barley, 13,969; mixed grain, 31,417; total, 248,367 bushels.

6. Grain received from January 1, 1915, to December 31, 1915: wheat, 1,133,282; oats, 288,955; barley, 4,685; flax, 6,082; mixed grain, 5,019; total, 1,438,023 bushels.

From January 1, 1916, to January 14, 1916: wheat, 1,340,742; oats, 329,638; barley, 12,486; flax, 7,181; mixed grain, 6,197; total, 1,696,244 bushels.

7. The railway laws and practices governing the stop-over privileges do not allow this without extra charge.

8. The Calgary elevator was not intended and is not favourably situated for shipping grain east to Fort William. The lines mentioned are provided for by the elevators at Saskatoon and Moosejaw. The balance of through rates from point of origin on wheat, oats and barley to final destination of reshipment, plus 1 cent per 100 pounds for terminal service at Calgary, and the following additional freight charges for additional hauling are allowed: Canadian Pacific railway, Calgary-Edmonton branch from Innisfail south, 1 cent per 100 pounds. From Penhold, Tuttle and Red Deer, 1½ cents per 100 pounds. Blackfalds and Lacombe, 2½ cents per 100 pounds. Morningside-Ponoka-Menaik and Hobbema, 3 cents per 100 pounds. Navarre, Wetaskiwin, Big Stone, Millet, Kavanagh, Leduc, Nisku, Ellerslie and Strathcona, 4 cents per 100 pounds. Calgary-Macleod branch, stations between Calgary and Cayley, 1 cent per 100 pounds. Nanton and Parkland, 1½ cents per 100 pounds. Staveley, Claresholm and Woodhouse, 2 cents per 100 pounds. Granum, 3½ cents per 100 pounds. Kipp-Aldersyde branch, all stations between Calgary and Blackie, 1 cent per 100 pounds. Brant and Ensign, 1½ cents per 100 pounds. Vulcan and Kirkaldy, 2 cents per 100 pounds. Champion and Carmangay, 3 cents per 100 pounds. Barons, 3½ cents per 100 pounds. Noble, 4 cents per 100 pounds. Monarch and Kipp, 4½ cents per 100 pounds.

Calgary-Medicine Hat Branch.—On this division no balances of through rates allowed. Canadian Northern railway, Hanna Branch.—No balances of through rates allowed. These rates are taken from the tariffs issued by the railway companies.

SCHOONER TWO BROTHERS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the Schooner Two Brothers been chartered by the Department of the Naval Service?

2. If so, upon what date, and from whom?

3. What was the address of the owner of the said schooner at the date of the charter?

4. What is the amount paid per month for such charter?

5. Does the Department of the Naval Service pay wages and supplies of the crew of said schooner during the currency of said charter? If so, what is the cost of same per month?

6. In what service is the said schooner employed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Motor boat Two Brothers was chartered by Department of the Naval Service.

2. 30th September, 1915. Wm. Fuller.

3. North Sydney, N.S.

4. $250.

5. No. Wages and supplies of the crew were paid by the owners of the vessel and covered by the amount paid per month for the charter.

6. On patrol duty. Charter terminated December 30th, 1915.

GLACE BAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mail between the tram car and the post office at Glace Bay?

2. What remuneration does he receive?

3. What was the amount of his tender?

4. Who were the other tenderers, and the respective amount of their tenders?

5. Who had the contract previously, and what was his remuneration?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. William Gracie.

2. $345 per annum.

3 and 4. Tenders were received from Daniel McIntosh at $350, and Joseph Devoe

at $400. Mr. Devoe reduced his tender to $345, and the contract was awarded to him. On account of the enlistment of his son, he withdrew his offer, and the contract was given to William Gracie at the same price.

5. Daniel McIntosh, who received $484.79.

MEDICINE HAT-EAGLE BUTTE MAIL.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. In what month of the year 1915 did the Post Office Department first advertise for tenders for the carriage of the mails between Medicine Hat and Eagle Butte, Alberta?
2. When was the contract awarded?
3. How many tenders were received?
4. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender?
5. Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why not?
6. To whom was the contract awarded, and at what amount?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Tenders were received on 23rd April, 1915. Notice inviting tenders dated 12th March, 1915.
2. 2nd December, 1915.
3. Ten.
4. J. S. Knodel, $1,000 per annum; James Moore, $1,150; Wallace Nichol, $1,175; F. R. Kettlewell, $1,300; B. C. Nason, $1,500; John Dempster, $1,500; R. R. Smith, $1,500; Robt. Shannon, $1,550; D. A. McDonald, jr., $2,200; W. J. Avery, $2,500.
5. The lowest tender was set aside, the department having been advised that Mr. Knodel was an unsuitable person to entrust with the mails. The contract was awarded to James Moore, but having removed from the locality he declined to accept it.
6. John Dempster, the former contractor, having agreed to accept the contract at the rate of James Moore's tender, it was awarded to him at $1,150 per annum.

PAYMENTS ON PRE-EMPTIONS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What is the total amount of money so far received in payment of pre-emptions in Western Canada?
2. How much is still outstanding?
3. What is the total amount of the interest arrears?
4. How much of interest and principal was paid during the years 1913, 1914 and 1915?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. $3,490,210.43, up to December 31, 1915.
2. $20,669,112.91 approximately.
3. $507,651,52, as at March 31, 1915.
4.

	Principal.	Interest.
1913- - -	$545,169.94	$215,566.18
1914- - -	342,408.96	45,399.16
1915- - -	574,060.14	26,236.65

MEDICINE HAT POST OFFICE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the total cost of extras in connection with the addition to the post office at Medicine Hat?
2. What was the total cost of extras in connection with the post office at Bassano?
3. How much was the contractor's bill for extras in each instance?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $3,501.
2. $75.
3. For Medicine Hat, $4,326, and for Bassano post office, $75.

DOMINION-WIDE PROHIBITION.

Mr. MURPHY:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce during the present session of Parliament legislation restricting or prohibiting the manufacture or sale of liquor during the war?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Several notices of motion with regard to this question are upon the Order Paper, and it is not desirable to anticipate the discussion thereon.

SUBMARINE TORPEDO EQUIPMENT.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Upon what dates were the two submarines purchased for the Dominion Government at Seattle by Sir Richard McBride equipped with torpedoes?
2. By whom was the torpedo equipment supplied and installed, and what was the total cost thereof?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Upon the purchase of the submarines, torpedoes were immediately shipped from Halifax and were received and installed on 14th August, 1914.
2. The torpedo equipment was installed by the builders of the boats. The cost was included in the price paid for the boats. It is not known by whom this equipment was supplied.

SIR MAX AITKEN.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is Sir Max Aitken engaged in any capacity in connection with the Canadian overseas forces?
2. If so, what duties does he perform, and what remuneration is he to receive therefor?
3. Up to date what amount has he been paid?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. (a) General representative for Canada at the front. (b) Nothing for self, and only travelling and office expenses of his staff.
3. Answered by No. 2.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to take action on the report of the Commission on Technical Education?

Mr. CROTHERS: As soon as complete copies of this report were received from the King's Printer, the Minister of Labour caused a complete copy to be forwarded to each provincial premier, together with a letter from the Minister of Labour inviting an expression of view regarding the recommendations of the Commission, and intimating that any suggestion would receive a careful consideration. In the meantime the Department of Labour proceeded with the distribution of the report, several thousand copies being distributed to persons believed to be interested in the subject of technical education, requests for copies also receiving prompt attention. The various provincial premiers acknowledged reception of the reports, but, with one or two exceptions, no expression of view was received. The recommendations of the Commission being based on a proposed intimate co-operation as between the Dominion Government and the governments of the various provinces, the Dominion Government will be better able to determine its course of action when it has received the views of the various provincial governments.

RIOU STORE REPAIRS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What was the cost of repairs to the store of Mr. S. C. Riou, or any other one, at Fraserville, for the purpose of converting it into an armoury, or drill hall, for the enlisted soldiers?
2. What is the monthly rent for the said store?
3. For how many years has it been rented?
4. What is the monthly cost of maintenance of such armoury-store?
5. Does the Government intend to buy it? If so, what amount has been asked and what amount has been offered?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Cost of refitting to the Riou store at Fraserville was $439.42.
2. $75.
3. Since 19th May, 1914.
4. The total cost for maintenance of this building up to date has been $16.
5. No.

THE POOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTN:

Does the Government intend to aid the municipalities in supporting the constantly increasing number of poor people and people out of work?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This question does not seem to comply with the rules of the House, and I beg to suggest that the hon. member should amend it in form.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what respect does it not comply with the rules?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It contains allegations of fact.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

NEW CARLISLE WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Was any work done on the Government wharf at New Carlisle, Quebec, in 1915?
2. If so, what was the nature of the work, what did it cost, is it completed, and was it done under contract? If not, why not?
3. If by day work, who was the overseer and how much was he paid?
4. Who supplied the timber, and were tenders called for?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Work done consisted in the rebuilding of a portion of the face timber on the west side of the wharf; the slip was also repaired, and general repairs done to the planking and sheathing of the wharf. (b) $1,463.62. (c) Completed. (d) Day labour, as it was a work of repairs.
3. Daniel Walker. $2.50 per day.
4. (a) E. W. Legrand, M. Walker, Jas. Ray, Wm. Imhoff, John Imhoff, J. H. Flowers, D. Law, J. S. Thompson, Jas. Renouf, A. Dobson, A. Flowers, H. Caldwell, R. P. Flowers, W. P. Flowers, C. Hall, B. Rousey, J. Weary. (b) No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY-CAMPBELLTON SUPERINTENDENT.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Who succeeded the late Mr. Price as Superintendent of the Intercolonial railway, at Campbellton?
2. Was the principle of promotion followed in the appointment?
3. Was the new appointee connected with the intercolonial railway service?

Mr. REID:

1. W. R. Devennish.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.

OVERSEER OF FISHERIES.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Who succeeded the late Dr. Wakeham as overseer of fisheries, in command of the C.G.S. Princess, and was the appointment made a permanent one?
2. If no appointment was made, why not?
3. Is one soon to be made?

Mr. HAZEN:

1 and 2. Captain Joseph Chalifour has been temporarily entrusted with the duties.

3. The matter is under consideration.

GASPE AND BONAVENTURE LIGHT-HOUSES.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Were any new lights or lighthouses put up on the Gaspé and Bonaventure coast line in 1915?

2. If so, was the work done by contract after notice?

3. Who were the contractors, what were the amounts paid, and where are these new lights or lighthouses situated?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. A small pole light was installed on Grindstone wharf, Magdalen islands. The old lighthouse at Percé was rebuilt in concrete and a new lantern and apparatus supplied from the lighthouse depot at Prescott.

2. The tower at Percé was built by contract after inviting public tenders.

3. Tenders for the above were as follows: Joseph A. Boucher, carpenter, Percé, P.Q., $1,845; Charles Lamb, contractor, Percé, P.Q., $2,225; Lewis Maloney, contractor. Barachois West, P.Q., $2,500. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. The new light at Grindstone consists of a lantern hoisted on a pole. The lantern was supplied out of departmental stores. The total expenditure in connection with the installation was $162.64.

PASPEBIAC WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Was any work done by the Department of Public Works in 1915 on the wharf belonging to Messrs. Robin, Jones and Whitman at Paspebiac, Quebec?

2. What was the nature of the work, is it completed, and how much did it cost?

3. If the work is not completed, how much is it intended to spend there, and when will the work be done?

4. Does this wharf remain a private wharf or is it open to the public, and on what conditions? ?

Mr. ROGERS:

1, 2 and 3. No work done in calendar year 1915.

4. Is still a private wharf.

MARIA BEACH PROTECTION WORKS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. How much has been expended altogether on the beach protection works at Maria, Quebec, and how much last year?

2. Is this work completed? If not, is it intended to go on with it this year, and how much will it cost?

[Mr. Marcil.]

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $4,315.11, including $1,599.04 expended last year.

2. Yes, completed.

CARLETON BEACH PROTECTION WORKS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What amount was expended in 1915 by the Department of Public Works on the beach protection works at Carleton, Quebec, and has the work been completed?

2. If not, how much more money is required, and is it intended to go on with the work this year?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. (a) $688.31. (b) No.

2. (a) The district engineer reports that $1,000 will be required for the coming fiscal year; this will be considered in discussing Estimates. (b) Information will be given when the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

CAMPBELLTON-GASPE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Have any arrangements been made for the subsidized steamship service between Campbellton, N.B., and Gaspé, Quebec, for 1916, and what are they?

2. How much was paid for this service in 1915, and to whom?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No.

2. $20,000 paid to the Gaspé and Baie des Chaleurs Steamship Company Limited.

GASPE-ANTICOSTI MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Was a mail service subsidized in 1915 between Gaspé, Anticosti and the North Shore of the St. Lawrence?

2. If so, who was the contractor, what was the service, how much was paid, and during what time was the service maintained?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes.

2. Robin Jones and Whitman; frequency, fortnightly; rate, $2,000 per season; 1st May to 27th October, 1915.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND NEWFOUNDLAND STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Did the Charlottetown board of trade petition or request the Government or the Department of Trade and Commerce to subsidize a steamer or steamers for the trade between Prince Edward Island and St. John's, Newfoundland, for the season of 1915?

2. Did the board of trade suggest or recommend the Red Cross Steamship Line of New York for that service?

3. Did the Department of Trade and Commerce enter into a contract with the said steamship line?

4. If so, what was the nature of the contract, how many ships were to be employed, how

many round trips were to be made, what were to be the ports of call, and what subsidy was to be paid?

5. Did the SS. Florizel of the Red Cross Line make one or more trips? If so, how many, and what did the service cost?

6. What was the tonnage and carrying capacity of the SS. Florizel?

7. Was the contract with the Red Cross Line, if any existed, cancelled? If so, why, and at whose request or instance?

8. Was a contract entered into with any other steamship or steamship company?

9. If so, who was the owner of the steamer, what was the name of the company, and what was the name of the steamer?

10. What was the nature of the contract, how many trips were made, what was the tonnage and carrying capacity of the steamer, and what did the service cost?

11. At whose request or instance was the new contract entered into, and was the Charlottetown board of trade consulted in the matter? If not, why not?

12. What quantity of produce was carried by the Black Diamond Steamship Line from Prince Edward Island to St. John's, Newfoundland, in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914, and what did the service for each of these years cost?

13. What quantity of produce was carried in the year 1915, and what did the service cost?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. The department has no definite information. No subsidy has been paid.

6. The Florizel is a steamship of 3,081 gross tons. The department has no definite information as to carrying capacity.

7. No contract was entered into.

8. Yes.

9. W. N. Macdonald. Steamship Senlac.

10. The usual contract for the carriage of mails, passengers and freight. Two trips were to be made in July, two in August, three in September, three in October, three in November, and if service continued during December, two trips in said month. The Senlac was 615 net and 1,011 gross tons, with carrying capacity of 1,100 tons and accommodation for 400 passengers. The subsidy paid up to December 8, 1915, was $10,416.67.

11. Tenders were invited from 15 firms and the contract awarded to the only person submitting a proposal. The Charlottetown board of trade was sent a copy of the call for tenders.

12.

Year.	Tons Weight	Tons Measurement	Subsidy Paid
1912	7,736	138	$12,000.00
1913	6,009	84	16,500.00
1914	5,622	57	14,278.84

13. Abstract manifests of exports for 1915 have not been received from the contractor yet. Cost of service, $10,416.67.

WATER CARTS.

Mr. NESBITT:

1. What number of tenders were received for water carts or wagons for the lot that was to be closed on the 25th May, 1915?

2. What is the (a) name of each tenderer, the (b) price of each cart or wagon, and the (c) number of carts or wagons ordered at that time, and (d) from whom ordered?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Five (5) tenders were received.

2. (a) Names of tenderers: Woodstock Wagon and Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Woodstock, Ont.; Canada Carriage Co., Ltd., Brockville, Ont.; Preston Car and Coach Co., Ltd., Preston, Ont.; The Bain Wagon Co., Ltd., Woodstock, Ont.; Ottawa Car Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Ottawa, Ont. (b) The price of the water cart was $232 each. (c) Forty-eight (48) water carts were ordered. (d) The carts were ordered from the Woodstock Wagon and Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Woodstock, Ont.

NOVA SCOTIA HAY COMPRESSING CONTRACTS.

Mr. COPP:

1. Has the Department of Agriculture, as agent for and on behalf of the British government, entered into a contract with any person or persons, firms or corporations for the compressing of hay, at Windsor, or at any other place in the province of Nova Scotia?

2. If so, with what persons or firms, and at what place?

3. What price is being paid said persons or firms for the hay compressed, and at what place or places of delivery?

4. If any such contract has been entered into, was same let by public tender?

5. If tenders were called for, from whom were tenders received, and what was the price given in each tender?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to make arrangements for the compressing of hay either as a Government work or for and on behalf of the British government at Halifax, or at some other point in the province of Nova Scotia on the line of the Intercolonial railway?

7. Has the Department of Agriculture decided to compress hay at Windsor or any other place in the province of Nova Scotia as a Government work?

8. If so, at what place or places will said work be done.

Mr. BURRELL: 1. The Department of Agriculture acts as agent for the British Government in the purchase of various supplies whenever requested. It is undesirable in the public interest to give information on such matters at the present time.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY COAL SUPPLY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

How many tons of coal were stored on December 31, 1915, at the following Intercolonial railway stations: Rivière du Loup, St. Flavie, Lévis, Drummondville and Montréal?

Mr. REID: Rivière du Loup, 8,599 tons; Ste. Flavié (Montjoli), 1,571 tons; Lévis, none; Chaudière Junction, near Lévis, 26,075 tons; Drummondville, 16,508 tons; Montreal, none.

COAL CONTRACTS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the date or dates when contracts were signed with the different coal companies in 1915?

2. What was the price awarded to each company?

3. What were the quantities allotted to each company?

4. Were any contracts awarded in 1915 for the delivery of coal by water?

5. If so, to what companies, what amount, what price, and what was the date of said contracts?

Mr. REID:

1. No regular contracts were signed with the companies. The orders were given by letter and the dates of the orders are shown below, the only exception being a contract with The Valley Camp Coal Company, dated June 9, 1915, for 100,000 tons, more or less.

2 and 3.

Company.	Date of order.	Prices.	Quantity.
Dominion Coal Co	April 28	$3.25	130,000 tons.
		3.00	
	June 9	1.75	60 to 100 tons weekly.
	October 2	3.70	5,000 tons.
	November 2	3.00	1,000 tons.
	December 7	3.00	36,000 tons.
Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co	July 13	3.60	32,000 tons.
	July 20	3.65	18,000 tons.
	December 4	4.95	10,000 tons.
	December 7	3.00	36,000 tons.
Colonial Coal Co	April 21	3.00	
		2.50	60,000 tons.
Inverness Railway & Coal Co	May 8	3.10	Requirements at Pt. Tupper
		2.75	and Mulgrave.
	September 10	1.25	As ordered weekly.
		3.02	500 tons.
	December 28	3.10	800 tons weekly.
		2.75	
Intercolonial Coal Mining Co	May 3 and 7	3.25	71,300 tons.
Acadian Coal Co	April 29 and	3.25	110,000 tons.
	May 7	3.00	
		3.10	As required.
Maritime Coal Co	April 29 and	3.25	75,000 tons.
	May 1	3.00	
	Sept. 10	1.50	As required weekly.
Minudie Coal Co	April 29 and	3.20	60,000.
	May 7. June 17	1.55	As required weekly.
E. Long	May 7	3.20	30 tons weekly.
L. C. Betts	July 23	3.20	30 tons weekly.
Atlantic Coal Co	April 30 and May 7	3.20	50 tons weekly.
M. F. Keith	May 7 and 30	3.20	120 tons weekly.
Minto Coal Co	June 22 and July 9	3.15	20,000 tons.
G. H. King	May 7 and July 22	3.20	As ordered.
Northfield Coal Co	May 7 and Aug. 16	3.20	As ordered.
Rothwell Coal Co	May 7 and June 22	3.20	As ordered.
H. Welton	May 7 and June 22	3.20	As ordered.
A. G. Robinson	June 7, 1915	3.15	As ordered.
Valley Camp Coal Co	June 1, 1915	4.50	3,000 tons.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Co	November 9, 1915	3.08	127,000 tons.

4 and 5.

Water Coal.

Company.	Date of Order.	Prices.	Quantity.
Intercolonial Coal Mining Co.	May 3 and 7	$4.05	18,700 tons.
		2.70	
Dominion Coal Co.	October 2	3.55	15,000 tons.
Acadia Coal Co.	November 26	3.35 and freight.	30 tons.
Valley Camp Coal Co.	June 9, Nov. 9 and Dec. 7	3.08	130,000 tons.
		3.00	
		2.93	
	October 8	3.63	700 to 800 tons.
	November 2	2.18	15,000 tons.

Hard Coal.

Company	Date of Order	Prices	Quantity.
Buckley Coal & Contracting Co.	Aug. 14	$7 25	120 tons.
George E. Full	Aug. 16	7.35	120 tons
J. S. Gibbon & Co.	Aug. 16	6.75	700 tons.
Valley Camp Coal Co.	October 12	6.60	3,000 tons.
Hudson Coal Co.	October 12	6.75	600
Archer Coal Co.		8.00	Ordered from time to time in small quantities as required.
Head & Shannon		10.10	
D. E. Adams		8.00	Ordered from time to time in small quantities as required.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many tons of coal were purchased by the Intercolonial railway in the province of Nova Scotia from the 1st of April to the 31st of December. 1915?

2. How much was purchased from each of the coal companies in Nova Scotia, and at what price in each case?

Mr. REID:

1. 447,154½ tons.

	Tons.	
2. Dominion Coal Co.	6,280½	$3 70
	13,902	3 55
	70,910¾	3 25
	29¼	3 15
	35,294	3 00
	358¼	1 85
	1,501	1 75
Colonial Coal Co.	10,797½	3 00
	26,900½	2 50
Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co.	351¾	4 95
	377¾	3 65
	32,000	3 60
	28½	3 36
	8,256	3 00
Inverness Coal Co.	26,622	3 10
	361¾	3 02
	1,760¾	2 75
	2,552	1 25
Acadia Coal Co.	16,455½	3 25
	1,227¾	3 10
	33,944½	3 00
Intercolonial Coal Co.	41,981	3 25
Maritime Coal Co.	68,478¾	3 25
	5,584	3 00
	940¼	1 75
	3,174	1 50
	30¾	1 35
Minudie Coal Co.	32,315½	3 20
	25¼	2 95
	2,358	1 55
	904	1 65
L. C. Betts	184¼	3 20
Atlantic Coal Co.	1,266¾	3 20

M. G. ARCHIBALD.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Is there an officer of the C.A.M.C. in Kamloops, B.C., named M. G. Archibald?

2. If so, what is his rank and rate of pay?

3. Is he paid for full time, or fees for services rendered?

4. Is the Department aware that he is continuing his private practice?

5. Is the Department aware that he fills the following public offices in addition to his military duties: medical health officer for the city of Kamloops, medical inspector of schools, coroner, and provincial health officer?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Yes, medical officer, 102nd Regiment.

2. Captain M. G. Archibald has been employed since August 10, 1914, as medical officer of 102nd Regiment, Rocky Mountain Rangers, and drew pay and allowances of

a lieutenant from August 10, 1914. He was promoted to captain from September 25, 1915, and as he is carrying on a private practice he is only entitled to pay of rank, $3 a day from that date.

3. Pay of rank, $3 a day; no allowances, as he is carrying on a private practice, as per regulations.

4 and 5. Yes.

STEAMER STARLING.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

On what terms, and for what purpose is the steamer Starling hired by the Government of Canada, what is the age and tonnage of the said steamer, and from whom is she chartered?

Mr. HAZEN: $60 per day. Owners to pay for engine room and deck stores, wages and board of crew, and provide board and accommodation for an officer of the Department of the Naval Service. Owners to accept and pay for ordinary marine insurance risk. Department to provide fuel, water, port charges and pilotage and to accept war risk on vessel. Term of charter for minimum period of 3 months and from day to day thereafter as required. Owners to be paid monthly in advance and for any sums paid and not earned department to have lien on ship. Fourteen days' notice of termination of charter to be given. All fittings and alterations necessary to meet the Government's purposes to be removed or restored prior to return at the expense of the Government. The vessel to be returned in her original condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted. Payment to cease if ship should be prevented from performing her duty for more than 24 hours on account of any defect or breakdown. Built 1888. Gross tonnage, 122 tons; net tonnage, 50 tons. Chartered for mine-sweeping and patrol. Chartered from Lockport Cold Storage Company.

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What was the immigration into Canada by nationalities for the calendar years 1914 and 1915?

2. What were the total numbers entered for each of said years at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver and Victoria, respectively?

Mr. ROCHE:

1.

Nationality.	Calendar year 1914.	1915.
African, South	26	13
Albanian	6	..
Argentinian	5	..
Australian	58	25
Austro-Hungarian—		
Austrian, n.e.s.	626	14
Bohemian	132	..
Bukowinian	108	..
Croatian	190	..
Dalmatian	36	..
Galician	49	..
Hungarian, n.e.s.	357	..
Magyar	205	..
Ruthenian	6,504	..
Slovak	40	..
Belgian	1,495	224
Bermudian	4	..
Brazilian	..	2
Bulgarian	4,512	1
Chinese	1,600	82
Cuban	1	1
Dutch	735	182
French	1,568	191
German—		
German, n.e.s.	3,004	34
Bavarian	2	..
Great Britain and Ireland—		
English	35,801	6,672
Irish	3,942	865
Scotch	9,430	1,952
Welsh	706	117
Greek	1,357	124
Hawaiian	18	1
Hindoo	..	1
Hebrew—		
Hebrew, n.e.s.	324	26
" Austrian	218	1
" German	1	..
" Polish	9	..
" Russian	3,727	46
Italian	7,365	365
Jamaican	30	9
Japanese	681	380
Macedonian	149	..
Maltese	20	1
Montenegrin	15	..
Negro	200	36
Newfoundland	356	193
New Zealand	20	23
Persian	8	..
Polish—		
Polish, n.e.s.	189	1
" Austrian	1,509	..
" German	7	..
" Russian	619	6
Portuguese	14	..
Roumanian	442	5
Russian—		
Russian, n.e.s.	6,606	43
Finnish	637	91
Scandinavian—		
Danish	419	163
Icelandic	150	15
Norwegian	967	196
Swedish	1,086	152
Serbian	308	4
Spanish	776	9
Swiss	240	49
Turkish—		
Turkish, n.e.s.	60	..
Arabian	4	..
Armenian	57	..
Egyptian	3	..
Syrian	94	6
U.S.A. citizens, via ocean ports	62	11
West Indian	382	36
From the United States	68,659	36,098
Totals	168,930	48,446

2.

Port.	Calendar year 1914.	1915.
Halifax	22,056	1,425
St. John	8,532	1,697
Quebec	49,431	6,168
Vancouver	1,439	118
Victoria	1,246	477

Arrivals are classed according to port at which they enter the Dominion, consequently, inland points have no immigration arrivals credited to them

LT.-COL. ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Does Armand Lavergne, M.P.P. of Quebec, still retain his rank as a Colonel in the militia of Canada?

2. Does the Government intend to allow him to retain his rank in the militia?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Lieut.-Colonel A. R. Lavergne holds the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Canadian militia, commanding the 61st Montmagny Regiment of Canadian militia.

2. The Government's course in the matter is governed by the provisions of the Militia Act, the relevant section of which, section 74, is as follows:

"The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's Regulations, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of Canada for the government of the Militia."

"2. Every officer and man of the militia shall be subject to such Acts, regulations and laws,—

"(a) from the time of being called out for active service;

"(b) during the period of annual drill or training under the provisions of this Act,—

"(c) at any time while upon military duty or in the uniform of his corps or within any rifle range or any armoury or other place where arms, guns, ammunition or other military stores are kept, or within any drill shed or other building or place used for militia purposes;

"(d) during any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present in the ranks;

"(e) when going to or from the place of drill or parade; and

"(f) at any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present as a spectator whether in uniform or not."

"3. Officers and men of the permanent force and members of the permanent staff of the militia shall at all times be subject to military law."

PORTSMOUTH PENITENTIARY—TRANSFER OF INSANE CONVICTS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When were the insane convicts removed from Portsmouth penitentiary to Guelph?

2. What salary was paid to Dr. Phelan for each of the months from April to December, 1915?

3. How much is paid per week for the care of each insane convict sent from the penitentiary to Guelph?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. July 14, 1915.

2. The usual salary, namely, $225 per month.

3. Five dollars.

PORTSMOUTH PENITENTIARY—CONVICT GOWAN.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Was convict Gowan sent to Guelph on the removal of the insane convicts from the penitentiary?

2. Was he liberated by the order of officials at Portsmouth penitentiary two years before the expiration of his term?

3. Was he re-arrested? If so, was he returned to the penitentiary or to Guelph?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Yes, and returned to Kingston penitentiary,—the Guelph authorities having pronounced him sane when discharged.

PORTSMOUTH PENITENTIARY SURGEONS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When did Dr. Phelan cease acting as surgeon at Portsmouth penitentiary?

2. Was he dismissed or did he resign?

3. Was he asked to resign?

4. Was he given a gratuity? If so, how much?

5. Is he to receive an annual pension? If so, how much?

6. Who have been appointed as surgeons of Portsmouth penitentiary, and what are their respective duties and salaries?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. December 31, 1915.

2. He was retired on superannuation, his office having been abolished.

3. No.

4. No.

5. Yes. $1,512 per annum.

6. Dr. Robert Hanley and Dr. W. T. Connell have been appointed joint surgeons, the former as attending surgeon at a salary of $860 per annum, and the latter as consulting surgeon at a salary of $500 per annum.

RIGAUD-POINTE FORTUNE MAIL ROUTE.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the names of the tenderers for the contract for the carrying of letters, etc., in the rural mail boxes that have been set up between Rigaud and Pointe Fortune, and what is the amount asked by each of them?

2. Who obtained the said contract and for what amount?

3. What are the names of the tenderers for the contract for the carrying of letters, etc., in

the rural mail boxes that have been set up in other parts of the parish of Rigaud, and what is the amount asked by each of them?

4. Who obtained the said contract and for what amount?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Rigaud Rural Route No. 1:—Hilaire Seguin, $495; Adelard Belisle, $599; Hilaire Seguin, $600; Arthur Larocque, $600; J. Hector Chevrier, $650; Elphege Mallette, $650; L. J. N. Chevrier, $747; Napoleon Seguin, $850.

2. Hilaire Seguin, at $495 per annum.

3. Rigaud Rural Route No. 2:—Joseph Cholette, $595; Edmond Lalonde, $700; Joseph Cholette, $700; Onesiphore Mallette, $723; Pierre Chevrier, $748; L. J. N. Chevrier, $820; Hector Blais, $850; Napoleon Seguin, $900.

4. Joseph Cholette, at $595 per annum.

BERLIN, ONT., REGISTRAR OF ALIENS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Did the Minister of Justice receive a petition from the city council of Berlin, Ontario, in May or June, 1915, praying for the appointment of a registrar of aliens for the city of Berlin, Ontario?

2. What action, if any, has been taken in regard to the said petition?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes, dated May 18, 1915.

2. Upon investigation the conditions at Berlin did not appear to warrant the maintenance of a registration office, as the chief constable had already been authorized under the proclamation of August 15, 1914, to arrest and detain all suspected aliens. However, on May 21, 1915, Mr. John A. Weir, police magistrate, was also authorized to act under the same proclamation.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. KAY:

1. Is the British Government at present buying any horses in Canada for military purposes? If so, how long have they been buying in Canada?

2. Is the French Government at present buying any horses in Canada for military purposes? If so, how long have they been buying in Canada?

3. Is there any agreement or understanding between the Dominion Government and the British or French Governments as to the number of horses to be bought by the British or French Governments in Canada, or as to the provinces in which they may be purchased? If so, what agreement is there?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. There is a British Remount Commission in Canada but the Government is informed that the commission is not purchasing horses at present. Up to November last a considerable number of horses were purchased in Canada by the British Remount Commission.

2. The Government is informed that the French Government is at present buying horses in Canada for military purposes and that they have been so purchasing for several months past.

3. There is no agreement on the subject but both Governments have been urged to purchase in Canada so far as possible any horses required for military purposes. In the month of August last the Prime Minister conferred with the authorities of the War Office and after some correspondence and discussion succeeded in securing arrangements by which the French Government should in future be permitted to purchase in Canada horses required by that government for military purposes.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. How many horses did the Government buy in Prince Edward Island for military purposes from the 1st August, 1914, to date?

2. What was the total amount paid for these horses, exclusive of commissions, and what did the commissions amount to?

3. What was the average price per horse?

4. What are the names and addresses of the persons who made the purchases, and how many horses did each of the buyers purchase?

5. Were the horses purchased in Prince Edward Island found to be suitable and satisfactory?

6. What was the average price paid for horses purchased in the other provinces of Canada, and were they found to be suitable and satisfactory?

7. What was the total number of horses purchased by the Government in Canada for military purposes from 1st August, 1914, to date?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. 115 horses.

2. Total cost, $20,068. No commissions were paid by the Government.

3. Average price per horse $174.50.

4. Mr. W. S. McKie, Charlottetown, 99 horses; Major E. C. Thurston, Sydney, N.S., 2 horses; Lt. N. J. Barry, Ottawa, 14 horses.

5. Yes.

6. Average price $167.29. Yes.

7. Total number of horses purchased by the Government in Canada since 1st August, 1914, to date, 24,672.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many horses have been bought in Canada by the Dominion Government for military purposes from the outbreak of the war up to November 30, 1915, and what was the average price paid?

2. How many horses have been bought by the Government of Canada for military purposes between November 1 and November 30, 1915, and what was the average price paid?

3. Is the Government buying any horses at the present time for military purposes?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Total number of horses purchased from outbreak of war to November 30, 1915, 24,672. The average price paid was $167.29.

2. None.

3. No.

INTEREST ON SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce during the present Session of Parliament legislation for the purpose of fixing the rate of interest on deposits in the post office and other Government savings banks?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. The Governor-in-Council has power under existing legislation to fix from time to time the rate of interest referred to, not exceeding four per cent.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce during the present Session of Parliament legislation for the purpose of fixing the rate of interest on savings deposits payable by the banks, under the Bank Act, at not less than four per cent?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

Existing conditions would not, in the view of the Government, warrant or justify the enactment of such legislation.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What amount of money has been expended on the Hudson Bay railway project up to January 1, 1916?

2. What amount has been expended respectively, on the railway, bridges, and harbour and approaches?

3. How many miles are graded, and on what mileage has steel been laid?

4. When is it expected that the railway portion of the project will be completed?

5. Will the harbour be completed or ready for traffic about the same date?

6. What amounts have been expended respectively by the Railway Department and the Marine Department?

Mr. BLONDIN:

Department of Railways and Canals:

1. $15,465,304.70.

2. Expended on the railway to January 1, 1916, $10,446,592.96, which includes an expenditure to January 1, 1916, upon bridges, trestles and culverts of $683,166.75.

Expended on harbours and approaches by the Department of Railways and Canals up to January 1, 1916, $5,018,711.74, which includes an expenditure to January 1, 1916, upon bridges of $163,012.30.

3. 378 miles graded, steel laid to Mile 242.

4. It is expected that steel will reach Port Nelson early in 1917.

5. It is expected that the harbour will be ready for traffic, though incomplete, about the time that the railway will be ready for operation.

6. $5,018,711.74.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

6. $21,293.96.

SHELL BOXES.

Mr. GERMAN:

1. Has a contract or contracts been awarded to C. W. Burgoyne, of Fenelon Falls, or to Alfred Tiers of the same place, to manufacture shell boxes for the Government?

2. What number of shell boxes are to be manufactured under such contract, and what price is to be paid per box?

3. By whom is such contract or contracts, if awarded, being carried out?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

SHELBURNE PORT PHYSICIAN.

Mr. LAW:

1. Is there a regular port physician at Shelburne, N.S.? If so, what is his name?

2. Is he paid a salary by the Government, or for work performed, or both?

3. How much was he paid for each of the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

4. Will the Government bring down a copy of all accounts paid the said port physician during these years?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. Dr. S. W. Burns.

2. Salary.

3. Dr. Burns was appointed port physician January 1, 1913, at a salary of $100 per annum. He was paid for the fiscal year 1912-13, 3 months, $25; for 1913-14, $100. On March 1, 1915, his salary was increased to $150 per annum, to include treatment of sick mariners at out-port of Sanby point. For the fiscal year 1914-15 he was paid $104.16, being 11 months at the rate of $100 per annum, and one month at the rate of $150 per annum.

4. No accounts paid except salary.

APPLICATION FOR BELL BUOY.

Mr. LAW:

1. Has the Government received a petition from residents of Shelburne county, N.S., asking for a bell buoy on Bantam rock, at the entrance to North East harbour or Cape Negro harbour??

2. If so, does the Government intend to place bell buoy on said rock, and when?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No. An application, however, was received for a bell buoy to mark a rock locally known as Bridget, and evidently that chartered as Budget. This application

was considered by the Lighthouse Board, but the board reported unfavourably.

2. See answer to No. 1.

THE COMMANDEERING OF WHEAT.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How many bushels of wheat were commandeered by the Government in 1915?
2. On whose requisition did the Government act?
3. How many bushels were loaned back to the dealers or operators, and what deposit per bushel was required?
4. How much of said wheat has been shipped from Canada?
5. To whom has such shipment from Canada been made?
6. At what price has such wheat been disposed of?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. 13,621,806.50 bushels.

2. Authority to purchase the wheat was cabled by the Secretary of State for the Colonies on November 23.

3. 8,051,968.10 bushels. Of the wheat loaned from eastern elevators a deposit of 10c per bushel was required. On that which was loaned from terminal elevators no deposit was required, but the bills of lading and the official commandeered wheat certificates were retained until the grain was paid back.

4. 4,296,617.50 bushels.

5. The shipments have been made or are under order to the Committee of the Allies.

6. The wheat is passed on to the Committee of the Allies at the price paid therefor at Fort William, viz., 1 Northern, $1.04 3-4; 2 Northern, $1.03 1-8, and 3 Northern, 98 3-4c.

INSPECTORS OF MUNITIONS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many inspectors of munitions have been appointed since the war began?
2. By whom are those officials appointed?
3. What qualifications are required for these positions?
4. Has the Minister of Militia assured himself in all cases, before making the appointment, that the person to be appointed possesses the necessary technical knowledge of the work?
5. Have these appointments been made on the recommendation of the person having the political patronage in the district where they have been employed?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. For Militia Department, four officers on militia contracts.

2. By the Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, on the recommendation of the Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition, for militia work.

3. Those already with some knowledge of inspection duties, or certified mechanical engineers.

4. The Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition, as the technical representative of the hon. the minister, has done so in all cases.

5. No appointments have ever been made on the recommendation of the person having the political patronage in the district where they have been employed; they have been selected for their technical qualifications only.

THE FARMERS BANK.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation during the present session, with a view to reimburse the depositors of the defunct Farmers Bank?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not the intention of the Government to introduce such legislation during the present session.

CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were public tenders called for the construction of a new lighthouse and dwelling on Cape Negro island?
2. If so, in what papers were the advertisements published?
3. Who were the tenderers for this contract, and what was the amount of each tender?
4. To whom was the contract awarded, and at what price?
5. Who was the inspector on said work, how much per day did he receive, and what was the total amount paid him for his services?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Tenders asked by posters.
3. D. C. Mulhall, $15,900.
4. D. C. Mulhall, $11,200.
5. Samuel K. Greenwood, four per cent of contract price, $448.

THE AMERICAN VESSEL STARLING.

Mr. LAW:

1. Was the American vessel, Starling, entered for duty at Shelburne, N.S., during years 1915 or 1916? If so, on what date?
2. What valuation was placed on said vessel, and on what price was the duty paid thereon?
3. Did said vessel receive a crew register? If so, what is the number?
4. What is her gross tonnage?
5. What is her registered tonnage?
6. When was said vessel built, and where?
7. Who is the registered owner or owners of said vessel?
8. Have any negotiations passed between any person or persons and the Government in respect to a proposed charter of said vessel to the Government?
9. If so, for what service, and at what price?
10. What was the date of said charter, with

whom is said charter partly made, and when is vessel to be taken over by the Government?

11. How long does the Government expect to employ said vessel?

12. Will the Government bring down all correspondence relative to chartering of said vessel?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. (Customs): The American vessel Starling was entered for duty at Shelburne, N.S., December 18, 1915, and was appraised for duty purposes in the usual manner.

2. It is not usual to give information as to the value of individual importations entered at the Custom House.

3. (Marine): The official number of the ship's certificate of registry is 134,177. The Registrar of Shipping registered this vessel under a misapprehension of his instructions and the matter is receiving attention.

4. 121·58 tons.

5. 50·43 tons.

6. 1888; East Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

7. The Lockport Cold Storage Company, Ltd.

8. Yes.

9. Patrol and Minesweeping Service; $60 per day.

10. 11th January, 1916. Lockport Cold Storage Company; 7th January, 1916.

11. For a minimum period of three months.

12. There are no objections to bringing down this correspondence.

MAHONE BAY-MARTIN'S BROOK MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What persons recently tendered for the mail contract service between Mahone Bay and Martin's Brook, Lunenburg County, N.S.?

2. What was the amount of the respective tenders?

3. To whom was the contract awarded, and at what amount?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1 and 2. This service is performed under two contracts: (a) Mader's cove and Mahone bay; (b) Mader's cove and Martin brook. Tenders received for Mader's cove and Mahone bay: Harris W. Ham, $79.50; Penney Bros., $93; Abel Lohnes, $95; Charles W. Joudrey, $234; A. Essenhaur, $250.40. Tenders received for Mader's cove and Martin brook: Harris W. Ham, $53.50; Penney Bros., $62.40; Charles W. Joudrey, $62.40; A. Essenhaur, $70.20; Abel Lohnes, $80.

3. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer in each case.

SHELBURNE FISHERY GUARDIAN.

Mr. LAW:

1. Is Joseph Nickerson, of Port LaTour, a fishery guardian in the county of Shelburne, N.S.? If not, when did he resign?

2. What salary was paid him while in office, and on what date was he last paid such salary?

3. Who is his successor, and what salary does he receive?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No. He left the district about August 1.

2. $1.50 per day for such days as his services were required. He received $42 for twenty-eight days' services.

3. George L. Nickerson, of Port Latour, who is paid at the same rate as his predecessor.

CAPTAIN JOHN BATEMAN.

Mr. LAW:

1. Is Captain John Bateman of Patrol Boat Service in Shelburne county, N.S., still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity?

2. What salary per month did he receive during 1915?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. Officer in charge of patrol boat B.

2. $75 per month when the boat is in commission, he paying his own living expenses, and half pay the remainder of the time.

CAPTAIN CHARLES BLADES.

Mr. LAW:

1. Is Captain Charles Blades, of Patrol Boat Service in Shelburne county, N.S., still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity?

2. What was his salary during 1915?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. Officer in charge patrol boat F.

2. $75 per month when the boat was in commission, he paying his own living expenses, and half pay the remainder of the time.

CAPTAIN WILLIAM ROSS.

Mr. LAW:

1. Is Captain William Ross, at present of Cape Negro, N.S., formerly captain of SS. Winchester, still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity?

2. What wages were paid him per month during 1915, and how many months was he paid during said year?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. William Ross is serving in the Royal Canadian Navy as Chief Warrant Officer.

2. Pay, $80 per month, twelve months.

SALE OF WAR STAMPS.

Mr. SMTH:

What is the percentage paid postmasters for the sale of war stamps?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Under consideration. No payments will be made under this heading until next fiscal year, this year's revenue serving as the basis for postmasters' salaries next year.

WESTERN, N.S., FISHERY INSPECTOR.

Mr. LAW:

1. Who is Fishery Inspector for Western Nova Scotia?

2. When did Ward Fisher, Fishery Inspector, resign, who is his successor in office, and what salary does he receive for such services?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Ward Fisher.

2. Answered by No. 1.

SHELBURNE FISHERY GUARDIANS.

Mr. LAW:

1. What are the names of the Fishery Guardians for the county of Shelburne for the year ending March 31st, 1915, and how much was paid each one for his services during that year?

2. What are the names of the Fishery Guardians for Shelburne County, N.S., at the present time?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. John Nichol, $50; R. McKay, $50; Wm. MacLean, $30; Freeman Hagar, $50; R. E. Hagar, $30; Chas. Towner, $25; John J. Ryer, $40; H. Smith (resigned, October 13), $40; B. O. Bower, $40; Oliver Goodick, $40; S. Smith, $40; John McKay, $40; R. Firth, $40; J. F. Farrington, $258; Geo. Longhurst, $404.25; H. C. Dash, $156.60; J. E. Gross, $122.40; W. E. Decker, $25; D. P. Swim, $25; F. Poole, $25; V. Brannen, $462; H. L. Shand, $462; B. H. Smith, $462; David Atwood, $412.50; J. E. Smith, $390; John Nickerson, $255; H. Swaine, $152; P. A. Stoddart, 647.50; Judah Nickerson, $384; J. M. Davis, $50; total, $3,677.

2. John Nichol, R. M. McKay, Wm. McLean, Freeman Hagar, Robert E. Hagar, Chas.. Towner, John J. Ryer, Clifford Harris (in place H. Smith); B. O. Bower, Oliver Goodick, S. Smith, John McKay, R. Firth, J. F. Farrington, Geo. Longhurst, H. C. Dash, J. E. Gross, W. E. Decker, D. P. Swim, F. Poole, V. Brannen, H. L. Shand, B. H. Smith, David Atwood, Jos. W. V. Wilson, (in place of J. E. Smith, deceased); Jos. Nickerson, (in place of John Nickerson); George Nickerson, (in place of Joseph Nickerson); H. Swaine, P. A. Stoddart, Judah Nickerson, J. M. Davis.

[Mr. Hazen.]

RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS OFFICER.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Did the honourable the Minister of Customs receive a letter from Mr. L. O. Vallee, of Rimouski, requesting an investigation in connection with his dismissal as Customs officer at Rimouski?

2. If so, does the minister intend to grant him such investigation? If not, why not?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Investigation was made by the Inspector of Customs for the district, and no further investigation is necessary.

LOUISVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. To whom was the contract given to make a cement sidewalk all around and in front of the post-office at Louisville?

2. What was the cost of that cement work?

3. To whom was the contract given for the building of a fence around the post office at Louisville?

4. How much did such fence cost?

5. What has been the total cost of the post office at Louisville, including the land and the repairs that have been made?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 3. Messrs. George Therien and L. Lamy.

2. $584.75, approximately.

4. $896.50, approximately.

5. $33,164.38 to December 22, 1915, including cost of site, $2,700.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. At what date did Mr. T. A. Mousseau cease to be employed as superintendent of the construction work in connection with the construction of the post office at Louisville?

2. What is the total amount that has been paid him for all the time that he was so employed at Louisville?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Services dispensed with on December 29, 1914, but re-employed as required.

2. Services to October 7, 1915, $2,808; outlay, $44.90; commission to November 4, 1915, $22.64; total, $2,875.54.

VICTORIA, B.C., DREDGING.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. How much money has been paid to Messrs. Grant, Smith & Co. in their contract for dredging in Victoria, B.C., harbour, outer wharf?

2. What was the estimate of the Public Works Department when tenders were called for, as to solid rock, and as to mud or dirt?

3. How many cubic yards have been returned on progress or final estimates for solid rock and for mud or dirt?

4. How many cubic yards have been paid for from May 1, 1915, to date, for solid rock and for mud or dirt?

5. What was the contract price for solid rock and mud or dirt?

6. Who was the engineer in charge of the works?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $201,151.67.

2. 4,300 yards of rock, 47,600 yards of mud or dirt.

3. Latest progress estimate received: earth 31,940 cu. yds.; rock, 25,288 cu. yds.

4. Earth, 28,746 cu. yds.; rock, 18,165·7 cu. yds.; rock blasted but not removed, 4,594·5 cu. yds.

5. Earth excavation, 52 cents per cu. yd.; rock excavation, $9.10 per cu. yd.

6. J. S. Maclachlan.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Who supplied coal for the Government dredges Ajax and Mudlark, Victoria, B.C., dur- the years A.D. 1911 and 1912, respectively?

2. What was the contract price and amount delivered in each of said years?

3. Was a contract entered into for the above services services for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914, with J. Kingham & Co.?

4. If so, what was the price per ton in said contract?

5. Was any coal delivered thereunder? If not, why not?

6. From what other persons or firms did the department purchase coal for said services during said fiscal year?

7. What was the price per ton, and the amount purchased?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Fiscal year 1911-12, J. Kingham and Company; 1912-13, J. Kingham and Company.

2. Fiscal year 1911-12. Terms: Delivery alongside dredge, wharf or other place, as may be specified, best lump, $5.50; washed nut, No. 1, $5.00; washed nut, No. 2, $4.50. Deliveries: Dredge Ajax, 1,244 tons at $5.50; 152 tons at $5.00. Mudlark, 657 tons at $5.50.

Fiscal year 1912-13. Terms: Delivery alongside dredge, wharf or other place, as may be specified. Best lump, $5.25; washed nut, $4.75. Deliveries: Dredge Ajax, 1,428 tons at $5.25; 156 tons at $5.50; Mudlark, 5 tons at $6.75; 148 tons at $5.50; 249 tons at $5.25.

3. Yes.

4. Delivered alongside dredge, wharf or other place: Best lump, $5.25; washed nut, $4.75.

5. Yes.

6. Kirk and Company; Victoria Fuel Company.

7. Dredge Mudlark. Kirk and Company, 10 tons at $6.50; 1,205·73 tons at $7.00; 22 tons at $7.50. Victoria Fuel Company (under contract on board dredge), 10 tons at $5.50; 200 tons at $6.00; 10 tons at $6.60. Dredge Ajax. Kirk and Company, 586·16 tons at $7.00; 373·65 tons at $6.25.

FIELD KITCHENS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. How many of the infantry battalions of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces now in France and Belgium are supplied with field kitchens?

2. How many of such field kitchens have provided by public subscription?

3. How many field kitchens provided by public subscription have been accepted by the military authorities of Canada?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. All the infantry battalions of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces now serving in France or Belgium are fully supplied with travelling kitchens.

2 and 3. This is not known, as the supply by public subscription was a private and regimental matter, and did not come before the department.

MAJOR GENERAL LESSARD.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What is the present position of Major General Lessard in connection with the Canadian militia or with the Overseas Expeditionary Forces?

2. Is the Minister of Militia and Defence availing himself of the services of Major General Lessard in connection with the Overseas Expeditionary Forces?

3. Is Major General Lessard going to Europe as an officer of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces or as a civilian?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Inspector-General of Eastern Canada.

2. Yes.

3. For purposes of instruction.

AUSTRIAN AND GERMAN IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

How many persons of Austrian and German nationality have entered Canada from August 1, 1914, up to the present time?

Mr. ROCHE:

Via ocean ports: 173 Austrian, 166 German. From United States of America: 106 Austrian, 61 German. Total: 279 Austrian, 227 German.

Of the Austrian immigration by ocean ports, 154 came during August, 1914, and of the balance since that date, all but six were women or children.

Of the German immigration by ocean ports, 112 came during August, 1914, and of the balance since that date, all but 12 were women or children.

QUEBEC P.O. SUPERINTENDENT.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who has been appointed superintendent of the parcel post branch at the Quebec post office, and what is his salary?

2. When was he appointed, and has he begun his duties?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Dr. Michael Fiset; $2,800 a year.

2. Appointed and reported for duty on the 18th April, 1914.

FISHERIES GUARDIAN, GULF DIVISION.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Has Commandant Wakeham, of the vessel guarding our fisheries, been replaced? If so, by whom?

2. What is the name of the vessel that is to guard our fisheries this year?

3. Has such vessel instructions to visit the coast of the Bay des Chaleurs?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Captain Joseph Chalifour has been temporarily entrusted with the duties of inspector of fisheries for the Gulf division.

2. As in past years, several vessels and boats will be engaged in this service.

3. Bay des Chaleurs will as in past years receive necessary supervision.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY THROUGH LUMBER RATE.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Is there a through rate on lumber from points on the National Transcontinental railway to points on the Canadian Pacific railway, Grand Trunk railway, and the Canadian Northern railway in Quebec and Ontario?

2. If not, when was such rate cancelled, and why?

Mr. REID:

1. There are through rates on lumber from all points on the National Transcontinental railway, east of the St. Lawrence river; also from such points west of the river to Hearst, Ont., inclusive, from which lumber is likely to be shipped to points on the Grand Trunk railway in Quebec and Ontario. No through rates yet arranged to points on either, the Canadian Pacific or Canadian Northern railways in Quebec and Ontario.

2. Answered by No. 1.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY COAL RATES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What is the freight rate on the Canadian Government railways at the present time on coal from the following points, respectively, to Montreal: Sydney, Stellarton, Point Tupper and Springfield?

2. What was the freight rate between the same points on coal in 1911?

Mr. REID:

1. Freight rate, Stellarton to Montreal, $1.90 per ton; Point Tupper to Montreal, $2.30 per ton. No commodity rates in effect at present between Springhill or Sydney and Montreal and no business offered.

2. Coal rates in 1911 to Montreal as follows: Springhill, $1.80; Stellarton, $1.80; Point Tupper, $2.25; Sydney, $2.55.

S.S. STADACONA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the amount paid the Department of Naval Service for the "Stadacona"?

2. When was she purchased?

3. What amount has been expended on her for repairs?

4. Is she now ready and fit for service?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. $70,000.

2. August 4, 1915.

3. Repairs to ship, $31,509.64; wireless equipment, $3,076.80.

4. Ship has been on duty all fall doing efficient work.

BADDECK WHARF.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Was there any wharfage charged at the Government wharf at Baddeck, Nova Scotia, during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

2. If so, from whom was the wharfage collected, and now much from each one?

3. Is there any authority issued by the department to collect wharfage at the above wharf? If so, who has such authority, and what is the scale of wharfage provided by the department?

4. Do the following steamers pay for the use of the Government wharf at Baddeck; the Blue Hill, the Mariner, the Seal, the Scotsburn? If so, how much for the season?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, during the years 1913, 1914 and 1915.

2. See attached statement (filed with Clerk of the House).

3. Wharfage is collected in accordance with the provisions of chapter 112, Revised Statutes, "An Act respecting the Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters." See page 7 of attached regulations. (Filed with Clerk of the House.)

4. Yes.

	1913.	1914.	1915.
Marion	39 60	36 00	22 50
Blue Hill	71 40	74 70	57 00
Seal..	9 00	6 60	6 60
Scotsburn		5 60	80

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPHS, VICTORIA COUNTY.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Were there any new Government telegraph lines built in Victoria county during the years 1913, 1914 and 1915? If so, where, and what was the length of such line or lines?

2. Were there any telegraph poles purchased for new lines in Victoria during the years above mentioned? If so, from whom, and at what price?

3. Are all the telegraph poles purchased in the county of Victoria during the above years paid for?

4. When were such poles ordered by the department, what are the names of the persons or parties who were authorized to buy these poles, the names of persons from whom they were purchased, and prices paid to such persons?

5. Who was the paymaster of the department in connection with the above work and procuring of said poles?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes, line built from Little Narrows to within four miles of Washabuck Centre in 1912, completed in 1914. Poles for the above were purchased from Neil P. McLean, 153; from John D. McRitchie, 110, and from Murdoch McAskill, 165, at seventy-five cents each. In 1915, seven miles of loop line from South Gut to Munroes Point, and four miles extension from Washabuck Centre to Grass Pond.

2. Yes, for the above eleven miles and for repairs from N. McAuley, 150; J. Morrison, 160; D. D. McLeod, 90; A. W. McNeil, 120; and from N. A. McNeil, 186, at $1 each.

3. Yes.

4. The above seven hundred and six poles were ordered by the late J. G. Dunlop, general line repairer, without any authority from headquarters.

5. Work of construction paid for in 1914 by D. C. Dawson, district superintendent, and in 1915 by C. W. McKee, acting district superintendent. Poles were paid for by cheque from the department .

I.C.R. SLEEPERS.

Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. Did Messrs. Stewart and Culligan receive a contract or an order from the Government to supply sleepers for the Intercolonial railway?

2. If so, what prices were paid to these gentlemen for Nos. 1, 2 and 3?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. No. 1, 44 cents; No. 2, 36 cents; No. 3, 24 cents.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY DIVISIONS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any orders been given for the management of the various divisions of the Canadian Government railways or the creation of a new division or divisions?

2. If so, what are the changes made in that respect?

Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

RIVER JOHN CUSTOMS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the sub-collector of customs at River John, Pictou county?

2. When was he appointed?

Mr. REID:

1. Charles T. Gammon is acting sub-collector of customs at River John, Pictou county.

2. He was employed August 1, 1915.

RURAL MAIL, PICTOU.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many rural mail services have been established in the county of Pictou during the years 1914 and 1915?

2. What was the extra cost of those services in each year respectively, and the services previously given in the districts served?

3. How many post offices have been closed as the result of the new rural services, and what are the names of such offices?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Rural mail service established in 1914, 1; in 1915, 13.

2. Extra cost of service established in 1914, nil; in 1915, $4,022.74.

3. Number of post offices closed, 25: Abercrombie, Abercrombie Pier, Central West River, Churchville, Cross Roads, Roger's Hill, Elmfield, Granton, Green Hill, Heathbell, Hedgeville, Iron Rock, Island East River, Lime Rock, Loch Broom, Lovat, Lower Barneys River, Mountain Road, Mount William, Pleasant Valley, Ponds, St. Paul's, Silvester, Upper Elmfield, Upper Scotsburn, Welsford.

PICTOU TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Is it the intention of the Government to provide telephonic communication between Pictou Island and the mainland?

Mr. ROGERS: No steps are being taken to provide telephone communication between the island and the mainland.

PICTOU ISLAND LIFE BOAT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any request been made to the Department of Marine as to changing the site of the life-boat station at Pictou Island?

2. Is it the intention of the department to make a change in said site? If so, to what point?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.

2. No.

BIG ISLAND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any petitions or requests been received by the department relative to giving

additional mail service to Big Island, Merigomish, Pictou county?

2. If so, does the Department intend to give additional service?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. A petition for a daily mail service was received at the department from Mr. Charles Tanner, M.L.A., on January 28, 1916.

2. The Post Office Inspector has been instructed to inquire into the matter.

WAR PROFITS TAXATION.

Mr. TURRIFF:

Is it the intention of the Government to consider the advisability of following the lead of Great Britain by enacting legislation levying taxation in respect of excess profits over the pre-war standard of profits of any trade or business arising out of war contracts?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Any taxation measures the Government may have to propose to Parliament will be announced, following the usual practice, in the Budget speech.

YARMOUTH PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LAW:

What amount has been spent in the county of Yarmouth, N.S., for public works, wharves, breakwaters and blockings, either for new works or repairs to same, during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, and what were the respective amounts paid for such works?

Mr. ROGERS: $103,394.83, as follows:—

Bluff Head Breakwater—Construction, repairs, 1913-14, $3,367.81; 1914-15, $2,976.27; 1914-15, $199.29; total, $6,543.37.

Chebogue, Town Point wharf:—Repairs, 1913-14, $1,099.57.

Chebogue Harbour Boat Channel, 1915-16, $150.

Chegoggin Breakwater—Construction:—1912-13, $984.05; 1914-15, $2,698.65; total, $3,682.70.

Eel Brook Wharf—Construction, 1912-13, $1,020.50.

Kelly's Cove, Breakwater—repairs, 1912-13, $348.64; construction, 1913-14, $149.93; construction, 1914-15, $9,206.73; repairs, 1914-15, $99.10; repairs, 1915-16, $1,290.22; total, $11,094.62.

East Pubnico Wharf—1914-15, $150.90.

Lower West Pubnico, breakwater—repairs, 1913-14, $775.57.

Middle West Pubnico, wharf—repairs, 1912-13, $399.74.

North Belleville, wharf—1914-15, construction, $210; 1915-16, $815.27; total, $1,025.27.

Port Maitland, breakwater—Construction—1912-13, $200; Repairs, 1913-14, $62.67; 1914-15, $954.59; total, $1,217.26.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Sanford, breakwater — Construction:—1914-15, $3,914.87; repairs, 1914-15, $3,075.12; repairs, 1912-13, $393.83; repairs, 1913-14, $197.41; total, $7,581.23.

Surette's Island, boat channel—1915-16, $148.96.

Tusket Wedge, wharf—Construction:—1912-13, $1,709.81.

Wedgeport, wharf — Repairs: — 1915-16, $297.68.

West Pubnico, wharf—Construction:—1913-14, $1,424.16; repairs, 1915-16, $397.64; total, $1,821.80.

Yarmouth Harbour Improvements.—Dredging, 1912-13, $32,679.60; repairs, 1913-14, $430,27; dredging 1914-15, $4,038.40; construction, 1914-15, $4,227.28; dredging, 1915-16, $10,039.98; construction, 1915-16, $3,673.68; repairs, 1915-16, $1,914.08; total, $57,003.29.

Yarmouth Public Building, including maintenance:—1912-13, $1,952.49; 1913-14, $3,229.45; 1914-15, $2,390.62; total, $7,672.56.

Grand total, $103,394.83.

YARMOUTH DREDGING.

Mr. LAW:

1. What amount was spent for dredging in Yarmouth Harbour during the year 1915?

2. Were tenders called, and what price per cubic yard was paid for same?

Mr. ROGERS: $4,924.21 at Yarmouth Bar at 30 cents a cubic yard, scow measure; $1,466 at Amiros Point at 35 cents a cubic yard, and $3,549.77 at the Gateway Fish Company's wharf, at 30 cents a yard. Work done under agreement.

ADVANCES ON LIVE STOCK.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce any amendments to the Bank Act during the present session?

2. Has the Government received a request from the United Farmers of Alberta asking that the Bank Act be amended, so that small farmers may have the privilege of borrowing at long date from the banks on the security of live stock?

3. If so, what action does the Government purpose taking?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. It is the intention of the Government to introduce an amendment to the Bank Act authorizing advances upon the security of live stock.

2. A request has been received from the United Farmers of Alberta with reference to the matter.

SEPARATION ALLOWANCES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Do the dependents of men enlisted for overseas service receive separation allowance be-

fore these enlisted men are provided for in camp or barracks?

2. Do the dependents of men enlisted for overseas service receive an allowance from the patriotic fund before these enlisted men are provided for in camp or barracks?

3. What is the subsistence allowance of men enlisted for overseas service before they are provided for in camp or barracks?

4. Where men having dependents enlist for overseas service and are billeted, do their dependents receive separation and patriotic fund allowances?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Yes, from date of enlistment; only, instead of calling the money paid to dependents separation allowance, the Paymaster of the unit pays the dependent subsistence allowance of 65 cents a day, which is equivalent to separation allowance of $20 a month, or, in case of a married man, living at his own home, the wife is paid 85 cents a day subsistence instead of 65 cents.

2. Application should be made to the Secretary Canadian Patriotic Fund for this information.

3. Subsistence allowance for men enlisted for overseas service is as follows:

(1) Men living at their own homes if (a) married men; (b) widowers with children under sixteen years of age; (c) single men if the sole support of widowed mothers; 85 cents a day to be paid by Regimental Paymaster to the wife, guardian or widowed mother.

(2) Married men not living at their own homes, also widowers and single men under classes (b) and (c) above; 65 cents a day to be paid by Regimental Paymaster to wife, guardian or widowed mother, and the soldier himself if quartered in government buildings, etc., will receive rations in kind the same as unmarried men under clause 4, or, if billeted, then to be rationed under arrangements by the Units concerned at a total cost not exceeeding 60 cents per diem.

(3) Unmarried men if billeted in villages, etc., whether living in their own homes or not. To be rationed under arrangements made by the units concerned at a total cost not exceeding 60 cents per diem. This payment covers cost of board and lodging, washing, etc.

(4) Unmarried men if quartered in government buildings or free quarters provided by local authorities, etc. To be issued with rations.

4. Answered by 1, 2 and 3, i.e., when billeted the dependent receives a subsistence allowance of 65 cents a day, which is equivalent to separation allowance.

HERRING FISHERY AT SOURIS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Did the Government, or any department thereof, carry on an inquiry into the Herring Fishing at Souris, P.E.I., last summer?

2. If so, what was the object of the inquiry, and what results were obtained.

3. How many professors or doctors of science were employed in this inquiry, and what is the name, address and nationality of each, and what salary or wages did each receive?

4. Has the inquiry been closed or is it still going on? If so, what is it costing per day, per week or per month?

5. How many men were employed all told in connection with the inquiry, and what was the wage or salary of each, per day, per week or per month?

6. How many steamers were employed in connection with the inquiry, what was the total number of men employed on board said steamers and the cost per day, per week or per month?

7. Were any buildings, parts of buildings or other property rented at Souris in connection with this inquiry?

8. If so, to whom did such property belong, and what rents were paid?

9. Was any property bought for purposes of this inquiry?

10. If so, to whom did it belong, what was paid for it, and what became of it?

11. What is the total cost of the inquiry up to date?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Two objects: (a) to determine the seasonal movements of herring schools in our Atlantic waters; (b) to decide the cause of the seasonal fluctuations in our herring supply. Final report of investigation now in course of preparation.

3. Five: Dr. Johan Hjort, Norwegian, Bergen, Norway, $300 per month; Dr. Paul Bjerkan, Norwegian, Bergen, Norway, $125 per month; Professor A. Willey, Canadian, McGill University, no salary; Dr. Huntsman, Canadian, Toronto University, $200 per month; Dr. J. A. Mavor, Canadian, Toronto University (now at Madison, Wisconsin), $200 per month.

4. The inquiry is closed.

5. One technical employee, Captain Iversen, Norwegian, Bergen, Norway, $250 per month, and boy assistant, Casimir Marcon, paid $16 for season.

6. One herring drifter No. 33, having a crew of 5, at a total cost per month of $327.50 for April and May, 1915, and $560 per month in June and July, when the crew consisted of 10 men. Two steamers, D.G.S. Princess and D.G.S. Acadia, assisted while engaged in their ordinary duties, without cost to the investigation.

7. Yes.

8. (a) Augustus MacDonald, Souris, at $13.33 per month; (b) A. L. Fraser, Souris, $25 for the period the building was in use.

9. No.

10. Answered by No. 9.

11. $17,112.77.

SUPPLIES FOR TROOPS IN CANADA.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What procedure is followed to obtain supplies for the troops at local headquarters?

2. Are tenders asked for by public advertisement, or is there a patronage list, and are the parties whose names are on the patronage list asked to submit offers?

3. Is there a patronage list for Prince Edward Island?

4. If so, who prepared the list for the Government, what are the names and addresses of the parties on the list, and who recommended these names to the Government or the purchasing commtitee?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. The practice followed in making contracts for supplies to the troops at the various mobilization centres throughout Canada varies according to circumstances. If there is time enough before the supplies are required, tenders are called for by public advertisement, usually by posters put up in and about the town where the troops are to be stationed. When the time is too short to allow this to be done, tenders are obtained by circular letter or telegram from Ottawa, addressed to dealers of the locality concerned. Names of dealers are supplied by War Purchasing Committee. In some cases where the time is very short, the officer commanding the district is authorized to procure tenders from local concerns and transmit them, by mail or telegraph, to Ottawa for approval. No application from responsible parties for permission to tender is refused; and tender forms and necessary information are supplied to all such applicants. In all cases, the lowest tenders received are accepted.

2. Answered by No 1.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

ANTIGONISH FISHERY OFFICER.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM:

Who was the fishery officer for the county of Antigonish during the past year, and how much has been paid to him for salary and expenses respectively?

Mr. HAZEN: Hugh McDougall, Cross Ponds, Ohio. Salary, $200; disbursements, $254.87.

[Mr. Hazen.]

ANTIGONISH RIVER GUARDIANS.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM:

What are the names of the river guardians who were employed last year in the county of Antigonish, and how much was paid them, respectively, for their services?

Mr. HAZEN: Frank McLean, $35; Thomas McAmis, $20; John McDonald, $30; John J. McLean, $20; Daniel Murphy, $20; Wm. Gordon, $10; Hugh Chisholm, $20; Donald Cameron, $35; Duncan McDonald, $20; John L. McDonald, $20; Alex. McDonald, $15; Ivan Randall, $6; Peter Williams, $20; Alex K. Chisholm, $20; John A. Chisholm, $20; Daniel A. Cameron, $19.40; Archibald Cameron, $2.40; William Landry, $15.40; William Forbes, $10. Total, $358.20.

ANTIGONISH POST OFFICES.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

1. What post offices were closed or dispensed with in Antigonish county since October 6, 1911?

2. What new post offices were established since said date?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Backlands, Frasers Grant, Pomquet River, Rear Caledonia Mills, Usher.

2. Beechwood (re-opened), Cape Jack, Ireland (re-opened), Merland, Rear Caledonia Mills (since closed), Rear Georgeville, Sylvan Valley (re-opened).

PAYMENT OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a special despatch from Ottawa, published in the Toronto Mail and Empire, on November 10, 1915, as follows:

"Will Pay Soldiers' Wages By Cheque.

"Provides an Additional Check on Paymasters and Sheets.

"Special to the Mail and Empire.

"Ottawa, November 9.—All the soldiers are to be paid by cheques in the future. That is the new order to the paymasters, both of the organized units and the paymasters in recruiting offices. The cheques are drawn on the Bank of Montreal, and being Government cheques, no war tax is necessary on them.

"In the past the soldiers have been paid in cash. The change is viewed with favour generally by the paymasters, especially in the cases where the paymaster is also the recruiting officer. It avoids the dangers of mistakes in paying out in cash, but it is understood that the real reason for the change is that the Government may have a closer tab on the pay. This is an additional check on the paymasters and the pay-sheets, as they come into headquarters and the cheques have to correspond. It is claimed that in some parts of Canada there have been grave suspicions about paymasters in recruiting stations which had resulted in the change being made. One game which it is said

has been played is in regard to subsistence allowance. Each soldier is allowed seventy-five cents a day for his maintenance from the time he enlists until he goes into camp where the Government keeps him. This is in addition to the ordinary pay. In some parts of the country where living is not quite so high as it is, far example, in Ottawa, the recruiting officers, it is claimed, have arranged for the men's board in boarding houses at fifty cents or thereabouts a day. The recruiting officer kept the difference between the amount the Government paid and the amount the board came to. It has been the custom practically everywhere for the recruiting officers to pay the soldier's board and keep it out of the pay, instead of paying the soldier and letting him pay the board bill. The reason was that sometimes the board bill would not be paid, and there was trouble all round. The recruiting officer stands good for the board when the soldier enlists until the first pay."

2. What amount of money was mis-appropriated as alleged in the above despatch?

3. Was the amount so mis-appropriated, recovered by the Government?

4. Were the guilty parties punished? If so, what punishment was inflicted?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The statement of the Mail and Empire is very much exaggerated. There was no loss to the department or the public, as all cases of such nature were adjusted and refunds made, but with the view of preventing any abuse or worry to the Pay Branch of the Militia Department the system of pay-check was adopted. In no instance, however, was fraud proven. In every case where subsistence was charged at lower prices than those allowed by regulations, these differences were absorbed and credited to regimental funds, and in no case was the money appropriated for personal use. Therefore, it was a very easy matter for the department to adjust these accounts.

ASSISTANT RECEIVER GENERAL, REGINA.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

When will the office of the Assistant Receiver General be opened in Regina?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

The office in question will not be opened until the building acquired for the purpose has been remodelled and proper vault accommodation provided. At present it is not regarded as expedient that the expenditure involved should be made as there is no immediate urgency for the establishment of the office.

DR. H. H. ELLIOTT.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. Is Dr. H. H. Elliott employed by the Customs Department at Le Pas, Manitoba?

2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

3. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the said Dr. Elliott acts as town clerk of Le Pas at a salary of $1,500 per annum, and is also said to be secretary of the Board of Trade at Le Pas at a salary of $500 per annum?

4. Is the said Dr. Elliott supposed to devote all his time to the duties of the position he holds from the Customs Department?

5. Is it the policy or intention of the Government to allow their officials to hold other positions at remunerative salaries, and at the same time continue in receipt of an annual salary from the Government as well?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. As sub-collector, salary, $2,400 a year.

3. The Government is aware that Dr. Elliott has acted as town clerk and secretary of the Board of Trade at Le Pas, but has no information as to the salaries received by him in these positions.

4. Dr. Elliott should devote his time to customs duties during customs hours.

5. It has been the practice of the Department of Customs to permit customs officers in special cases to hold other positions which do not interfere with their duties as customs officers

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the purchase by the Government of the several parcels of land now comprised in the Experimental Farm at Rosthern, Saskatchewan.—Mr. McCraney.

For a copy of all affidavits, letters, telegrams and other correspondence during the years 1914 and 1915 in reference to the S.E. 7-1-13 West 2nd Meridian, now the 160-acre homestead of Frank Strubell, between the Department of the Interior or the Minister, or any officer of the department and the land office at Weyburn and Estevan, and with all parties who endeavoured to secure or assisted in securing homestead entry for the said land.—Mr. Turriff.

For a return showing the names of all employees of the Government of Canada in the inside and outside service who have enlisted since the 4th day of August, 1914, for overseas service; and the names of all employees of the Government of Canada in the inside and outside service who have enlisted since the 4th day of August, 1914, for home defence; also the salary received by each previous to enlisting; and the rate of pay received by each since enlisting; specifying those, if any, who continue to enjoy the salaries paid them before their enlistment and the amount of same.—Mr. Kyte.

For a return showing the names and addresses of members of the House of Commons and of the various provincial legislatures in Canada who are in the service of the Department of Militia and Defence either in Canada or overseas; the official rank and rate of pay of each; the names of those who are now in Canada; the names of those who are in England, and the names of those who are or have been in active service at any of the battle fronts.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams, pay-sheets, pay-rolls, receipts and documents of all kinds whatsoever in connection with the extension or repairs on the public breakwater at Port Morien, in South Cape Breton, during 1915.—Mr. Carroll.

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and documents of all kinds whatsoever in connection with the tenders and awarding of the contract for carrying the mails between the tram cars and the post office at Glace Bay, South Cape Breton.—Mr. Carroll.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, or other communications sent to the Government or any member or department thereof before August 15, 1914, pointing out the necessity of granting relief to the settlers in the drouth-stricken area of Alberta.—Mr. Buchanan.

For a copy of all letters, tenders, advertisements, posters, telegrams and of other documents in connection with the letting of the contract for conveying the mails between Medicine Hat and Eagle Butte, in the constituency of Medicine Hat, Alberta.—Mr. Buchanan.

For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents regarding the proposed public building in Prince Rupert for post office and other purposes, and regarding the land proposed for such public building and the purchase of such land.—Mr. Knowles.

For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, recommendations and other documents in connection with the Government's decision in September, 1915, to exact payment of one-half of the seed grain liens.—Mr. Knowles.

For a copy of all documents, letters, messages, correspondence and reports concerning the contract for carrying the mails between the post office at Saint Jean, P.Q., and the railway stations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Vermont Central Railway Company since and during the year 1911.—Mr. Demers.

For a return showing all the employees in the inside service of the Department of Inland Revenue, their names and Christian names, and their respective salaries in 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915-16. Also of all the employees in the outside service of the same department, their names, Christian names and respective salaries for 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915-6. A statement of the services for which these latter were employed, and of the services in which they were employed, and the number of dismissals and appointments since 1911.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a copy of the investigation held from 1911 to 1913 concerning the loss of a horse, at Lac au Saumon, on the Intercolonial railway, by J. S. Théberge.—Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all Orders in Council passed since August 4, 1914, dealing with members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in the following particulars: Pensions to partially or totally disabled soldiers or their dependents; money allowances or other provision made for the support or care of partially or totally disabled returned soldiers; and pay allowances or other consideration to dependents of soldiers while on active service, and after their return from active service, because of disablement from any cause.—Mr. Oliver.

[Mr Kyte.]

For a copy of all correspondence, memorials, letters and telegrams received by the Hon. Postmaster General or the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, in 1915, relating to the contract for carrying the mails between Roberta, in the county of Richmond, and West Bay, in the county of Inverness, N.S., and also of all replies thereto.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and memorials received by the Hon. Postmaster General or the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, since January 1, 1912, relating to the contract for carrying the mail across Lemon ferry in the county of Richmond, N.S., and also of all replies thereto.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of the report of the investigation held in connection with the burning of the barn of George Lavoie, a farmer at Bic, on the 23rd May, 1914.—Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all reports upon the depths of water in the different locks in the East River of Pictou, improvements, and of all correspondence and recommendations in regard to changes on the plans therefor.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a return showing the names of all medical officers employed and designated in the years 1914 and 1915 in the examination of recruits in the county of Pictou, and of any changes in the list of said officers in said period.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, papers, evidence, reports and all other documents relating to the investigation into certain alleged irregularities in the weighing of freight on the Intercolonial railway at Stellarton and New Glasgow in 1914 and 1915, and the dismissal of Arthur McLean in connection therewith.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and agreements between the Department of Railways and Canals, and any official thereof, including the officials of the Intercolonial railway, regarding the installation of the McQueen siding, so-called, at Shediac, in the province of New Brunswick, and the subsequent removal thereof.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all documents, papers and telegrams in any way referring to the application of Aenas McKinnon, of Iron Mines, Inverness county, for the Fenian Raid Veteran bounty.—Mr. A. W. Chisholm.

For a copy of all documents, letters and petitions in the possession of the Railway Department relating to the dismissal of Wm. P. Mills, bridge and building master of District No. 4, Intercolonial railway; and also a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and documents of all kinds in the possession of the Government, either in Ottawa or at Moncton, relating in any way to the application of said Wm. P. Mills for an investigation into the causes which led to his dismissal.—Mr. A. W. Chisholm.

For a copy of the report of the investigation held in the case of Messrs. Nazaire Morin and Napoléon Hébert, of Ste. Florence, county of Matane, bearing the number 10083 of the records of Mr. Alward of Moncton.—Mr. Boulay.

For copies of all telegrams, letters, petitions, correspondence and other documents whatsoever relating to the post office and the postmaster of the parish of St. Esprit, in the county of Montcalm, from October, 1911, to the present day.—Mr. Séguin.

For a copy of all petitions, letters, papers, telegrams, tenders and other documents relating to the establishment of rural mail route from

Scotsburn to North Scotsburn, Rogers Hill and Hardwood Hill, and as to the closing of any post offices on said route.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters and other documents relative to the appointment of Mr. Price as assistant superintendent of the Oxford and New Glasgow division of the Government railways, and as to his retirement therefrom, and the appointment of Mr. Rufus Martin in his stead.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, agreements and all other papers relative to the creation of a Board of Conciliation, during the year 1915, under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act in regard to the employees of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, in the county of Pictou.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other papers relative to the granting of a Conciliation Board to the employees of the Acadia Coal Company, in the county of Pictou, in the autumn of 1915.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, directions and other documents relative to the surveys for a railway under the Railway Department, which have been carried on during the past summer, points east and west from Sunnybrae, in the county of Pictou.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all tenders, letters, telegrams and contracts relative to a mail contract from Noel to Maitland, in the county of Hants, and relative to the awarding of the same under contract.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, including tenders, relating to the establishment of a rural mail route between Pictou and West River, in the county of Pictou. —Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, including tenders, relating to the establishment of the rural mail route from Eureka to Sunnybrae and return, in the county of Pictou.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, including tenders, relating to the mail contract from Tatamagouche to New Annan and Tatamagouche Mountain, in the county of Colchester.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of the investigation held on the loss of a horse belonging to Louis de Gonzague Belzile, of Amqui, county of Matane, during the year 1915.—Mr Boulay.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents in detail, showing expenses, mileage and disbursements of Joseph W. V. Wilson, of Barrington, N.S., as fishery guardian in Shelburne, N.S., during year 1915.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with repairs, upkeep and watchman's services on Patrol Boat A, Captain Blackford while laid up at Shelburne, N.S., during the month of December, 1914, and subsequent months until ready for sea in 1915. —Mr. Law.

For a copy of all telegrams, letters and other documents in connection with repairs to wharf at Shag Harbour, Shelburne county, N.S., during the years 1915 and 1916.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all letters, papers, pay-rolls, telegrams and correspondence in connection with the expenditure of, and receipts and vouchers for moneys paid for the building of a wharf or blocking at the head of Belleville, Yarmouth county, N.S.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relative to repairs on the Hanlover at Cape Negro, Shelburne county, N.S., in 1915. —Mr. Law.

For a return showing the itemized disbursements of Ward Fisher, inspector of fisheries for western Nova Scotia, for the year 1912, amounting to $388.40, and the year 1913, amounting to $1,009.84.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all letters telegrams and other documents in connection with the purchase of a site for the post office building at Bear River, N.S.—Mr. Law.

For a return showing the fractional areas of homestead lands, or otherwise, in the province of Saskatchewan, sold in the year 1915, the name of the purchaser, and the price paid in each case.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

For a copy of all documents, title deeds, papers, notarial deeds or private writings in connection with the sale, donation or transfer, by the estate of Alex. Fraser, of Rivière du Loup, to the Government or the Railway Department, for the Intercolonial, the lot of land or part of the lot of land, at the east of the Intercolonial bridge at Rivière du Loup, at a place called Gauvreau Yard; also of all correspondence in this connection.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a return showing: Who the recruiting officers were for the counties of Lunenburg, Queens, Shelburne and Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, during the months of July, August, September October, November and December, 1915; what remuneration each received during each month, for salary, disbursements and expenses; if they are still employed as recruiting officers; if so, what salary is being paid each recruiting officer per day or per month.—Mr. Kyte.

For a return showing: How many officers, N.C.O.'s and men went from Canada with the First Contingent; how many of these were British subjects born outside Canada, French Canadians, English Canadians, that is Canadians of English, Scotch, Irish or Welsh descent, and German Canadians; how many of the First Contingent were Methodists, Presbyterians, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and other denominations.—Mr. Edwards.

For a return showing: The number of officers, N.C.O.'s and men enlisted in Canada for overseas service during the year 1914, and during the year 1915; how many enlisted from each province in each year; how many of those enlisting in each year were British subjects, born outside of Canada, French Canadians, English Canadians, that is, Canadians of English, Scotch, Irish or Welsh descent, and German Canadians; how many of those enlisting in each year were Methodists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and other denominations.—Mr. Edwards.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BURNHAM.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, the Toronto Star of Tuesday, February 1, has the following:

Ottawa, Ont., Feb. 1.—At the opening of the House yesterday, J. G. Turriff, M.P. of Assiniboia, rose to a point of privilege. He quoted from Captain Burnham's paper, the Peterborough Review, in which, during the course of the latter's speech, Messrs. Carvell and Turriff were accused of having made remarks which the Review interpreted as showing a

desire on the part of the Liberals for an election.

"I am quoted as having said that (an election) is what we wanted last year," said Mr. Turriff. "Now, what I actually did say was, 'That is what you wanted last year.' I consider it unfair for any member of the House to distort the words of other hon. gentlemen in his own paper."

Mr. Speaker Sevigny thought the point well taken.

This is an absolute fabrication. What was said by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), as appears from the Hansard report, was this:

I am not attributing any blame whatever to the paper. The mistake has occurred through the Hansard reporter not catching exactly the right word; the word "we" was substituted for the word "you," which changes the whole meaning of the sentence. What I said was: "That is what you wanted last year." Instead of "you" they put in "we."

In this correction made in Hansard by the member for Assiniboia no reference was made to me, none whatever as you will see, Mr. Speaker, and there was no reference to distortion. If reports like those can be sent out about a member of this House, public life in Canada would become intolerable. This is no joke. I ask for the protection and the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the hon. member and the House that my attention was called this morning to the article referred to, and I can only say that it is certainly unjust; I need not say more to the hon. member for Peterborough. If this report was sent to the paper in question by a member of the Press Gallery, I think it is his duty to apologise, and to do justice to the hon. member for Peterborough.

TRAIN SERVICE IN THE WEST.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): I wish to read, for the information of the House, a telegram that I have just received with reference to the delay in fuel deliveries in the West:

Toronto, Ont., Feb. 3.

Hon. J. D. Reid,
Acting Minister of Railways,
Dominion of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

From newspaper reports of proceedings Ottawa, some members would appear to be under impression delay in delivery coal to western towns and villages tributary our line due to lack of cars or motive power. This absolutely untrue. Deliveries fuel have been delayed due continuous snow storms and low temperature which has made it quite impossible do more than mortal men can do. With ample fighting facilities our disposal we are giving delivery fuel first consideration and yesterday distributed one hundred twenty-three cars. This matter receiving our most serious consideration.

D. B. Hanna.

CONTROL OF WATER-POWERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GRAHAM: May I call the attention of the Government to an item which appeared in the press of Tuesday, which stated that an arrangement had been arrived at between the Dominion Government and the Government of Ontario by which the water-powers heretofore under the control of the federal authority were to be handed over to the Provincial Government. Is that report correct?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There was some negotiation between counsel representing the Government of the province of Ontario and counsel representing the Dominion Government with regard to certain outstanding litigation touching the respective rights of Canada and of the province in water powers. No arrangement has been arrived at, so far as I am aware, up to the present time, but I think the negotiations are progressing rather favourably.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand my right hon. friend to mean that the negotiations are progressing towards a transfer of the rights of Canada in water powers to the province of Ontario?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, progressing with regard to the questions involved in litigation which is outstanding in the courts, and which calls in question on the one hand, the rights of Canada in the water-powers, and on the other hand, the rights of the province of Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a question which is in the courts?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An action was brought in the courts—I think it was instituted by the Attorney General of Ontario, if I remember rightly—and the Deputy Minister of Justice was instructed to make a report upon a proposal which is confidential at present on the part of the province of Ontario, looking to some arrangement along lines that were not really in controversy. Negotiations have gone on, but no conclusion has been reached yet, so far as I am advised.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand my right hon. friend to mean that in addition to the question which is involved and is in controversy in the courts, negotiations are progressing with regard to some other question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, with regard to the question as to rights raised in the courts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With a view to a compromise?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With a view to coming to a conclusion without further litigation

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A settlement out of court?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. There were certain concessions made on the one hand and on the other, which seemed to warrant the belief that a conclusion might be arrived at without further litigation.

Mr. GRAHAM: The reason I asked the question was that Sir Adam Beck is reported to have told a deputation from eastern Ontario who are anxious to get water power—I think it was two days ago—that an arrangement was under consideration, though not yet completed, by which those powers would be handed over to the province, subject to legislation by both this House and the Provincial Legislature.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: His answer might relate to some particular phase of the question as to which I have not been advised. I think there was some reference to certain water-powers which was distinct from the general question about which my hon. friend asked.

HALIFAX MILITARY HOSPITALS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to inquire of the Minister of Militia if he has yet received the report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the administration of the military hospitals at Halifax, and if so when it will be made public?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The report has not yet been received.

RECRUITING—THE COLOUR LINE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to take advantage of the presence of the Minister of Militia to ask him if he can give the information—which the Minister of Finance was unable to give when asked—with regard to a number of young patriotic coloured men in the city of St. John who are anxious to enlist and go to the front to fight for the flag, but who, as they allege, have been driven from pillar to post. They were advised to go to the recruiting office in St. John, and they did so, and offered their services, and they were told they would be accepted. Then they were sent to Sussex, and after being there for some few days they were told they were not required. The question I put to the Government, in the absence of the Minister of Militia, was: whether there is any colour line so far as the enlistment of soldiers is concerned, and whether the Minister of Militia would look into this question and give an answer upon the subject. I may say, as I informed the Minister of Finance a few days ago, that I have a letter from a very intelligent and thoroughly reliable coloured citizen of St. John stating these facts, and expressing the hope that I would draw the attention of the Government to the matter.

Sir SAM HUGHES: From the city of St. John a large number of coloured men have enlisted in the various regiments raised in that vicinity. There is scarcely a regiment in the Dominion, or at the front, but has coloured men in the ranks, and they are splendid soldiers; very excellent soldiers indeed. I may further say that application has been made for permission to raise a coloured regiment, but we have asked that a statement be made as to the population from which such a regiment could draw its men, its details, and the possibility of keeping up recruiting. Owing to the limited number of the coloured race in Canada, it is impossible, they themselves admit, to get up a regiment composed of coloured people alone. The case referred to by my hon. friend I will inquire into. The only complaint we have any record of is with reference to the fact that two or three young men, possibly good fellows, came to a certain recruiting office and were rejected because they were not in the very best condition. I do not know whether my hon. friend wants anything further or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am told that some of these young men were actually accepted and enlisted and were then sent away being told that their services were not required. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) knows that we have in St. John quite a large coloured population, certainly very many thoroughly respectable citizens, and I am sure that quite a large number are anxious to tender their services. As to what my hon. friend has stated as to their condition, I never heard that there was any objection on that score.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The reference I made was to two or three men who went from St. John to Sussex.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There were some twenty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I may say that no respectable or reputable young coloured man in the Dominion of Canada has been rejected as far as I have any information in regard to the matter. Such men are accepted, they make excellent soldiers and are very handy in various ways around the camp.

COL. PAPINEAU.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) if anybody has replaced Col. Papineau at the Wellington Barracks School at Halifax whilst he is engaged at the newly-established school in Ottawa, and if the minister does not think it is hardly fair to the Wellington Barracks school to have him away from there?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Wellington Barracks school will be conducted by the officer next in command. Colonel Papineau will be here for a very short time. We have splendid officers and instructors at the Wellington Barracks school to take the matter in hand. Colonel Papineau is not the only officer in Canada who is capable of conducting the school.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

On the order for the second reading of Bill No. 2, to amend the Criminal Code.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: It has been suggested that I should delay asking for the second reading of the Bill until my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) returns. Under these circumstances I have no objection to postponing it. I would like to have it understood, however, that I would not lose my turn on the Order Paper. The Minister of Justice may be away for some time, and I want the Bill to become law this session. I would like the right hon. the Prime Minister to say that I shall not lose my turn.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the request is quite reasonable. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice is expected to be here early next week, probably on Monday.

Order stands.

COMMANDEERING OF WHEAT.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (for Mr. Knowles) moved:

For a copy of all orders in council, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents in connection with the commandeering of wheat about the 27th November, 1915, and in connection with the disposal of such wheat.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no objection to this passing, with the proviso that the Government must exercise its discretion as to which of these papers may be brought down. A number of them may be brought down without any public interest being harmed in any way. Others, however, are so much connected with negotiations from the other side that at the present time they could not properly be brought down.

4 p.m. Everything necessary to a reasonable understanding of the question, can, I think, be placed before the House.

TRANSPORTATION AND MARKETING OF FISH.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby) moved:

That, whereas, fish is a highly nutritious and palatable article of food, of which abundant supplies are continually available at low prices at the sea-coast and inland waters of Canada; and, whereas, in order that an increased demand for fish might be speedily developed in the interior markets of the country by having the same placed thereon in prime condition and at moderate prices, the Government has been and is assisting the industry, under certain conditions, by paying a portion of the express charges, and providing more adequate transportation facilities; notwithstanding which, the prices at which fish can be purchased in such interior markets seems unreasonably high, as compared with those received by the producer, which condition is militating against the ends in view.

Therefore, be it resolved, that, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that an inquiry should be made to determine if possible the cause or causes of the great discrepancy between the price of fish at the places of production and that charged on the interior markets.

And it is further resolved, that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, with instructions to consider the subject matter thereof and make such inquiry.

He said: I wish to acknowledge the courtesy of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in permitting this resolution, which stands ninth in order, to take precedence over the others. The subject with which it deals is an important one; it appeals, I

think, to the people of all Canada, and I am glad to have an opportunity of discussing it briefly this afternoon.

It will, I think, be admitted that in computing the annual value of food products of Canada, too little importance, from an economic and national standpoint, has hitherto been given to the harvest won by our fishermen from lake and sea. A quarter of a century ago this harvest was valued at less than $18,000,000, while last year it was valued at over $31,000,000. Create the demand, and in five years' time I believe that this total will be nearer $50,000,000. About 50 per cent of the fish represented by this amount was consumed in Canada during 1915, either in a fresh or partly cured condition. Some $2,500,000 worth of fish and fish products were imported, of which oysters represented a substantial part, while our exports of fish were valued at almost $20,000,000. Economically, Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all wrong. $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 worth of this cheap food should now be consumed in Canada yearly. One reason why such is not the case is that the transportation companies have been delinquent; and the other reason, and perhaps the principal one, is that the people themselves have been rather indifferent.

In discussing a subject of this character, statistics are a sort of necessary evil, and I will inflict as few as possible upon the House. I wish, however, to give the value of the fisheries of the different provinces for the year 1914-15, in order that the extent of the business may be fully appreciated. In Nova Scotia the value of fish marketed in that year was $7,730,000, in round numbers; New Brunswick, $4,940,000; Prince Edward Island, $1,261,000; Quebec, $1,924,000; Ontario, $2,755,000; Manitoba, $849,000; Saskatchewan, $132,000; Alberta, $86,000; Yukon Territory, $69,000; British Columbia, $11,515,000. The total market value of Canadian fisheries for the year mentioned was $31,264,631.

The amount invested in the fisheries of Canada in 1915, by divisions, was as follows: Atlantic division, consisting of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and the gulf division of Quebec, $13,610,000; inland division, consisting of inland Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon, $2,292,000; Pacific division, consisting of the province of British Columbia, $8,829,000. The total is $24,733,163.

The following table shows the number of persons employed in the fisheries business in 1913:

	Fishermen.	In fish-houses, freezers, etc.
Atlantic division	49,998	17,070
Inland division	8,124	393
Pacific division	11,232	7,096
Totals	69,954	24,559
Total number of fishermen		69,954
Total number of persons engaged in fish-houses curing and preparing fish for market		24,559
Total number of persons employed		94,513

The fish marketed from the Atlantic division consists principally of cod, halibut, cusk, pollock, herring, mackerel, sardines, smelts and haddock, from which latter the standard finnan haddies are produced. To this should be added lobsters, which are chiefly tinned or shipped fresh to the American market, where the demand is fairly regular, and to which, from certain districts, the means of transportation assures quick delivery, which is imperative.

The fish marketed from the Pacific division consisted chiefly of salmon and halibut, while the inland waters yield whitefish, trout, pickerel, bass and pike.

Food fishes caught by the Canadian fisherman constitute a nutritious and palatable article of food. Authorities on food values have worked out a table showing the relative nutritive properties of various food fish and meats, which is very striking. This information has been included in a booklet recently prepared by the Superintendent of Fisheries, and issued by the department, entitled, "Fish and How to Cook It." The pamphlet, which is of great value to housekeepers, may be obtained by application to the Department of Naval Service. Here I should like to pay a tribute to the energy, zeal and intelligence displayed by Mr. Found, the Superintendent of Fisheries, in the discharge of the important duties devolving upon him.

Generally speaking, fish may be classed as only from 2 to 4 per cent poorer in nutritive nitrogenous ingredients than meat, though in some instances, notably in the case of cod steaks, its nutritive qualities run higher. I have here a table showing the comparatitve food values of certain fish and meat foods which I shall read:

Kinds of Material.	Protein by Factor (n X 6.25)
Fresh Fish.	Per cent.
Cod (steaks)	17.0
Cod (dressed)	11.1
Cush (dressed)	10.1
Hake (dressed)	7.3
Haddock (dressed)	8.4
Halibut (dressed)	15.3
Herring (whole)	11.2
Mackerel (dressed)	11.6
Pickerel (dressed)	12.0
Pollock (dressed)	15.4
Salmon Atlantic (dressed)	15.0
Shad (dressed)	10.6
Smelt (whole)	10.1
Sturgeon (dressed)	15.1
Oysters in bulk	6.0
Oysters in shell	1.2
Long-neck clams in the shell	5.0
Little neck clams in the shell	2.1
Mussels in shell	4.6
Lobster in shell	5.9
Lobster in can	18.1
Crabs in shell	7.9
Crabs in can	15.8
Animal Foods.	
Beef, side, medium fat	14.8
Mutton, side	13.0
Average of beef, veal and mutton	14.5
Pork, side	8.3
Chicken	13.7
Turkey	16.1
Milk	3.3
Vegetable Foods.	
Wheat flour	11.4
Wheat bread	9.2
Beans, dried	22.5
Potatoes	1.8
Cabbage	1.4

This is a splendid showing, and is ample justification of our advocacy of the fish diet. Not only do food fishes constitute a very nutritious article of diet, but it has been stated on the authority of eminent scientists that fish is the brain food par excellence. This prompts me to observe that of the five Canadian born premiers of Canada, Sir John Abbott, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir John Thompson, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Robert Borden, the three last named came from the province of Nova Scotia, where, for upwards of a century the fish diet has held an esteemed place in the domestic economy of every well regulated household.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does that include lobsters?

Mr. JAMESON: My hon. friend is in an attitude now that suggests them. For years past the price of meats has been steadily rising in this country and in the United States. This has been due partly to the increased population and partly also to the raising of a lesser number of food animals in the United States and in Canada relatively to the population. This, while regrettable in itself has nevertheless led to the increased use of fish, as a cheaper and yet nutritous food. But we find that food fishes, at certain points distant from the coast sell at prices which seem unreasonably high for fish should be cheap in Canada. If the fisherman who by toil, industry and hardship compels the sea to yield him tribute were deriving the advantage of these prices, there would probably be little or no cause of complaint on any side. The fisherman, however, secures relatively little advantage from the price paid, under normal conditions by the consumer, although his prices have advanced to some extent in recent years and just now, owing to the abnormal conditions created by the war the price of fish on the seaboard is abnormally high. Nor does the shipper, as a rule, obtain the advantage of the price. He is subject to competition amongst shippers and must accept a reasonable profit only or he cannot continue to do business.

Yet it should be borne in mind that in a country of great distances such as Canada, many miles separate producer and consumer, and that reasonable transportation charges and legitimate profits of dealers have to be paid.

The rates charged on fish by the transportation companies are, however, the subject of much concern. And not only do some people engaged in the fish trade consider they are getting neither the rates nor the services which the importance of the business warrants, but in certain instances actual discrimination affecting adversely cities in the interior of Canada has been more than hinted at. I may add that fresh and lightly cured fish generally speaking, require under existing conditions, to be shipped by express in order to reach the consumer in prime condition. I would like to place a table of the express and freight rates on Hansard:

Transportation Rates—Fresh Fish.
Express

From Halifax or Mulgrave to:	From St. John or St. Andrews to:
Quebec	$1.25	$1.25
Montreal	1.50	1.30
Ottawa	1.60	1.40
Toronto	1.75	1.60
Hamilton	1.90	1.60
London	2.00	1.75
Windsor, Ont.	2.50	2.00
Digby to Montreal	1.50	....

Per 100 lbs. net weight of fish, including delivery.

Freight	Carload.	L.C.L.
From Halifax to Montreal...	.26	.35
From Mulgrave to Montreal..	.28	.38
From St. John to Montreal..	.22	.31
From Digby to Montreal....	.27	.41

Per 100 lbs. gross weight, delivery extra.

Express From Vancouver or New Westminster to:	Carload.	L.C.L.
Calgary	$2.50	$2.80
Edmonton	2.75	3.20
Regina	2.50	3.60
Prince Albert	3.75	4.80
Winnipeg	2.50	3.60
Toronto, Montreal or Boston.	*3.00	....

Per 100 lbs., including delivery, charge on net weight of fish in C. L. lots and on net weight plus 25 per cent for ice and packages less than C.L.L.

From Prince Rupert to:		
Edmonton	$2.50	$3.20
Regina	2.50	3.60
Prince Albert	3.30	4.20
Winnipeg	2.50	3.60
Toronto, Montreal or Boston.	*3.00	....

* A delivery charge of 15 cents is made in Boston.

Freight From Vancouver or New Westminster to:	Carload.	L.C.L.
Calgary	$0.94	$1.88
Regina	1.25	2.55
Winnipeg	1.25	2.87

Per 100 lbs. gross weight, delivery extra.

From Prince Rupert to:		
Edmonton	$1.05	....
Winnipeg	1.25	....

The Marine and Fisheries Department has for some years been endeavouring to aid in securing a market for the producer and good fish, at fair prices, for the consumer. It will be of interest to state what has been done in this way. The following is a synopsis:

The Federal Government is giving the following aid to develop the fish business:

(a) It accepts responsibility for one-third of the express charges on less than carload shipments from all points on the Atlantic coast to destinations in Quebec and Ontario, and from all points on the Pacific coast to destinations as far east as the eastern boundary of Manitoba.

(b) It has arranged for a weekly refrigerator express service from Mulgrave to Montreal, shipments from Halifax being consolidated in the car at Truro one day each week during the summer season. In addition to paying one-third of the transportation charges on shipments in this car, the express and railway companies are guaranteed that the earnings on this car will be at least those on 10,000 pounds.

(c) It has made available to the shippers at Mulgrave and Halifax a cold storage freight car one day each week by guaranteeing the railway that the earnings on this car will be at least those on two-thirds of a minimum carload of 20,000 pounds at carload lot rates.

(d) It has for the past two seasons given a first-class exhibit at the Toronto exhibition, which has been awarded a gold medal each year.

(e) It has sought to advertise fish by the issuing of a booklet which has been broadly distributed throughout the country.

The shipments carried by express on which a rebate is paid, include fresh and mildly cured fish, such as smoked fish as well as shellfish. The increase in the sales resulting will be gathered from the payments made to the express companies during the past number of years, which are as follows:

Year.	On shipments from East.	On shipments. from West.
1909-10..	$15,162 20	$13,541 76
1910-11..	16,898 13	21,896 73
1911-12..	19,620 62	35,315 10
1912-13..	29,969 48	39,277 13
1913-14..	37,818 85	44,114 47
1914-15..	26,667 33	34,528 60

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does that refer only to fresh fish?

Mr. JAMESON: This is all fresh and mildly cured fish.

The industry to which this assistance was granted increased very rapidly as the result, I am told, of that assistance. Last year, it seems, there was a falling off to a certain extent; I do not know what the explanation is unless it be that smaller quantities of fish are being shipped by express and larger quantities by freight, in which case I think the same amount of assistance would not be rendered. In view of the assistance in respect of transportation charges upon fish, and the increased quantities handled, it might reasonably have been expected that the cost to the consumer would be reduced very considerably. The tendency of price however has been to go up rather than to become less.

Let us for a moment follow the journey of the fish from the boat to the consumer. Having been caught by the fishermen, dressed, and lightly cured, or packed in ice and shipped by the local buyer it reaches some centre in the interior of Canada where it is perhaps sold to a jobber. It is then sold to a retailer who may do business 50 or 100 miles distant, involving further transportation charges. By him it is again sold to the consumer at a price which is startling compared with that received either by the fisherman or by the local shipper. Two important facts should not be overlooked; first, that under our present system the ownership of the fish necessarily changes four, five or six times between the time it leaves the hands of the producer and reaches the consumer; and secondly, that there is a loss by the retailer which the consumer must eventually pay, by reason of the fact that he has not in his establishment proper facilities for preserving or attractively displaying the fish. So, there are expenses and profits at every stage of the journey from the fisherman to the con-

sumer at whose door the retailer leaves the fish, it may be 100, 500, or 1,000 miles distant from the waters from which it was taken.

I have an illustration to give to the House of what it would mean if we could affect a short cut, so to speak, between the producer and the consumer. It is the experience of a gentleman in the Railway Department J. L. Payne. This gentleman informs me that he recently purchased 900 boxes of finnan haddie from a Nova Scotia firm and they were laid down at the doors of some 900 different people in Ottawa who had joined with him in the order. The fish at their doors, all expenses paid, cost seven cents per pound, while at the same time, in the retail stores in this city the same class of fish was selling at twelve and a half cents and upwards per pound.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose there were no further expenses in connection with that shipment other than the original cost of the fish and the transportation charges?

Mr. JAMESON: That is my information.

Mr. MACLEAN: These were no distribution and selling expenses?

Mr. JAMESON: No. The shipment was the result of co-operation on the part of different people. Mr. Payne kindly acted as agent, and my information from him is that he paid six cents per pound to the producer, and that it cost one cent per pound to bring the fish to Ottawa and to deliver it at the door of the consumer. There were no profits.

Mr. MACLEAN: Can my hon. friend tell me what the selling price of the same class of fish is say, in western Nova Scotia, say at a point like Windsor or Kentville?

Mr. JAMESON: I cannot tell my hon. friend that; I do not know what the profits are down there, but I think the dealers just sell to the one man. For instance, the man who prepares the fish for the wholesale market would sell to the retailer, and so there would be just a profit for two individuals.

The trouble in dealing with this matter in regard to transportation is that two or three transportation charges are superimposed on the original price of the fish, and that the profits of dealers, jobbers and retailers, have to be considered. I merely mention this instance of which I have been informed by Mr. Payne, in order to show that unnecessary transportation charges, and perhaps the profits of some jobbers, might be eliminated or reduced.

Mr. HAZEN: From what point of Nova Scotia did they come?

Mr. JAMESON: I do not know that Mr. Payne would object to my giving that information. I think they came from the Maritime Fish Corporation, and that they were shipped from Digby. My information is that in England the system of distribution of sea foods has been so perfected that a part at least of the trade is direct between the buyer at the port of entry and the consumer. This obviates the profits of jobbers and retailers, and involves only the minimum cost of transportation, while the fish reaches the consumer in prime condition. The household which uses fish regularly has a standing order for delivery on certain days each week, and the dealer ships it in a receptacle woven from a sort of marsh grass which I am told costs less than a penny. Of course, in England distances are trifling and population great as compared with Canada.

Again, if my information serves me, fish trains under normal conditions leave the sea ports for various centres in England each night. They carry fish only at just one half of the ordinary rates, while they have the right-of-way over all other classes of traffic. This illustrates the importance of the business as there regarded.

It is related of His Majesty King Edward VII that once when returning from Balmoral he found the Royal train had been backed into a siding. His Majesty inquired the cause of the delay, and was informed that they were waiting for the fish train to pass, as it had the right-of-way. The King's reply was in that characteristic vein which did so much to endear him to his subjects: "Quite right," said he, "Monarchs should wait that my people may be fed."

Why does the fish train in England have the right of way? Because it carries a cheap food, which should be promptly delivered. Monarchs might wait, that the people should have a good and cheap food. How is it in this country? Why, a train loaded with pig iron is quite as apt to have the right of way as one loaded with fish.

Now that the halo of royally conferred titles surrounds so many Canadians closely associated with our transportation systems, it may not be unreasonable to hope that they will adopt a more kingly and kindly

attitude toward the problem of distribution of sea foods. It is idle to appeal for redress to the subordinate officers of transportation companies. They are paid to exact the uttermost farthing that the business will stand. It is the men at the top who must be induced to act. They have been singled out for high honours and distinction. Let them show they are worthy of these honours by now assisting in carrying to the people a cheap food by every proper means in their power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If they do not what shall we do?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Eat less fish.

Mr. JAMESON: My hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean), I am sure, sympathises with the attitude I take. He is not yet a recipient of any of these royal favours, whatever the future may hold for him, and, being one of the proletariat like myself, I have not the slightest doubt but that he will endorse up to the hilt the remarks that I have made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish you would provide a penalty.

Mr. JAMESON: We are in hopes they will act. The public would penalize them in some way, at all events. As a nation we have not yet perhaps entirely outgrown the extravagance of the pioneer in our use of the natural wealth of the country. This no doubt, in some measure, is the reason why the consumer calls for fish not only of standard variety, but also of standard size, the smaller which in other countries find a ready market, being in little demand here. And here I venture to express the opinion that the method in towns and cities of purchasing food for the household by telephone, rather than as formerly, by a visit to the market or shop of the dealer, and the delivery by the seller, instead of by the purchaser is probably in itself responsible for a substantial increase in the cost of supplying the family table.

In those great natural storehouses,—seas, rivers and lakes—a bountiful providence has reserved to the people of Canada an almost unlimited supply of sea foods. With this great natural advantage, aided by a properly organized system of distribution, fish should be cheap in Canada.

In the distribution and sale of food fishes is there needless expense which can be eliminated? Are there excessive or unnecessary transportation or other charges? Are there multiplied profits which might be avoided? I believe the answer should be "yes" to all these questions. They are questions to which, however, it may be undesirable to give an offhand answer; but they are questions that should be answered if possible. They are questions of importance to the consumer who wants to know he is not paying undue profits; and no less are they of importance to the fisherman, whose future market must depend, in a great measure, upon the product of his industry being available to the consumer at fair and reasonable prices. Yet, this at least we know, that to-day and for years to come, economy should be the watchword of this nation. Anything which will tend toward reducing the cost of supplying the family table calls for serious consideration.

I have some suggestions which I propose to make in a very kindly spirit to my hon. friend the minister who takes a deep interest in this matter and I will make them as briefly as I can. I believe there are others who desire to speak on this important resolution. The present method of distribution of sea foods seems extravagant and wasteful. I think it should be more highly organized. Reshipments involving several freight or express charges should be avoided, where possible. Transportation corporations all of which have been generously bonused by the people of Canada, should recognize their responsibility. They should aid in the distribution of a cheap food, by making especially favourable rates, which hitherto they have not seemed inclined to do.

This, I am informed, can be done without disturbing other rates by placing fish in what is known as a "commodity" classification instead of as at present. Fast freight trains, and what may be termed the "peddler car" system would also greatly aid in affecting cheaper transportation. The "peddler car" is a through car with a through rate, carrying carload lots, and distributing its load at different points en route, an additional charge being made each time the car is opened for that purpose. The transportation companies, being in favor of less than carload rates, are against the "peddler" car.

Fish dealers at inland points could get a better service by placing their orders a reasonable time in advance. Shipments could then be consolidated, and carload lot rates obtained. This, combined with a peddler car service, would effect a great saving in the cost of transportation. It would also tend to eliminate the jobber,

and so save his profits, to the benefit of the consumer.

Avoidable waste occurring, owing to lack of proper facilities in most retail markets for preserving and attractively displaying the fish, should be overcome. For not only does it add to the cost of the fish to the consumer, but nothing is more liable to discourage its general use than careless methods of handling; while to obtain good, fresh fish from retail dealers under such conditions, is impossible.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries, which for many years has been expending large sums in protecting the fisheries of sea and lake, should now, I think, go a step farther. In every important community they might establish, or exhibit for demonstration purposes, a model fish market. This might consist of what is known as a silent salesman, or glass case, with proper refrigeration. In a short time progressive fish dealers would, no doubt, properly equip their premises. A vigorous campaign should be set on foot for promoting the consumption of sea foods, not on fast days only, as chiefly heretofore, but as a stable article of diet throughout the year.

A demonstration kitchen, conducted by one who understands how fish should be cooked and served, should be made a feature at all fairs in Canada. The department might very easily keep this service up the year round in those centres where it would do the most good, until the blessings of a fish diet were known.

It should be borne in mind that the increased consumption of fish will aid in solving some features of the transportation problem. When fresh fish can be shipped in carload lots, the rates will be much less, tending to reduce the cost of the fish to the consumer. In this good work an important section of the press of Canada has already rendered signal service, and is entitled to the thanks, both of the fishing interests and the consumers. With their continued co-operation advantageous results can, I believe, be attained. With this introduction I beg leave to move the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, the subject of which my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) has been speaking is one of very great interest to my constituents, and I am very much pleased that he has brought it before the House. I do not know of any branch of business that could be promoted to a greater degree by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, than that of our fisheries, by the adoption of such measures as will increase the sale of fresh fish throughout Eastern Canada; I am not so familiar with the trade of the West.

The slight assistance that was given a few years ago has given splendid results. Prior to ten or twelve years ago, a large part of the fresh fish consumed in Montreal, Toronto, and other Canadian cities came from Gloucester in the United States. Our Nova Scotia fishermen worked on these Gloucester vessels, which caught the fish off our own coast and then took it to Gloucester, whence it was returned to Montreal and Toronto. This was a very unsatisfactory state of affairs, and the Government of that day introduced the policy of subsidizing the transportation of fish from the eastern coast of Canada to the big cities inland, by paying one-third of the express rates. The trade immediately changed. Instead of the inland cities of Canada buying their fish from Gloucester and Boston, they bought from Eastern Canada, with the result, that at present only a relatively small quantity of fresh fish is imported into this country.

5 p.m.

I agree with my hon. friend that fish as an article of food is not as much used in this country as it should be, and I think a good deal could be done by advertising to increase its consumption. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in advertising our fish, at the last Toronto Exhibition took a step in the right direction, and I commend him for so doing. If it were known throughout the towns of Ontario that the fresh fish of Nova Scotia was such delicious food, that we had plenty of it in Eastern Canada, and that it could be bought cheaply. I have no doubt that much more fish would be purchased and used in our homes. While referring to this matter I never could understand why the fisheries should be put under the Naval Department, and I must say that the House and the country have never yet been given an intelligent reason as to why this was done. I had hoped that the fisheries of this country would grow to such an extent as to occupy a minister most of his time, but instead of that, the Fisheries Department has been placed under the control of certain naval officers who have nothing whatever to do

with the fisheries of this country. If there is any business at all which should be under the branch known as the Marine and Fisheries, surely it is the fisheries of this country. I do not think it was a wise step to take, and it seems to me that some explanation should be given. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says he understands that only the ships of the Fisheries Department are under the control of the Naval Department, but as I understand it, everything connected with the fisheries is under the control of officers of the navy. This is an abnormal state of affairs, and I do not think it is in the interests of the industry.

The main problem is to find a market for our fish: if that industry is to grow, and it has possibilities of becoming very extensive, the local market will not suffice. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) that we should do everything in our power to develop the local market, and I have no criticism at all to make of his proposal in that direction; but the local market in Canada for fish, fresh or any other kind, is very small compared with the great supply it is possible to obtain around our coasts. Why should we not look for a market outside? There is no reason why we should not do everything in our power to develop a foreign market for our fish. Regulations are made to encourage people to export manufactured goods. If you look through the tariff, you will see that a man who makes an engine or a boiler in this country and sells it abroad can go to the Custom house and get a rebate of ninety-five per cent of the duty that he paid on the raw material. We are actually paying money to induce our people to send these articles abroad, and I think the policy is a good one, but why should we not apply the same policy to fish? Why should we not encourage the exportation of our fresh fish to the United States? To the south of us is an enormous country with a population of ninety million people. It is the richest country in the world, and the best market in the world, but we are not doing anything at all to reach that market. It has always been a puzzle to me why hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think it would be an unwise thing to develop a market for our fish in the United States? Two years ago I ventured to point out to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that in eastern Nova Scotia, in the vicinity of Canso and the banks of that region, we have one of the most prolific fishing coasts to be found in all America. We have a fine class of fishermen, who are second to none. We have everything that is needed to build up an enormous business in fish, except a good market. I proposed that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should subsidize a fast fish boat, touching at some of the ports of eastern Nova Scotia, and then going direct to Boston, which is the great market for our fish. That is where our surplus fish has to go whenever there is a large run of fish on the coast. If mackerel comes in on the coast in large quantities it has to go to Boston, because there is no sufficient demand for it in our Canadian cities.

Again, in eastern Nova Scotia we have not the facilities they have in the western part of the province, at Yarmouth, for example. If you compare the rates paid for fish at Canso, and at Yarmouth, you will find that a hundred pounds of codfish is worth $1.50, and sometimes more, at Yarmouth than it is at Canso. And the reason for that is that a boat runs between Yarmouth and Boston. When a fisherman comes into Yarmouth with his fresh fish, he loads it on the boat and gets it to Boston in twelve or thirteen hours, and he gets the market price for it, whereas at Canso we have not these facilities. If a fisherman catches a boat-load of haddock at some harbor on the coast where there is no transportation facilities, for example, what can he do with it? If it is winter he can freeze it, or convert it into finnan-haddie and sell it in the local market, but he cannot sell the fresh fish at a good price as can the Yarmouth fisherman. My proposal to the minister was that the Government should subsidize a fast line of fish boats, not passenger boats, to carry fresh fish from the ports of eastern Nova Scotia direct to Boston, Portland, and other American cities. I feel sure that if this proposal is adopted, a very large business can be worked up that will be of enormous benefit to the fishermen on that coast. The main trouble with them now is lack of transportation. We are spending a good deal of money to enable our fishermen to send their fresh fish to Toronto, Montreal, and the western cities. That is all right, and I am glad that it is being done. It has been done for a good many years, it is a proper policy and has worked out well. But, if we want to build up this industry to the proportions which it may reach, we must get into the United States markets, and the way to do that is to have a line of fresh-fish boats calling at the ports of Eastern Nova Scotia and delivering the fish direct to the Boston market. It would not cost very much to

provide this service. At present we are paying large sums to subsidize ships to go to South Africa, Australia, and other far-off parts of the world with our products. Why should not we do the same thing in the case of the United States, which we can reach in twenty-four hours from the places where the fish are landed? I would like some of my hon. friends on the other side to struggle with that question and tell me if they can, why that trade should not be cultivated. The Prime Minister must be as much interested in this as I am, for he represents a county with a very long sea-coast and among the inhabitants of which are a number of hardy fishermen. We have the fish on the coast and we have the men to catch them; we have, in fact, everything but the market.

This is not a party question but a business question, and one that a business government ought to deal with. As this is a friendly discussion, I do not wish to criticise, but I would remind my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) that freight rates have been increased since the present Administration came into power. The rate for express, I understand, is the same as it was before, but the freight rate on fresh fish from Nova Scotia to Montreal is higher than it was in 1911. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Digby, or my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), did not put in a protest when that was done. The increase between Mulgrave and Amherst, or Mulgrave and Truro, is something like $12 a carload, and this increase of rates was made by the present Minister of Railways to the disadvantage of the fish trade in the local market. I think the old rate should have been allowed to stand; if the department could not afford to reduce it, at least they should not have increased it. If we are to be confined to the Canadian market for our fish, we want as cheap transportation as we can get.

Mr. JAMESON: The hon. member has taken it for granted that I did not make a protest with respect to the increase in the freight rates. I may tell him that I did make this the subject of an interview, a somewhat warm one, between the Minister of Railways and myself. And that is what I mean when I say that you can not do anything with these men who are not at the top and who are not themselves responsible for the rates. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me in that.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am glad my hon. friend did make a protest, but I am sorry that it was not effective.

Mr. JAMESON: That is why we want to get their experts before the committee provided for in the resolution. We will then be able to show them the facts, and perhaps convince them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Perhaps I do not understand my hon. friend, but surely this is a matter which the minister and his department can settle. If the minister wishes to give an advantage to the transportation of fresh fish, it is quite within his power to do so.

Mr. JAMESON: But the point taken was that the Minister of Railways was advised by his officers that certain rates had to be charged in order to make the business pay, and he did not want to use the railway to give a bonus; he said the Department of Marine was giving a bonus.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not referring to what the Department of Marine is doing—the assistance that department is giving to pay the express rates is satisfactory—but I am referring to the freight rate from Mulgrave to points along the Intercolonial, where the increase was, I think, much larger than it ought to have been, and which increase has interfered, I have no doubt, with the trade.

I am glad to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in his place, also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), and the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and I would like to impress upon these gentlemen the importance of assisting the transportation of fresh fish from points on the eastern coast of Canada to the Boston and New York markets. I have no doubt that it would be of immense advantage to the fishing industry. Ask any merchant on the coast and he will tell you that if we could get in touch with those markets we could get better prices, and could be sure that we would always sell our fish. Why should we subsidize ships to distant parts of the world and leave unimproved an opportunity to develop the greatest Canadian industry that it is possible to develop? The supply of fish is inexhaustible; we have the whole Atlantic ocean to draw upon, and you cannot fish it out. They have been fishing cod off Canso for 300 years; the Breton fishermen were there in the fifteenth cen-

tury. The fishermen are on the same banks to-day, and the banks are as prolific and as well stocked as when the fishermen first came. It is a question of giving the fishermen an opportunity to put the fish on the market whenever they catch them. That is the problem for the Government. Can they do anything?

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, the House will, I trust, unanimously adopt the resolution under consideration. The inquiry will come under the direction of my hon. friend the member for Digby. Appreciating, as the House does, the diligent interest of the hon. member in, and his keen understanding of, the problems surrounding the fishing industry, the more readily will it consent to the committing of this matter to the committee over whose deliberations my hon. friend so ably presides.

The investigation of the subject will be peculiarly interesting because any benefits to follow will be twofold in their effect, in that they may advance the interest of the consumer as well as that of the primary producer, the hardy fishermen who constitute the commercial and social fabric of the communities in so many of the important districts particularly along the eastern seaboard of Canada.

The divergence in market prices existing at points of production and consumption in a great many lines of business in Canada and elsewhere has been a matter of bewilderment in many cases, even to those most directly engaged in such businesses. Official inquiries as to the primary causes for such divergences both in Canada and the United States have in different instances been made. I believe some of these inquiries have resulted in improvement in conditions, and it seems to me that of all lines of business that of the catching and marketing of fresh fish lends itself best to an inquiry such as is proposed.

The difficulties of operating a diversified fishing business will readily suggest themselves to all who consider the fundamental necessities of such an industry.

The food value of fish has long been very widely recognized, and is doubtless attracting more attention year by year. It is, of course, of the greatest importance that the product should reach the market in the freshest condition possible, otherwise consumption will not be encouraged. A considerable improvement of conditions in the trade has already been accomplished by Government aid to cold storage, the provision of refrigerator cars and of a fast refrigerator freight service, and other ways in which the Government has assisted.

Should the inquiry develop that there are substantial ways by which further Government assistance can improve conditions under which the industry operates, the Government should not be slow, and I am satisfied, will not be slow, to recognize the desirability of giving such assistance.

During the past ten years, a great deal of governmental attention has been given to particular industries in Canada. Generous bounties were made available to producers of iron, steel, lead and other metals; a system of interior and terminal elevators has been provided to foster the grain interest; steamship subsidies have been granted to encourage and promote general export business; enormous sums of money have been paid out in railway subsidies, and immense obligations undertaken by means of bond guarantees to provide railway transportation, and a programme has been undertaken involving the expenditure of $10,000,000 in the improvement of the great agricultural industry of the country.

All the above have been put forward in the general interest, and industry has been quickened and conditions improved as a result of many of the expenditures mentioned. It can be expected then that generous consideration will be given by Parliament of any feasible assistance required by the very important basic fishing industry.

The total value of the fish catch of Canada for the fiscal year 1913-14, according to reports furnished by the Department of the Naval Service, amounted to $33,207,748, and for 1914-15, to $31,264,631.

There possibly exists the temptation that Parliament, in the exploitation of our new found prairie wealth and magnificent resources of the western part of Canada, should overlook the older, but no less substantial, resources to whose value we may have become somewhat calloused, on account of long knowledge and association.

So long ago as the year 1758, the fishery was one of the most important industries in the whole country. A very interesting account of those fisheries is given in Brown's "History of Cape Breton." It states that 726 vessels and 1,555 shallops, which is a smaller type of fishing vessel, employed 15,138 men,—the number engaged in the fishing industry of Cape

Breton. The catch of the former class of vessels averaged 700 quintals per vessel, or about 508,200 quintals, and the shallops averaged about 300 quintals each, or 466,500 quintals in all, making a total of 974,700 quintals of fish, which would be worth roughly, at to-day's market price, $6,000,000.

In 1871 the Nova Scotia catch was valued at $6,570,000 and in 1872 at $6,016,000. Continuously then year by year the sea has yielded up its wealth, to be had for the taking, in good years and bad, furnishing employment to a large population of as fine a class of citizens as exists in the whole Dominion.

So that it can be seen that this industry is a very old one, that it has furnished a means of livelihood to a large population for over a century and a half, and has been the base of substantial and steady commercial activity, and supplied a commodity which the province of Nova Scotia at any rate, as part of the Dominion of Canada, has utilized year by year to pay off a substantial portion of the annual foreign trade balance.

The exports of fish from Canada, according to the returns of the Statistical Department of the Marine and Fisheries and Naval Service Departments for the past ten years have been as follows:

1904-05	$11,114,318
1905-06	16,025,840
1906-07	10,362,142
1907-08	13,867,368
1908-09	13,319,664
1909-10	15,663,162
1910-11	15,675,544
1911-12	16,704,678
1912-13	16,336,721
1913-14	20,623,560
Total	$149,692,997
Average	$14,969,299

The average annual export value of fish from the province of Nova Scotia alone has been $6,141,093, while in 1914 the export rose to the banner amount of $7,438,625. British Columbia coming second with $6,946,231, and New Brunswick third among the provinces with $2,437,469. So that while in the past decade the average annual catch has been $28,097,973, the average annual export has been $14,969,299.

Students of the present economic situation in Canada cannot fail to appreciate that the present great need of Canada is for increased production. For years we have carried on a great construction programme.

[Mr. McCurdy.]

We must now get down to the great question of a bigger production.

One of the great problems of Canada today is rural depopulation, with its corresponding increase in urban population. The production of natural products of the country is greatly exceeded by their consumption, which fact is one of the most important features to-day in the high cost of living. The people of cities must turn their attention to economy and to production; if it is not possible for them to produce in the cities, they must, of necessity, go to the land, or go to some other part of the country where their labour or knowledge can be utilized to produce wealth. They must utilize undeveloped land, they must exploit every avenue offering productive occupation.

We call, and properly, for improvement in conditions making easier the production of wealth from the soil, and improving the living conditions and attractiveness of rural life. I support the resolution which suggests consideration of ways and means to make possible a larger production of wealth from our fisheries, to remove any restrictions or drawbacks under which this portion of our productive populace labour, and that will lead to improvement in living conditions and an increase in the fishing population of the country.

I can safely assert that while the attention of Canada during the period of the past few years has been largely directed towards the development of the West, the resources and possibilities of the Maritime Provinces, where fundamental conditions are probably as sound as in any part of the world, have during that period been partially overlooked. But they are attracting more attention to-day. The production of the Maritime Provinces has always greatly exceeded consumption, and this excess has been piling up year after year as a great cash reserve. The vast majority of property there is free from encumbrance. Here may be found not only millions of acres of choice farm lands, plenteous timber and pulp limits, coal, iron ore, gold, copper, gypsum, limestone, petroleum, natural gas and other minerals, but, as important as any other, the fisheries.

All these resources are concentrated, and navigation is open twelve months of the year. In 1913-14 the exports of Canada were some $300,000,000 below the imports. That situation has fortunately since been righted, but a substantial portion of the export is in the item of war munitions—the need for

which every one prays may at an early date be removed by the return of peace. When that item of export disappears we shall want further items of natural products to take its place. With the natural resources which we possess, and the character of the people inhabiting the Dominion, we may be sure that production generally will continue to increase. Meanwhile, if we are to be make good to our creditors, we must continue to concentrate our efforts towards economy and production

Enormous sums of money have been devoted by Canadian Parliaments during the past ten years and longer to facilitate the construction of rail transportation systems. We have gone the limit in the provision of assistance to railway promoters and builders. Some careful observers, whose opinions are entitled to great consideration, are of the opinion that the country has handled the transportation needs very badly, and that undue sums have been expended or wasted in the construction of parts of our railway systems, or the unnecessary duplication of systems, and they have much to support them in their views. There has undoubtedly been great waste in the building of our railway systems. I presume there will always be some waste in large construction enterprises.

The excuse, if not the reason, which is put forward in justification of the immense amounts of public moneys and credit given or loaned to the railway corporations, has been that production, particularly in the West, should be accelerated.

While subsidiary advantages have accrued to the more easterly parts of Canada in connection with the large construction programme of the past ten years or longer, still the fact remains that every resident of Canada, even in remote and inaccessible parts, has shouldered his share of the burden in providing the great transportation systems, largely for the direct anticipated benefit to the tiller of the soil. I therefore wish to take advantage of the present opportunity to bring the attention of the minister and the House to the necessity for giving the greatest attention to facilities for the prosecution of the very important fishing industry.

I am not unmindful of the assistance which has been given to that industry in the past. This assistance has, apart from tariff protection, mainly taken the form of facilitating transportation.

Notwithstanding the assistance given for shipments of fresh fish and the very large increase in the business at Montreal, the railways have not, I am advised, given any lower rates. The rates for small shipments appear to be too high, and prevent profitable business being done by small dealers unless the consumer is charged beyond reason. With reasonable rates and proper facilities for handling, it would appear, prima facie, that the retailer should be able to sell at lower than current retail rates and still have a fair profit.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and other hon. gentlemen have at different times urged in this House that provision be made by the Government for a steamship service to carry the output of the fisheries fresh to foreign markets. The hon. member, with his extensive knowledge of business, will appreciate the desirability of this service being performed by private effort if possible. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) will probably agree that if private initiative will establish such a service it will be apt to secure a better demonstration than if undertaken by Government.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If my hon. friend will excuse me. I did not propose that the Government should establish a line of boats as a Government line. If my hon. friend took that meaning from what I said, it is not what I intended. My idea was that they should give a substantial subsidy to enable private enterprise to put a private line of fast boats on the route between eastern Nova Scotia and the Boston and New York market. I would like to know if my hon. friend is in favour of that.

Mr. McCURDY: The arrangement to which I referred was one under which private interests should provide a steamship service with cold storage equipment, between a leading Nova Scotia fish producing port and foreign markets without any expense to the Government. No subsidy was asked for. Unfortunately, however, the war intervened and these projects have not been carried out, but I am assured that they have not been abandoned. These interests are to be congratulated on their enterprise. The experiment will, as soon as it can be undertaken, I am sure, be watched with interest, and if successful, I trust that my hon. friend may find that, in the constituency which he specially represents, as well as elsewhere, enterprising trade interests may afford the advantages of such a service to the fishing industry of the different producing districts.

Knowing the great interest which the hon. Minister of the Naval Service has always taken in the progress and development of the fishing industry, which is directly under his care, I feel that not only will he approve of the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Digby, but that the entire machinery of his department will be placed at the disposal of the committee in the suggested investigation.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART (Lunenburg, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, representing as I do a constituency which is interested, and vitally interested, in the fishing business, I feel that it is my duty—a duty which I owe to those who have sent me here as their representative—to say a few words in support of the resolution which has been proposed by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson).

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, before going further, to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Digby on his return to health. During a greater part of the last session the hon. gentleman was prevented from taking his seat in the House, and since then he has been obliged by continued illness to spend much of the time in a hospital. The pleasantest surroundings which the inside of a hospital affords, and the kindliest attentions of those who devote themselves to the care of the sick do not, cannot compensate one for the loss of health, or deprive an actively-inclined man of a desire to be up and about his work.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, opens up a very wide and very important question—that of the transportation and marketing of fish. But because it is wide and important, and because its solution may involve many difficulties, there is all the more necessity for its early consideration and all the more reason why the necessary study and effort should be attractive.

The hon. member for Digby and the hon. gentlemen who have followed him have given the house and placed on Hansard much valuable information. It is not necessary for me to take up the time of the House by repeating or adding to the figures already given. Enough has been said, if indeed it were necessary that anything should be said, to justify a compliance with the request for which the resolution calls.

I wish to take advantage of this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to say that the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House, has an extensive coast line, settled by a very thrifty and industrious people, nearly all of whom are engaged, or are interested in one way or another, in the fishing business. In no part of Canada, mile for mile, and family for family, can there be found a more prosperous, more contented, and happier people. Perhaps nowhere in the world can there be found a line of towns, villages and settlements whose inhabitants are engaged, as these are, almost solely and wholly in the fishing business, where such evidences of comfort and thrift exist as among the fishermen of the county of Lunenburg. This has not been accomplished without hard work, much exposure, great danger and rigid economy. If they are prosperous it is not because they have not earned all they have, but because they have saved what they have earned. If this House, or a committee of this House, can do anything to secure for them better returns for the product of their labours, they will be none the less deserving, and none the less appreciative of it, because their industry in the days that are past has made them comfortable now.

You have been told, though you do not need to be told, that fish is an excellent article of diet. The resolution of the hon. member for Digby speaks of it as a "highly nutritious and palatable" food. That it is nutritious there is no question, and needs not to be argued here. Whether or not it is palatable, depends on conditions. If it is not properly preserved, if it is not properly prepared for the table, and if it is not properly served, that is not the fault of the fish. There is no food which deteriorates so rapidly as fish. There is none which requires such prompt and careful handling. In former years when there was not a ready and sufficient market close at hand or when rapid means of transportation to more distant markets were not available, the fishermen were obliged to resort to some method of preservation. This was accomplished by the use of salt, by drying in the open air, and by smoking. Let me say right here, in passing, that many people do not know what palatable dishes can be made from fish thus preserved—do not know, for instance, what a fine breakfast can be made from a number one fat salt herring or a piece of finnan haddie when properly prepared by the cook. Dried codfish, which used to be despised in our own country, is now regarded as a luxury by those who have educated appetites.

Preserved in any of the ways just mentioned, fish will remain in good condition for a long time. Consequently the fisherman who thus cures his fish, and the merchant who is engaged in handling this class of trade, are not absolutely dependent on an immediate market.

It is in the transportation and disposal of fresh fish that the greatest necessity arises for promptitude and care. It may be frozen and thus prevented from decomposition. But food of any kind of necessity loses much of its fine flavour when subjected to cold-storage treatment. A measure of cooling by ice will preserve fish for some time, sufficiently long to be transported from the coast to our inland cities, if prompt methods of transportation are afforded. The Government has done much by way of assistance to transportation. Perhaps more can be done. Perhaps suggestions can be made for better methods of distribution which will commend themselves to the committee to which this matter is to be referred. I know the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) is sympathetic; and I believe the Government is willing to lend an ear to any suggestion that may be offered, and to go as far as is reasonable in the way of assisting in the development of what ought to be a big trade in this country.

What we want to do is to bring the hand of the hardy fisherman of our coast as close as possible to the mouth of the hungry citizen of the central portions of Canada—to reduce to a minimum all necessary charges in transportation and exchange, and to wipe out all those which are unnecessary—to give to the producer all that is coming to him for his labour, and to the consumer all that is coming to him for his money. This, I take it, is the object and purpose of the resolution, and I have much pleasure in giving it my support.

Mr. B. B. LAW, (Yarmouth): I have been very sorry to notice during the years I have had the privilege of sitting in this House, that when our fishing industry is being discussed, very few members stay in the chamber. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that fact does not account for the lack of brains shown in some discussions which take place in this House. I am very much interested in the matter which has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson). It would have been well if, when the question of wider markets was before this country in 1911, the hon. members for Digby, Shelburne and Queens and Lunenburg had exerted their influence to help to give the people the benefit of reciprocity.

We are at all times assisting the farmer, doing things for him, which, I have no hesitation in saying, are quite right, but very little has been done for the hardy, sturdy fisherman. We have in the county of Yarmouth a large number of fishermen. I have the honour of representing one of the largest constituencies in that line that, I presume, there is in the province of Nova Scotia. I just happened to-day to have some figures, not for this debate at all, of the imports and exports through the port of Yarmouth during the calendar year 1915. The total imports into the port of Yarmouth were $774,211 and the exports $2,141,389, which certainly shows that we have the trade balance on the right side as far as Yarmouth and the western counties are concerned. Our exports largely consist of fish and I would like to place on Hansard the following figures:

Exports.

Codfish, fresh, dried, pickled	$570,204
Mackerel, fresh, pickled	157,119
Halibut, fresh	47,416
Herring, pickled, smoked	42,112
Sea fish, other, fresh, preserved	90,671
Lobsters, fresh, canned	705,271
Salmon, fresh	27,053
Cod fish oil	8,525
Tongues and sounds	19,740

Making a grand total of exports of fish and fish products from the port of Yarmouth during the past year of $1,668,111, or one-quarter of the total exports of fish from the province of Nova Scotia. I cannot understand why the present Government, and hon. members supporting it, are so much afraid of the American market from the fisherman of western Nova you were to take away the American market from the fishermen of western Nova Scotia, from seventy-five to ninety per cent of them would have to go out of business. We, who are situated in the western part of Nova Scotia, particularly at the port of Yarmouth, have a daily line of boats in the summer time to Boston which is the best fish market on the North American continent. Our fishermen are able to obtain the highest market price for their fish there and if reciprocity had carried in 1911, as, to my mind, it should have, all our fishermen would now be getting better prices to-day than they are getting. A large part of the exports of fish from Yarmouth consists of boneless codfish and

there is a United States duty of three-quarters of a cent a pound on this commodity which duty is taken out of the pockets of our fishermen.

I am sorry to say that the lot of the fisherman is getting harder year by year. I was sorry to be informed just a few days ago that the price of rope has advanced to 20 cents a pound, and that the price of gasolene has advanced very largely, and is likely to go still higher. With these prospects in view, I am sure our fishermen can not expect as large profits in the future as they have had in the past unless something is done for them by the Government. I do not think that the hon. member for Lunenburg makes any suggestion at all for the amelioration of the lot of the fisherman, unless it might be that indicated in the remark which he made that it was important to get the fish as quickly as possible from the fishermen to the mouths of the consumers. The best way in which that could be done—and it would satisfy the constituencies of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens and my hon. friend from Digby, as well as my own constituency, and, in fact, all of the western counties—would be by the Government subsidising a line of boats running between Boston and Yarmouth so that the boats would put in proper cold storage plants. The matter was discussed last year at some length, but I am sorry to say that up to the present time nothing has been done in reference to it. It would certainly help the fishermen to a very large degree.

Another way in which the fishermen could be helped would be to give a bonus, or a bounty, in some form to them. There is no line of industry in the world that is fraught with so much danger and hardship as the fishing industry. In my own constituency the fishermen carry on a very large industry in live lobsters, as will be seen by the figures which I have given to the House. This industry is carried on between the 15th of September and the 15th July, and it therefore takes practically the whole of the winter season. These fishermen are obliged to go out day after day, exposing themselves to hardship and cold as well as to danger and death. If there is any way in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his department can alleviate the difficulties and hardships of the fishermen, it would certainly be appreciated by those who are engaged in this industry. I have no fault to find with the motion which has been moved by my hon. friend from Digby. If anything can be done for the fishermen by submitting this matter to the committee, I shall be heartily in accord with it. I am sorry to say that I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is commencing at the wrong end of this question. Unless the committee consider the question of free fish into the United States, which is the natural market, and without which market the fish business in the western part of Nova Scotia would be entirely obliterated, I am afraid that we can not hope for any great results.

[Mr. Law.]

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say on the resolution of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson), and I am afraid I shall disappoint my hon. friend the member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) if his kind reception of myself is an indication that he expects an instructive or a lengthy speech from me. I of course very cordially approve of the remarks of the hon. member for Digby, and if as the outcome of this brief discussion, the fish trade will be benefited in any way, the House I am sure will be indebted to the hon. member who has introduced this subject. The wording of the resolution rather indicates the subject for discussion as being the cause of the difference in the price of fish between the points of production and the points of consumption, in the interior portions of the domestic market I assume, namely, in Canada. If that be the point which the hon. gentleman desires discussed in this House, I would say that it is rather an abstract and a very much involved issue, and to discuss it intelligently it would be necessary for one to have a very extensive knowledge of the fish trade; for instance, as to the cost of catching fish, methods of curing, methods of marketing, and then to some degree a knowledge of the tastes of the consumer. But the hon. member for Digby and the hon. gentlemen who have followed him have practically confined their remarks to the fresh fish trade and the cost of transportation, and I will therefore assume that, after all, those were the two points largely in the mind of the hon. member for Digby when introducing this resolution. In the few remarks I have to make I shall, therefore, confine myself to that aspect of the case.

The marketing and transportation of fish involves a great many issues, and it is very difficult to assign any disadvantages in our marketing and transportation of fish to any one cause. For instance, it might be that some of the disadvantages might lie with the fishermen in their methods of catching, others with the fish exporter, and others again with those who transport and market the fish. A great deal would also depend upon the consuming population, that is as to whether they were a fish-consuming people.

The domestic fish trade of Canada is, of course, largely of the fresh fish business. In the Maritime Provinces our experience largely relates to the salt fish trade. We have been engaged in that form of fish trade for a long number of years, and our markets are to be found throughout the whole world. Consequently, as our long experience has been mostly in the salt fish trade, we are not so well acquainted with the fresh fish trade. In the province of British Columbia their experience largely relates to the fresh and canned fishing business. In fact, with the exception of the Maritime Provinces, the experience of the rest of Canada is largely with the fresh fish business. The experience of the Maritime Provinces has, until recent years at least, been practically confined to the salt fish business. The fresh fish trade presents many difficulties, not only in Canada, but also in the United States. For instance, it is necessary to have a regular supply of fish, and a regular and fairly cheap system of transportation. Again, the fresh fish market is more easily disturbed by weather conditions than the salt fish market. Those who have any knowledge of the fresh fish trade understand very well that it is a much more hazardous business than the salt or cured fish trade. In connection with the Canadian fresh fish trade, there are also difficulties which are peculiarly due to conditions in this country. In the first place, we have a very small and a very scattered population, and in this respect we are at a very much greater disadvantage than are those engaged in the same trade in the United States. For instance, the port of Boston is probably the largest fishing port in North America, and probably in the world, and in connection with the fresh fish trade it has tremendous advantages over any Canadian port. If there is a surplus of fish on the Boston market after that city and nearby places have been supplied, the Boston fish merchants can readily load several cars, or even a train, with the surplus and dispose of it in the towns of the States of Massachussetts, New Hampshire and Vermont, where they will find a large number of customers. If they are unable to dispose of their surplus in these cities and towns they have the market of Montreal, even in the face of the duty. It is for these reasons that the American fresh fish trade has many advantages over persons engaged in that business in Canada. I have heard the suggestion made more than once by fish merchants in Canada that the Canadian people per capita do not consume fish to the same extent as people in the United States, and I fear there is an element of truth in that. What it is due to I would not venture to say. I would imagine, however, that Canada being a cold country, on the whole, that there is not the same desire to use fish as a foodstuff as would be in warmer countries.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) expressed his disagreement with the policy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in assigning to the Naval Branch of that department the administration of fisheries. I was not aware that this was the case. I had been under the impression that merely the administration of the steamers and ships belonging to the Government had been placed under the Department of Naval Affairs for administration. I concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough. To have fisheries administered by the Naval Branch is apt to bring that service into ridicule and contempt. I do not mean to say that the administration of fisheries is injured in efficiency by being placed under the control of the naval branch, but upon the face of it, and upon paper, it looks rather absurd and is apt to bring the service more or less into ridicule. I quite approve of the work of the department in producing the little booklet dwelling upon the value of fish for food purposes, but I think the booklet is made less effective by bearing on its face the announcement that it was issued by the Naval Branch. For there is no relation whatever between the administration of fisheries and the administration of the naval service. I think I mentioned this last year in the House, or else I spoke to the minister privately about it. I have forgotten what reasons he gave me on that occasion for the course of the department in this matter. I am not making these remarks in any cen-

sorious spirit, and will close my remarks on this point by again urging the minister to restore the administration of the fisheries to the Fisheries Branch.

I think the country may fairly complain of the interest manifested by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in fisheries matters. I do not attach blame to this Government more than to its predecessors, for I think there never has been an aggressive, intelligent, scientific administration of fisheries in this country. The entire staff of the department seems to be given up to administrative affairs, largely clerical work. Very little scientific or research work has been done by anybody in connection with the department. For instance, Professor Prince's duties relate to scientific affairs, yet his time for a great many years has been broken in upon by special matters assigned to him. Being a scientific man his work in the department should be scientific, and the special or extra work given to him of late years should be given to some other person. Little or no study is given by the department to the transportation and marketing of fish. There is little or no circulation of literature by the department for the purpose of instructing the country in the use of fish as a food, or in the methods of using it or marketing it. Everything is left to individual effort, which ordinarily I approve of; but I do think that by more aggressive and modern administration of fishery affairs by the department, our fisheries might be made to contribute a great deal more to the good of the country. In saying this, I repeat, I would not have the minister understand me as attacking the administration of the department by himself or by the present Government, any more than that of previous ministers and of previous Governments. I think there is great opportunity for reform and progress in our fisheries administration.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy) spoke of the importance of increasing our fishery production. Of course, any wealth produced from the sea is as valuable in our accumulation of wealth as that produced by agriculture, lumbering, mining or manufacturing. There is this difference to be noted—and it is to the advantage of our fisheries—that the supply is not diminished, apparently, by the annual catch. Further, no expenditure of capital or labour is needed in preparing and cultivating the source of supply, whereas, especially in agriculture, the producers must devote a great deal of money and time to cultivation in order to assure the yield. I cannot but realize, however, that the increase in production from fisheries in Canada depends largely on the possibility of marketing the product. We cannot increase our fisheries production to any great extent if we must depend upon the domestic market alone. I should not look for such an increased consumption of fish products in Canada within the next few years as would increase our fish production to any great extent. We must seek markets in other countries. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, in 1911, when the question of markets for fish was a vital and prominent issue, took the position that the Canadian markets were of more importance to the Canadian fishermen than the markets of the United States. I believe that it is hopeless to expect any great increase in our production of fish unless we gain a greater market in the United States. Upon some fish products we have free entry into that market to-day; upon others we encounter a small duty. We have advantages in production over the Americans, and with access to that market we should easily be able to hold our own against the producers in that country. I am inclined, therefore, to favour the suggestion made by the hon. member for Guysborough: to encourage, if we can, the marketing of fish in the United States—I speak largely from the standpoint of the Maritime Provinces—by aiding the establishment of a shipping service between the Maritime Provinces and the United States.

[Mr. E. N. Rhodes at this point for the first time took the Chair as Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (continuing): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that it would be quite appropriate if I should extend to you my hearty congratulations on your first appearance in the Chair. Your fellow-members from Nova Scotia are greatly pleased indeed to see this distinction conferred upon you, and I am sure that you will do honour to the position.

I was saying that if a regular steamship service, designed particularly for the carriage of fish between the Maritime Provinces and the United States, could be established by the granting of a small but reasonable subsidy, it would be invaluable to the fishing interests of Nova Scotia. I would say further—I think the hon. member for Guysborough made the same suggestion this

afternoon—that the fishing industry in the Maritime Provinces is possible only because of the market in the United States. It would be hopeless to talk of increasing our domestic markets if we were not able to carry on the fishing business in the large way that we do at the present time, and the extent of the industry is made possible by the fact that the United States is the largest market that we have, and that we export to that country fish valued at millions of dollars. As the hon. member for Queens-Shelburne suggests, I am always pleased to see an industry developed by private initiative; I do not like to see the Government extend aid to any form of industry if it is possible for that industry to make progress by itself. If a substantial increase in the fresh fish export business of the Maritime Provinces could be made by the granting of a subsidy to a line of steamships which would serve a number of ports, I would gladly support any steps taken in that direction. Indirectly that would benefit the consumers of fish in Canada, because it would make it possible to ship fish much more readily and much more cheaply to our home markets. Our catch would be much greater and there would at all times be a surplus which could be satisfactorily disposed of in the home market.

There is nothing further that I desire to say upon the resolution of the hon. member for Digby except that I heartily concur in it, and I trust that some good may come from its reference to the Committee upon Fisheries for their consideration.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Coming from a county that is largely interested in the fish business, I should like to offer a word of commendation to the resolution that has been introduced by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson). Before saying anything upon that resolution, let me join with my hon. friend the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to the position which you occupy. I adopt the words, sentiments, hopes and aspirations of the hon. member for Halifax in regard to your elevation to this office, and as to your reflecting honour and dignity upon the position.

I am glad that the hon. member for Digby has brought forward this motion as it gives us an opportunity to discuss the fisheries, which we do not often have; and the subject is well worthy of discussion. As has been said, one of the first essentials for the carrying on of a successful fishing industry is an efficient system for the collection of the fish into shipping centres and their rapid transportation to markets. It is all very well to talk about having vessels run along the shores of Cape Breton, Guysborough and Halifax counties touching at the different fishing centres, collecting fish and taking it to Halifax for shipment to Boston or New York; but such a system must necessarily be a slow one. I believe that for the rapid collection of fish we must depend on railways. We have now a railway along the shore from Halifax to Yarmouth, and I believe there is one running down the valley to Yarmouth. Trains on these lines collect fish at the various stations and take them to one of these ports, whence they are shipped to Boston or New York. If the few gaps that we have in our railway lines were filled in so that there would be railway connection with every fishing centre, then trains could collect the fish each morning and convey them to Halifax or Yarmouth, whence they could be transported to the American market which, after all, I believe is our natural market for fish.

There are two ways in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can greatly assist the fisheries. The first of these is by inducing his colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) to further improve the harbours along our coasts. These harbours have been greatly improved of late years and our fishermen have thus been benefited; but there is still room for improvement. Owing to the enlargement of our harbours, the fishermen have been enabled to use larger boats and thus to catch much greater quantities of fish. In this way they have been able to attract attention in the Boston market, and large Boston dealers now send agents among our fishermen to buy their fish, which, of course, is of great advantage to our men. The further enlargement and improvement of our harbours would enable our fishermen to better compete with the Americans who go upon the fishing grounds with large vessels, equipped with auxiliary gasolene engines, which they are able to use because of the good harbours in the United States from which they operate. If our fishermen had as good harbours they could employ the same class of boats and thus make greater catches. I would therefore urge very strongly on the minister that he use his influence with the hon. Min-

ister of Public Works to have the good work of harbour improvement continued.

My second suggestion is, I believe, a new one. In some parts of Cape Breton there are fishermen who have practically no land. Many of these people came from Newfoundland where they had been engaged in the fisheries all their lives. When these people came to Nova Scotia most of the land from which it would be possible to operate on the good fishing grounds had been taken up. The fishing companies will not part with their land, and these fishermen are hugging the shore, I might almost say, scraping the beach, trying to get a foothold from which to carry on fishing operation. I would suggest to the minister that he take power to expropriate lands where necessary, in order that these people may have an opportunity to properly carry on their fishing operation. I do not say that the minister should give them land for nothing; but it is in the public interest that these men should be encouraged to prosecute the fisheries and it is almost impossible for them to do so unless they have at least some land. As I have said, these men have come from Newfoundland. They are sturdy, fearless, seafaring men, of the same stock as those fishermen of Newfoundland who, in the Empire's hour of need, have left the fisheries and gone home in large numbers to join the Imperial Navy. If they are encouraged in the way I have suggested, not only will we have an increased fishery production but, when the call goes forth for recruits for the Imperial Navy, the officers can go among these men and secure the best naval recruits to be found in the world. I trust that the minister will give this matter his most favourable consideration.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, will you allow me first to congratulate you on the honour conferred upon you by your appointment to the responsible and dignified position of deputy speaker.

If, Sir, I were to say that I know something about the fisheries, I might be told: you knew something about the fisheries—for there are new developments in our fishing industry every day. It was contended at that time that the express rates from Portland and Boston were much less than from Halifax, and that the merchants of Montreal and Toronto were importing their fish both from Boston and Portland. In order to meet that difficulty, it was decided to assist the producers on the Atlantic seaboard to aupply the large dealers of Montreal. That concession was granted, and in my best judgment it was a concession that was wisely granted. The result of it was a larger distribution of fish from the Atlantic seaboard to Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto. I do not know whether it would be wise in the interests of the industry to extend that concession to all the inland places in the Dominion, at any rate to the inland places in Ontario and Quebec. The concession is not made to such places, as I understand. What might be a good thing, in the interests of the fisheries on the Pacific seacoast would be to grant the concession to fish which is expressed to the east.

Mr. HAZEN: It is.

Mr. LOGGIE: It is on fish expressed from the west to the distributing centres Montreal, but there are distributing centres further east which do not get the benefit of the concession. However, so far as I am concerned, I think it would be a retrograde movement if the suggestion of the minister made at Ottawa were carried out. I would like very much if the minister would favourably consider the idea that it would be in the interests of the fisheries if this concession were continued. I want to tell the minister and the public that I can ship frozen salmon from Chatham to London in better condition that I could ship them by express from Chatham to Montreal.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: London, England.

Mr. LOGGIE: Yes, London, England. The minister may wonder how it can be done. Let me explain first of all that salmon or frozen fish for export are packed in tight boxes, and loaded in refrigerator cars which are charged with tons of salt forty-eight hours before the fish are put into them. The fish are kept there until they go on board the steamer at say Montreal, and they are again put into a refrigerator, and kept in a reasonably even temperature until they arrive at London or Liverpool, where they are immediately put into cold storage. Thus they arrive in the hands of the consumer in fairly good condition. Salmon are even brought from the Pacific coast and transported to London in good condition. On the other hand, let me tell the minister, that if I wanted to convey that same box of

salmon, say in the middle of January, to Ottawa, I would have to put it on board a heated car which is ruinous to frozen fish. The car has to be heated because the express man must live in it and he must have a certain temperature, but the result is that within twenty-four hours the oil which is in the salmon, which is a very rich fish, there being no such salmon in the world as the Restigouche or Miramichi and Gaspe salmon—

Mr. HAZEN: St. John harbour salmon.

Mr. LOGGIE: I forgot about the St. John harbour salmon. By the time the salmon arrive at Montreal the oil has gone out of the fish, and you see a white scum on the skin. That fish must be consumed almost immediately, as in that condition it is not up to the standard. Now if that difficulty could be got over, if the minister would be willing to take up the matter with the Railway Department, and insist that the fish be put in a car with a partition so that one end could be kept cool while the express man could have his quarters in the other compartment, the fish would arrive in Montreal in perfect condition. The cost of such an arrangement would not be very large. I realize perfectly that the matter is surrounded with difficulty, because of the uncertainty as to the quantity of fish that would be put on the cars and expressed. But I believe that the proper way in which to carry fresh fish in small quantities is by express. You must keep the temperature of that portion of the car in which the fish is placed reasonably cool. I do not think it would be a very difficult proposition to have some arrangement with the Government railways and with the other railways for carrying the fish to Montreal under such conditions. So far as the Government railways are concerned at any rate, I think the proposition might be favourably considered. My hon. friend from Halifax said that we could not greatly increase the domestic consumption of fish. I do not care how much we increase the domestic consumption; that depends upon how fast the population grows. What I want to do is to give the people whom we have in this country our Atlantic fish. I think it is a reasonable proposition that we ought to consume our own fish, and not have them caught by American fishermen and shipped from Portland and Boston to Montreal and Toronto. In order to accomplish that, we must give the producers at the Atlantic end the best transportation facilities possible. I regret I was not present when the hon. member for Guysborough advocated the subsidising of a line of steamers between Canso, I think, and Boston. That, to my mind, is a very desirable proposition, but it would not necessarily fill the bill, because it would serve only one section of the country, whereas the express companies touch nearly every point in the Maritime Provinces.

If the Government would carry out the policy that they have already laid down of extending the Intercolonial Railway by means of branch lines to these producing centres they would serve the fishing industry in a marvellous way, and do a great deal to encourage the marketing of fish. Then the hon. member for Digby could hardly say what he has said in his resolution. The point that the hon. gentleman makes in his resolution is that the fish should be placed in prime condition, and at moderate prices, on the interior markets of the country. This, I am sure, is a laudable idea and one that we can promote by providing for prompt transportation. For fresh fish express transportation is the only kind that is feasible for reasonably long distances, such as that between Montreal and the Atlantic seaboard.

With reference to prices, I am not sure that the hon. gentleman is right in what he says about that subject. I am inclined to believe that fish is to-day sold at moderate prices in the consuming centres of the Dominion. I have never known of any unreasonable price being asked for fish. The hon. gentleman must not forget, when discussing the difference between the cost of production and the cost to the consumer, that this commodity is something like vegetables. You will recall, I am sure, the discussion there has been regarding the difference between what the farmers get for their vegetables and what the consumer pays for them on the market, but if any hon. gentleman will go into the business of distributing vegetables, or into the retail fish business, in any of our large cities, he will find how great an expense there is in conducting a business of that character. Therefore, I am not sure that the hon. gentleman is right in that part of his resolution. In my judgment, fish are sold at moderate prices all over the Dominion. He says that the prices seem unreasonably high, and that this condition militates against the end in view, which is to encourage the greater consumption of fish

throughout Canada. I shall be very pleased to support the resolution to have this matter discussed before the Marine and Fisheries Committee.

9 p.m. At this time Mr. C. R. Stewart, Chief Doorkeeper of the House of Commons, came hurriedly into the Chamber and called out: "There is a big fire in the reading room; everybody get out quickly." The sitting was immediately suspended without formality, and members, officials, and visitors in the galleries, fled from the Chamber. Some of them were almost overcome by the rapidly-advancing smoke and flames before reaching a place of safety. The fire, which had originated in the reading room, gained momentum with extrme rapidity and was soon beyond control. It continued till the following day, resulting in the almost total destruction of the Parliament buildings, together with the loss of several lives.

Friday, February 4, 1916.

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

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS BY FIRE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, we meet to-day under the shadow of a great calamity. It is most deplorable that the unfortunate occurrence of last evening should have been attended with loss of life. We are evidently called upon to mourn the death of a brother member whose voice had been heard in the House of Commons only a few hours before the event occurred which drove us all from the precincts of the building. I have been associated for a number of years with Mr. Law as a fellow member of the House of Commons, and with the greatest possible regret I voice the apprehension that he may have perished in the destruction of the Parliament buildings last evening. He was a man of kindly and genial disposition and of indefatigable industry in connection with all his public duties. He was always listened to with attention and respect when he rose to address the House. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will, I know, join in conveying to those who are bereaved our very deepest and most heartfelt sympathy in the loss which they have sustained.

[Mr. Loggie.]

But it is not alone the death of this our fellow member that we have to mourn. Two gentle and accomplished ladies who were the guests of the Speaker of this House, unfortunately perished in the same disaster. I had not the honour and privilege of their acquaintance, but I know how deep must be the loss which has been sustained by the husband and family in each case. I venture to express also on behalf of the House our very deep and sincere sympathy with the families of those who have been thus unexpectedly and terribly bereaved.

But this does not end the toll of the loss, because it is apparent from all that we can learn that a very highly esteemed officer of the House also lost his life in the calamity of last evening. Mr. Laplante became Assistant Clerk of the House very shortly after I entered Parliament, and it is not too much to say that the House of Commons never had a more capable, more industrious or more faithful officer. I am sure that members on both sides of the House will join in expressing also the deepest sympathy to the family and friends of Mr. Laplante. His death is an almost irreparable loss to the effective organization and work of the House.

It appears further that three of the employees of the House lost their lives in the disaster of last evening. I believe that they were engaged in the performance of their duty, seeking to stay the progress of the fire in some part of the basement. I have no accurate or official account of how it took place, but I have a report from one who told me that he was an eyewitness of what occurred. He said that these employees were cut off by the falling in of the roof, so that he, preceding them a little, was separated from them by the falling débris, and saw them no more. They lost their lives in the discharge of their duty, striving to do what they could to stay the progress of the flames and to take every possible precaution for the safety of the members of the House. To the families of these men also I am sure every member of the House will extend his heartfelt sympathy.

As to the historic building itself, my own association with it has now extended over a period of nearly twenty years; my right hon. friend on the other side of the House has been associated with it for more than twice that period. The building dates from the very earliest years of Confederation, or even before Confederation. In that Cham-

ber the great policies were debated and worked out which have touched the development of our country and its future destiny. In that Chamber the great men who founded this Confederation spoke, and did their duty as representatives of the people in Parliament from the inception of Confederation through the active period of their lifetime.

The destruction of the building is the loss of a great historic monument. I believe that the chamber of the old clock tower was prepared for the reception of the clock in 1877. Some one has handed to me an extract from the report of the Department of Public Works for that year, which recounted that the clock chamber of the tower had been placed in position to receive the clock from Messrs Dent & Company, of London, England, and that the new library had been finished and occupied. The old clock had held its own until the very last; it struck nine, ten, eleven, and made a brave but unsuccessful attempt to strike in full the midnight hour. Shortly afterwards the tower itself fell, a monument so conspicuous in Ottawa and the surrounding country, which for many years had heralded the sittings and the adjournments of this House.

I desire to present to the House a message from His Majesty the King, which was received by His Royal Highness the Governor General this morning, as follows:

The Duke of Connaught,
Ottawa.

I am grieved to hear of the deplorable destruction of the noble pile of buildings which has been for many years the home of the Dominion Parliament, and which I know so well. Please convey to your ministers and the people of Canada my sincere sympathy with them in their great loss.

George R.I.

His Royal Highness the Governor General will, on behalf of the Parliament, the people and the Government of Canada, return a suitable reply to the gracious message of His Majesty.

I have also a letter from His Royal Highness the Governor General which it is appropriate to read to the House.

My dear Sir Robert:

I desire to express through you my warm sympathy to both Houses of Parliament on the terrible calamity of last night, by which those historical buildings were almost entirely destroyed by fire.

I know how universal will be the regret felt, not only in the Dominion itself, but throughout the Empire.

I deplore the loss of life which has, I fear, occurred, and desire to express my deep sympathy with the families of those who have so unfortunately perished.

Believe me, yours very sincerely.

Arthur.

I shall deem it my duty to express to His Royal Highness the Governor General the appreciation which I know is entertained by all members of the House of the message which he has been good enough thus to transmit to us.

It is also proper that I should read to the House a telegram which I have received from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan, dated last evening.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I am directed by the Acting Premier of Saskatchewan to forward you the following resolution passed to-night:

Resolved,—that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, having just learned of the frightful calamity that has occurred this evening at Ottawa in the destruction of the Parliament Buildings, desire to convey to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, on behalf of our people, the very deep regret and concern that all feel respecting the disaster that has occurred.

I have also had the honour of receiving from the Prime Minister of Quebec the following message, which I give for the information of the House:

Quebec, 4th Feb., 1916.

Sir Robert L. Borden,
Premier,
Ottawa, Ont.

My colleagues and myself have learned with very great regret of the disastrous fire which caused so many deaths and destroyed public buildings. Please accept our sincere and deep sympathy. Can we be useful in any way?

Lomer Gouin.

I have sent appropriate replies to each of these messages, and I feel that I may express, on behalf of all the members of Parliament, our great appreciation of these tokens of sympathy.

We have had many offers of assistance from those who are provided with buildings in Ottawa. Offers of accommodation have been received from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Ottawa Collegiate Institute, the Dominion theatre, and from Rev. Dr. Sparling, on behalf of the Methodist church. It seems, however, that adequate provision can be made in this building for the immediate needs of Parliament.

I might also read, for the information of the House, a Minute of Council which was passed this morning and which sets forth what the proposals of the Government will

be with regard to carrying on the business of the country.

To His Royal Highness,
The Governor General in Council.

The Right Hon. the Prime Minister, on behalf of the members of the Government, desires to express to Your Royal Highness their deep regret at the sudden and appalling disaster which resulted in the almost complete destruction of the Parliament Buildings last evening.

They especially deplore the loss of life with which this calamitous event was attended.

The destruction of this historic building removes a land-mark which was created even before the birth of Confederation; and the loss of many valuable records touching the transactions of Parliament for half a century is particularly unfortunate.

There has been no opportunity as yet to make a thorough investigation into the origin of the fire which is still obscure and uncertain, but every possible endeavour will be made to ascertain the cause.

Temporary accommodation for the House of Commons and the Senate can be arranged in the Victoria Memorial Museum, and steps for that purpose have already been taken by the Minister of Public Works. It is proposed that the House of Commons will meet at the customary hour to-day in that building. The Minister of Public Works, together with the members of the Internal Economy Commission of the House of Commons, will act as a Subcommittee of Council for the purpose of making all necessary arrangements for the temporary accommodation of Parliament.

All of which is respectfully submitted for the information of your Royal Highness.

Rodolphe Boudreau.

I endeavoured to procure from such officers as might have means of knowledge a report for the information of Parliament to-day. Owing to the very great activities of Col. Sherwood, Superintendent of Dominion Police, and the insistent demands on his time during the forenoon, his report has not yet been forthcoming. I hope such a report, giving what information is available with regard to the origin of the fire, will be presented to the House on Monday. In the meantime, the sergeant-at-arms, at my request, has given me his report. I do not know that it gives much information not already in the possession of hon. gentlemen, but it may not be amiss that I should read it:

Memorandum for the information of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister.

The fire commenced in the reading room of the House of Commons; from there it spread with the greatest rapidity up the corridors of the House and through the second flat, such dense and suffocating volumes of smoke preceding the actual fire as prevented all efforts to effectively fight the fire from the inside. Many members and officers and employees of the House were unable even to get their hats and overcoats.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

The fire first destroyed the House and its offices and then spread rapidly to the Senate. A short time was therefore afforded for saving some of the property in the Senate side of the building,—the Senate Mace and many valuable oil paintings from the lobbies were saved, together with some furniture, but I am not able at the present time to ascertain exactly what records have been saved. I fear very few, except those that have been kept in vaults.

The fire having started in the reading room, with the wind blowing from a northerly direction, the flames were carried away from the Library, and although it was once or twice in very imminent danger, the building and its contents have been saved, except in so far as they may have been damaged by water. The firemen, the officers of the Library, and the Ottawa Garrison worked most strenuously and a large number of volumes were removed with the aid of the military motor lorries and placed in the Government garage.

This complete loss was due to the extraordinary rapidity with which the fire spread through the lobbies and long corridors, the ceilings of which were of wood, and also to the smoke which made it quite impossible for any person to enter the upper parts of the building. It may be possible that the contents of one or two offices may be saved as from the external appearance of the windows, one or two rooms appear to have escaped very serious injury; but it is impossible at the present time to make any examination. The House of Commons' Mace is missing.

Henry R. Smith,
Serjeant-at-Arms.

Ottawa, Feb. 4, 1916.

It is, I am sure, a very great satisfaction to all the members of the House to know that so little damage has been done to the Library. I believe, however, that the loss may be somewhat greater than is expressed in the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms, if I may judge from a conversation which I had with Mr. Martin Griffin, one of the joint librarians, while on my way to the House. He feared at that time that about 30,000 volumes had either been destroyed or very seriously damaged.

The appalling suddenness of this calamity must, I am sure, have impressed itself on every member who was within the precincts of the House at the time the fire occurred. Those who were not actually present within the building will hardly believe with what startling suddenness the volumes of smoke and the gusts of flame came into the corridors. When I went down the corridor leading past the press room, the smoke and flames were rolling through the corridor which led to the reading room in an appalling volume; and the fire and smoke seemed to be accompanied by a series of short, sharp explosions, indicating the fierceness with which the fire was making its headway. I know that many hon. members of the

House had very narrow escapes indeed, and we are most thankful that, under Providence, the loss of life was no greater than it was. When one thinks of what might have occurred under different conditions, with all the galleries crowded, I am sure we have every reason, indeed, to be thankful that the loss of life was not more appalling. It is well that we should join in the tribute expressed in the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms to the officers of the House, to the police, to the firemen, and to the troops who were called out by the Minister of Militia, and who rendered splendid service all through the night.

So far as our proposals are concerned, I have already explained to my right hon. friend that we propose today to adjourn until Monday, and to proceed with the public business of Canada in the usual way. It seems to me that such is the desirable course for us to take, particularly as we have fortunately accommodation much more adequate than I had supposed could be found in this building. Doubtless, not only the members of the Government, but the members of the House, will have to put up with certain inconveniences, in proceeding with the public business, as we can not have here all the facilities which were afforded in the splendid building which was almost completely destroyed last night. But I believe it will stand out as a good example of the Canadian spirit of determination if we proceed at once with the public business, and carry on our work without unnecessary delay. What we may arrange for another session, we do not yet know. I have asked my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to accompany me this afternoon to the new Customs building, with the view of considering whether or not, by stopping the work now proceeding there, and by somewhat modifying the interior of the building for the time being, we should be able to provide there a temporary home for Parliament until a new, more convenient, and more splendid edifice is erected upon the site of the historic buildings occupied by Parliament for so many years. And so I commend to the consideration of the House our proposal to proceed at once, with firm hearts and renewed resolve, in the discharge of our duties as representatives of the people of Canada in this Parliament.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I re-echo every word that has been spoken by the Prime Minister on this calamitous occasion. Sad indeed are the circumstances under which we meet to-day. The old Parliament Building in which we sat yesterday, and which has been identified with the life of the Canadian people since Confederation, is a mass of ruins. Great though the material loss is to every member of Parliament, to those of the present day and to those of an older generation still living, the loss of life is still more appalling. We had become attached to the scene and to everything which appertained to that building. To the people of Ottawa especially it will be a sad loss, because it was part of the life of the community, as it was the pride of every Canadian who came to Ottawa to see the British flag floating on the stately tower. The noble building will rise again with no loss of time and we will see it again at no distant date, in its pristine beauty. But what can we say about the loss of life. We had yesterday in the full vigour of almost youth, Mr. Law, the member for Yarmouth, whom we are not likely to see again in this life, and who a few hours before had given us his views on a very important question. Now we know his body is in that mass of ruins.

We had at the table an officer who had been for very nearly 20 years a faithful servant of the House of Commons, a man whose courtesy, ability, activity, and kindness every member had learned to appreciate. How he disappeared, we do not know, but unfortunately there is no hope that we will be able to see him again in life.

And what have we to say, Sir, of the loss of those two young ladies, young happy mothers, young happy wives, bright as the lark in the blue sky of the morning, full of life, full of contentment, and appreciating the benefit of their station visiting old friends in their present high station, and now no more.

I have nothing more to say except to endorse what has been said by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, that we should go on at once with the business of the country. When we look at the mass of ruin there on the hill, and when we know that it is the result of an accident, we are reminded of the ruins of Louvain, and of the ruins of Rheims, caused not by accident, but by the wickedness of a cruel foe. If there is anything which the present calamity should impress upon us, it is the desirability of going on with our work and doing everything to bring those cruel murderers to justice.

TRANSPORTATION AND MARKETING OF FISH.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, when the unfortunate event which has been alluded to occurred last evening there was under discussion in the House a motion which had been presented by my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson). I understand that some hon. members on this side of the House, at least, proposed to speak to that motion, but they have informed me that under the circumstances they will forego their right. I am also informed that no other members on the other side of the House desire to speak upon it. As the resolution relates to an important matter, and it is merely for the purpose of enabling the appropriate committee of the House to proceed with an inquiry into that subject, I have asked my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consent that we proceed to Order No. 7 on the Order Paper of yesterday so that we may have the motion put to the House and disposed of. I move:

That the House now proceed with the consideration of Order No. 7 on the Order Paper of yesterday.

Motion agreed to.

The motion of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) respecting a proposed inquiry by the Committee on Marine and Fisheries into the transportation and marketing of fish was put to the House and agreed to.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

Monday, February 7, 1916.

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1915, vol. 3.—Sir Thomas White.

Despatch to His Royal Highness the Governor General from the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, transmitting copy of the Parliamentary Debates of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom on the 12th January upon the resolution which was adopted by that House to this effect: With a view to increasing the power of the Allies in the prosecution of the war, His Majesty's Government should enter into immediate consultation with the Governments of the Dominions, in order with their aid to bring the whole economic strength of the Empire into co-operation with our Allies in a policy directed against the enemy.—Sir Robert Borden.

THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) laid on the table a copy of an Order in Council appointing Robert A. Pringle, of the city of Ottawa, one of His Majesty's counsel learned in the law, and His Honour D. B. MacTavish, county court judge for the county of Carleton, commissioners for the purpose of conducting an inquiry into and concerning the origin of the fire which destroyed the Parliament buildings at Ottawa, and to make full investigation into all matters connected therewith, with full power to engage the services of experts, and technical advisers, and other assistance as they may deem necessary.

THE LATE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES TUPPER, BART.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) presented the report of the committee appointed to prepare a resolution on the death of the Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet, G.C.M.G.: This report reads as follows:

Resolved, that the House of Commons of Canada desires to express its deep sense of the loss sustained by the Dominion and the Empire in the death of the late Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet, G.C.M.G., C.B. For many years a commanding figure in the Parliament and Government of this Dominion in the confederation, expansion and development of which he played so great a part, Sir Charles Tupper's name and career will ever be held by Canadians in intimate association with the progress and upbuilding of our country.

Full of years and honours he has passed away, leaving behind him a long and impressive record of public service.

The House of Commons avails itself of this opportunity to record its tribute of respect to the memory of one of its most distinguished members.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved, seconded by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the adoption of the report.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper entered public life in the province of Nova Scotia, of which he was a native, just sixty years before his lamented death last autumn. For twelve years before Confederation he was a leading and com-

manding figure in that province, and his record and career in that provincial arena was what we might expect from one who displayed the great qualities which characterized him in after years in the wider Federal arena. Under his leadership the province of Nova Scotia entered upon a policy of free public education and of active railway development. His proposal for the union of the Maritime Provinces led to the holding of a conference at Charlottetown, at which delegates from the united provinces of Canada made their presence known, and in that way he directly led up to the great movement which resulted in the founding of this Confederation. For nearly twenty years after Confederation he was a member of the House of Commons; and in that historic building on the Hill, now in ruins, his was one of the most commanding figures during all that time. He occupied many and important portfolios, and in 1886, or thereabouts, left the active discharge of political duties in this country to undertake the not less important duties of High Commissioner at London. All those who had an opportunity of knowing his record and his work during that time agree, I am sure, that Canada could have had no more able, no more indefatigable, and no more faithful public servant than Sir Charles Tupper. I came into Parliament when the Government of which he was Prime Minister was defeated in 1896. I had known him, of course, but not intimately, as a great Nova Scotian, before I entered public life, and I can pay with every sincerity this tribute to his memory. After serving under him for four years, while he was leader of the Opposition from 1896 to 1900, I was impressed and inspired with an even higher appreciation of his great ability, and an even greater admiration of his wonderful qualities than when I first, in the autumn of 1896, as one of his followers, took my seat in the House of Commons. He had splendid qualities. Not only his political friends, but his political opponents admired and paid tribute to him. He had a magnificent courage which never quailed before any danger, or in the face of any odds. He had a fine optimism. He was a firm believer in every sense in the resources of this Dominion, and in the greatness of its future. His constructive statesmanship was evidenced in the various policies which he advocated for the development and upbuilding of the country. Whatever difference of opinion may have existed with regard to the wisdom of those policies, no difference of opinion could possibly have existed as to his sincere conviction that they were wise policies, or as to the remarkable ability and the wide vision which he displayed in defending them, both in Parliament and in the country. He was undoubtedly a great protagonist, a man who, in the course of his public career delivered and received as many hard blows as any public man in Canada. But those who knew him intimately, not only his political friends, but his political opponents, will agree that, behind the vigour of his attack, behind the strong and earnest effort which he always brought to the advocacy of the policies which he upheld, there was absolutely no personal bitterness.

I had the privilege of an interview with him in the month of August last; I went to his home in the country, near London, for the purpose of seeing him before I returned to Canada. So far as his physical condition was concerned, he was, of course, very feeble, but I do not remember ever having spoken to him when his mind was clearer, his intellect more vigorous, or when he took a keener interest in the welfare of this Dominion, in its relations to the Empire, and in all that concerned the Empire at large. I spent about an hour with him on that occasion, and I came away inspired by the wonderful interest he displayed in the great events through which we are passing; by the boundless optimism and courage which still animated him with regard to the conduct of the war, with regard to our duty in the war, and with regard to its ultimate outcome.

In him passed away the last of the great Canadians who took a leading part in laying the splendid foundations of this Dominion. He lived to see its boundaries extended to the great oceans on the West and on the North. He lived to see amply fulfilled the prophecies of early days which his far-seeing vision had inspired. At the last, as at the first, he held an abiding faith in the future of his country, and in its great destiny as one of the sister nations of this vast Empire. Among the thousands who followed his mortal remains to their last resting place, I was privileged to be present. Years ago, he marked the spot where after life's fitful fever he should sleep. There in the quiet God's acre, in the suburbs of Halifax, where he desired to be laid at rest, he reposes by the side of her who for more than sixty years was his faithful companion and help-mate.

I trust that in the not distant future, upon Parliament Hill, there will arise a monument worthy of his memory; but,

his most enduring monument will be the splendid record of achievement which commemorates his name in every province of Canada. Upon the tablet above the tomb of the great architect of St. Paul's Cathedral, there is written this inscription, "Si monumentum requiris, circumspice." So of him, one of the greatest founders of our Confederation, this may justly be said; if you seek his monument, look around you and behold all that he wrought for the Canada that he loved so well and served so faithfully.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons will honour itself, even more than it will honour the memory of Sir Charles Tupper, by testifying in the most solemn manner its appreciation of the many services and arduous labours of one who was in his time, and who must remain for all time upon its roll of honour, one of its most illustrious members, one who contributed in no small degree to make Canada what it is to-day. Sir Charles Tupper was the last survivor of that galaxy of strong and able men whom the Canadian people delight to honour with the name of Fathers of Confederation. Amongst the able men, who in the fall of 1864, assembled in the city of Quebec with the object of finding a basis of union for the then disjointed provinces of British North America, and whose united efforts brought forth the Canadian Confederation, the name of Tupper stands eminent among the most eminent. Fifty years and more have passed since that date, and perhaps now, we are sufficiently removed from those stormy times to be able to frame a correct estimate of the part played by the statesmen of Canada in that intensely dramatic period of our history.

Undoubtedly to George Brown was due the first initiation of Confederation. He it was, who, by his strong and persevering agitation against the unwieldy union of Upper and Lower Canada, directed the destinies of Canada towards the Confederation of the older provinces of British North America. It seems to me to be equally true that it was Sir George Cartier who first put the idea into shape when he set upon it the seal of his essentially practical mind, and brought to it the support of the one province which was material to the idea, if the idea was ever to become a fact.

By his talent and ability, Galt lent aid to the movement; still more did he do so by obtaining for it the influential adhesion of the strong minority in the province of Quebec, of which he was the illustrious representative. It was the good fortune of Tilley to be able, almost from the first, to bring his province to support the idea with a minimum of division and difficulty. Macdonald was the last to come into line. It is of record that for many years he objected to any change in then existing condition of things, and only a few days before the coalition of 1864 he had almost passionately antagonized the very idea of a federal union. But when he did adopt the principle he became at once the captain and the pilot. It was his master hand that took hold of the helm, met difficulties as they arose, arrived at solutions of unforeseen obstacles, and steadily and unerringly directed the course until port was reached. And what was the part of Tupper? In his day, this question of Confederation antagonized friends and divided foes. Now that we may look upon it in the calm judgment of history, it must be admitted, I think, that Tupper brought to the cause more firm conviction and took more chances than did any one else. It must be remembered that at that time Nova Scotia was completely against him, and that instead of using time and patience to win the province over to the idea of Confederation, he forced it into the union by the doubtful authority of a dying legislature. The grandeur of the idea strongly appealed to his mind, and he would not let pass the opportunity which if missed might not occur again for many years. If he erred at all, he erred because he loved not wisely but too well. Indeed, in order to understand the action of Sir Charles Tupper at this important juncture in the history of our country, we must remember what was the chief characteristic of the man. In my judgment the chief characteristic of Tupper was courage; courage which no obstacle could down, which rushed to the assault, and which, if repulsed, came back to the combat again and again; courage which battered and hammered, perhaps not always judiciously, but always effectively; courage which never admitted defeat and which in the midst of overwhelming disaster ever maintained the proud carriage of unconquerable defiance. This attribute of courage was the dominant feature of his whole public career, and perhaps never shone more prominently than in the manner in whch he entered public life. It had not been his lot to be born to wealth or affluence. The son of a poor Baptist clergyman, he had succeeded by his own efforts in obtaining an education, and winning a

diploma in the medical profession. He was a young practitioner, not known at all outside the precincts of his own town, and hardly known within them, when with splendid audacity he threw himself against one who was the darling of the people, the most potent influence in Nova Scotia and, perhaps the brightest impersonation of intellect that ever adorned the halls of a legislature in any part of what is now Canada. Joseph Howe was then the member for Cumberland. In the province of Nova Scotia there is a tradition still extant, transmitted from father to son, and repeated at many firesides, that on one occasion, when Howe had addressed a meeting of his constituents and had brought his auditors to a pitch of enthusiasm even greater than that which his magnetic eloquence had ever before elicited, a young man rose from the audience to reply. It is stated that Howe was somewhat surprised and perhaps not a little amused but at once yielded assent with something like patronizing condescension. If he was surprised at first, he had greater reason for surprise when he listened to the address of his hitherto unknown opponent. He found that in the speech of this young man there was meat and substance which moved the people and which gave cause for reflection and worry. The tradition further has it, that when Howe returned to Halifax he stated to his friends that he had met in Cumberland a young doctor who would be a tower of strength to the Conservatives and a thorn in the side of the Liberals. The truth of his prediction was soon borne out, even at his own expense. At the elections which followed in 1855 young Tupper came forward against Howe in the county of Cumberland and wrested it from him. Howe at that time was at the zenith of his fame and it may certainly be said of his successful opponent that no one ever crossed the portals of any legislature through so wide an entrance. Sir William Johnson was the leader of the Conservatives in Nova Scotia. He was a man of eminent ability, but being far advanced in years and in poor health, was only too glad to rely on the services of a young man of so much promise. From the day that young Tupper came to the fore in the legislature of Nova Scotia he became the guiding spirit of his party and the inspiration of all his followers. Almost from that day his life became associated with the life of Canada, because it was only a few years afterwards, when he had become premier of his province, that the movement for Confederation was suddenly started. In that movement for Confederation, with all the excitement that it produced, and with all the agitation to which it gave birth, he found a genial field for his great parliamentary ability.

I have said that courage was his chief characteristic; but it was not his only characteristic. His mind had been cast in a broad mould. Whatever question he had to deal with he never approached it from the narrow sphere of parochial limitation; on the contrary, he approached it always from the broadest conception it was susceptible of. When I entered this House, more than forty years ago these were the two things which particularly struck me in him. He was then in the prime of life and in the full maturity of his powers; he seemed to me the very incarnation of the parliamentary athlete, always strong, always ready to accept battle and to give battle. Though often my judgment was against him, in every case I could not say that he was animated by anything else than the broadest view of Canadian problems. When Confederation had become an accomplished fact he rose to the front in the broader arena, just as he had taken the first rank in the legislature of his own province. From the day that he first entered the Chamber of the House of Commons, now unfortunately destroyed, his power was at once asserted and at once acknowledged by everybody. He came into the Federal House under the most distressing circumstances, for in the elections of 1867, the first after Confederation, his whole province had gone against him; he alone had succeeded in retaining a seat. His conduct under these circumstances was worthy of all praise. He applied himself with untiring zeal and unselfishness to the task of binding the wounds of his province, and of reconciling the people to the new conditions. At first he met with but indifferent success; the feeling of resentment persistent only to be assuaged by the soothing hand of time. He had not the supreme gift of which Sir John A. Macdonald was pre-eminently the master: that of reconciling conflicting elements and, with the minimum of friction, of bringing them together as if they had always been one.

In this House his name must ever remain attached to two measures— measures very different in character, but each

of which brought forth the particular qualities with which he was endowed; I refer to Protection, and the Canadian Pacific railway. This is not the time nor the occasion to discuss Protection as an economic principle, but I think everybody, friend or foe, must admit that the introduction of Protection into Canada was, be it for weal or woe, was due to Sir Charles Tupper. Sir John A. Macdonald, as in the case of Confederation, had at first been rather indifferent and doubtful; Sir Charles Tupper never had a doubt. He it was who first became its advocate in this House, and he it was who carried on the agitation in the country; and in my humble judgment, great as was the personality and prestige of Sir John A. Macdonald, the victory of 1878 was due more to Sir Charles Tupper than to any one else. But it was not he, after all, who introduced the priciple of protection as an actual measure. He had been the champion, but he was not its artisan in this House. That honour was reserved for Sir Leonard Tilley. But if Sir Charles Tupper did not introduce the protective measure in this House, it was simply because he did not choose to do so. He might have had the portfolio of Finance, but he rather chose the portfolio of Public Works, which at that time included railways. With this portfolio he had the occasion to attach his name to another very great measure, the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. All parties in this country had been in favour of a transcontinental railway, but no party had taken up the question with anything like serious earnestness until sir Charles Tupper took it up with all the vigour of his nature. He organized the syndicate which built the railway. These terms were much criticised as extravagant and yet though we may yet criticise the terms granted the syndicate as extravagant—such was the immensity of the enterprise that it was more than once on the eve of collapse. Nothing daunted the courage of Sir Charles Tupper. He never had any doubt of its ultimate success, and it was his good fortune to see all his predictions more than fulfilled. Sir Charles Tupper had reached the zenith of his fame and power in this House when suddenly he withdrew from parliamentary life to accept the High Commissionership in London. The reasons which induced him to that step never were given to the public. But whatever they might have been, we who were his opponents thought that he had committed a great mistake. Undoubtedly his services in London were honourable and useful to the country, but in my opinion he was more fitted for parliamentary life, and his services to the country would have been still greater had he remained on the floor of this Parliament. Though absent from Ottawa and in far-away London, his heart never deserted the field of his former activities, and whenever there was a battle to be fought he appeared on the scene, and, with his characteristic vigour, was always in the thickest of the fray. Next to Sir John A. Macdonald, he was undoubtedly in his time the most powerful figure in the Conservative party. Indeed, it has always been a mystery to me and to those who sat on this side of the House that Sir Charles Tupper was not sent for when the old chieftain died. He was sent for at last, but then it was too late. The battle was already lost, and notwithstanding the vigour and brilliancy with which he threw himself into the battle, he could not redeem the fortunes of his party.

The public life of Sir Charles Tupper ended with the elections of 1900, when he had reached the age of almost eighty years. His strong constitution had at last been shaken by a life of arduous labour, and he withdrew to a well earned rest. But though he retired from public life and the seclusion of his family circle, he continued from day to day to follow with passionate interest the fortunes of Canada. In that daily spectacle he had this great satisfaction, that the correctness of his estimate of the resources of this country, when they were still unknown and undeveloped, was abundantly justified. When at last the end came his eyes closed upon a Canada whose population had doubled and more than doubled, whose national revenue had trebled and quadrupled, whose commerce had risen from a comparatively small figure to the billion dollar mark and more, whose products in agriculture and industry had reached figures that would have seemed fantastic in the first year of the Union—a Canada whose people were united even to the shedding of their blood in the defence and for the triumph of those principles of freedom and justice which the Fathers of Confederation had placed under the ægis of British institutions. To say that the life of Sir Charles Tupper was without fault would be to say what cannot be said of any human life. But it must be said, and

should ever be remembered, that but for the life of Sir Charles Tupper Canada would not be what it is to-day.

Motion of Sir Robert Borden agreed to.

Sir Robert Borden moved:

That the resolution of condolence on the death of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Tupper be communicated to the members of his family on behalf of this House by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS BY FIRE.

MESSAGES OF CONDOLENCE.

Sir Robert BORDEN: I desire to read for the information of the members a number of messages of sympathy which have been received on and since Friday last, but not in time to be communicated to the House at an earlier date.

From the Colonial Secretary to the Governor General.

London, 4th February, 1916.

To Sir Robert Borden:

Deeply sympathize with you and the Government, Parliament and people of Canada in their great loss. People of Great Britain already bound to the Dominion by gratitude, magnificent services to Empire's cause will be yet more firmly united to Canada by common grief.

ASQUITH.
(Sgd.) BONAR LAW.

From the Governor of Newfoundland to the Governor General of Canada.

St. John's Newfoundland,
4th February, 1916.

My ministers desire me to convey the expressions of the universal sympathy in Newfoundland over the destruction of the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa and sorrow over the loss of life through the conflagration.

(Sgd.) Davidson.

From the Governor General of Australia to the Governor General.

Melbourne, February 5, 1916.

Would express to Your Royal Highness my deep regret at loss sustained by people of Canada in destruction of their beautiful Parliament Buildings.

(Sgd.) R. M. Ferguson.

Littlemill, February 5, 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Canada.

Filled grief saddest news. For seven years new daily inspiration from sight beautiful towers. Lady Grey and I, while deeply mourning Canada's loss, know you will raise from ashes building worthy of a great destiny which war sacrifices in cause of righteousness have already abundantly insured for Canadian people.

Grey.

London, February 5, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

Council and members Royal Colonial Institute deeply sympathize Government and people of Canada destruction your splendid Parliament Buildings.

Grey, President.

London, February 5, 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Mr. Andrew Fisher, Australian High Commissioner, telegraph begins. Please convey to your chief and through him to the people of Canada Australia's sorrow at the sad misfortune that has overtaken them in the disastrous fire at Ottawa and our sympathy in the deplorable loss of valuable lives that attended.

Perley.

London, February 5, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa.

My sincere congratulations on your fortunate escape from the disastrous fire which to our deep regret has wrought such damage to your Parliament Buildings.

Kitchener.

Toronto, February 4, 1916.

The Right Hon. R. L. Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sincerely regret loss sustained in the destruction of the Parliament Buildings and especially sorry to hear of injuries sustained by your colleague and others, which I hope will not prove of a serious nature.

John. S. Hendrie.

St. John's, Newfoundland,
February 7, 1916.

Rt. Hon. Sir R. L. Borden,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Government and people of Newfoundland deeply sympathize with you in the destruction of your Parliament Buildings. This last act will still further increase the feeling of admiration throughout the whole Empire for your splendid work in connection with the war.

E. P. Morris.

New York, February 4, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

Grieved beyond expression, but this dreadful event will only weld together more firmly than ever the inflexible patriotism of all Canadians.

Aberdeen,

Metropolitan Club, New York.
Toronto, February 4, 1916.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

This Government and the people of Ontario as a whole have learned with deep regret of the destruction of the Parliament Buildings and we will be glad to co-operate in any way possible to minimize the inconvenience of the disaster. Have learned with much satisfaction of the escape of yourself and the members of the Government and members of Par-

liament. We deeply deplore the loss of life which resulted from the fire and extend sympathy to those who have sustained personal injuries.

W. H. Hearst.

Montreal, February 4, 1916.

Sir Robert Laird Borden,
Premier and President of the Privy Council,
Ottawa, Ont.

I hasten to present to you my sincerest condolences for the terrible disaster which occurred last night to the Federal Parliament Building.

Likatscheff,
Imperial Russian Consul General.

Kamloops, B.C., February 4, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

Shocked to hear of accident but thankful you escaped. On behalf of people of British Columbia wish to extend deepest sympathy to bereaved.

W. J. Bowser.

(Translation.)

Montreal, February 4, 1916.

The Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

Following on the fire which has just destroyed the Parliament building, I wish to convey to you, on my behalf and that of the whole French colony, the assurance of our deep sympathy with the Dominion government in this dire calamity, and of our grief at the losses of human life consequent on it.

C. E. Bonin,
French General Consul.

Montreal 4th February, 1916.

The Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

On behalf of the citizens of Montreal I beg to express to you my heartful sympathy in the appalling disaster which has caused the loss of several lives and the destruction of the most historic building of our Dominion.

Médéric Martin,
Mayor of Montreal.

Winnipeg, Man., 4th February, 1916.

Rt. Hon. Sir R. L. Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

The Legislature of the province of Manitoba desire to express to you deepest regret and concern for the great calamity which has befallen Canada in the burning of Parliament Buildings at Ottawa, and to convey our sincere sympathy for the families of those who have lost their lives, and to those who themselves have been injured.

T. C. Norris.

London, 4th February, 1916.

Borden,
Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Accept my deep sympathy at great disaster.

Harcourt.

Auckland, 5th Feb., 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Government and people of New Zealand desire express warmest sympathy with people of Canada in destruction their magnificent Parliament Buildings by fire and consequent loss of lives. Telegrams received indicate some doubt origin disaster. Will therefore not deal with this point until definite information to hand.

Massey,
Prime Minister.

From Mr. Bonar Law to the Governor General.

London, 4th Feb., 1916.

I hasten to express my profound sympathy with your Government and the people of Canada in the grave disaster which they have suffered by the destruction by fire of the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa. I sincerely trust that there has been no loss of life and am anxious to learn extent of damage.

Bonar Law.

Montreal, Que., 4th Feb., 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

I wish to express to the Dominion Government my sympathy for the sad loss of life and terrible destruction of the Dominion Parliament Buildings.

Italian Consul General,
Zunini.

London, 4th Feb., 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Deeply deplore loss of life and disastrous fire. Have received many expressions sympathy and regret here. Hope Burrell's injuries not serious.

Perley.

Toronto, Ont., 4th Feb., 1916.

The Right Honourable
Robert L. Borden
Premier, Ottawa, Ont.

Sincere sympathy in loss of noble buildings. God guide you in this fresh difficulty.

Bishop of Toronto.

London, 4th Feb., 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

At Grand Trunk Board to-day I was requested to convey great regret and sympathy at disaster of House of Parliament.

Alfred Smithers.

New York, 4th Feb., 1916.

Sir R. L. Borden,
Premier Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

Am deeply affected by misfortune by brutal criminal act of our enemies. Am so glad the Lord has protected you. Please extend my feelings of sorrow to families of unfortunates.

Cap Seferovich,
General Consul.

London, 5th Feb., 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa.

Deeply grieved to hear of deaths and destruction of Parliament Building by fire.

Howard.

Aughrim, Wicklow, 5th Feb., 1916.

Rt. Hon. R. Borden,
Ottawa, Canada

All Ireland filled with indignation at brutal outrage. Accept deepest sympathy of our people.

Redmond.

Panne, 6th February, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa, Canada.

Lament irreparable loss of beautiful buildings. Congratulate you on merciful escape.

Alexander of Teck.

Boston, Mass., Feb. 5, 1916.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

The Canadian Club of Boston in executive meeting assembled extends to you its sincere sympathy at the loss of life and destruction of historic Parliament Buildings. We are sure that from the ruins will arise with the indomnitable Canadian spirit a new and grander edifice to testify the unconquerable soul of Canada.

Martin Green,
Secretary.

London, 6th Feb., 1916.

Prime Minister,
Canada.

I and all Canadian Corps wish to express our deep regret at deplorable loss of Dominion Parliament Buildings.

General Sir Edwin Alderson.

London, 6th Feb., 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Desire express sympathy of Salvation Army in the deplorable disastrous fire which, whether occasioned by accident or design, has caused such loss and disappointment, and removed from one of the beauty spots of the Empire that striking result of faith and bold imagination so courageously established in early days of Canada's history. But the flag still flies I am convinced.

That faith in God in Canada in the future will shortly rise up out of the ashes a building more noble and more expressive of the opportunities and determination of a great and free people.

General Booth.

Ottawa, February 5, 1916.

Dear Sir Robert:

Confirming my verbal communication of this evening, I hasten to inform you that I have just received a cable from my Chief, Baron Beyens, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, directing me to tender to the Government of the Dominion, on behalf of the Belgian Government, the expression of its deep sympathy in the general regret caused by the destruction of the Parliament Building.

My Government expresses special feelings of sympathy with the loss of life having resulted from the disaster.

Yours sincerly,
(Sgd.) M. Goor.

Royal Consulate of Sweden at Montreal.

Montreal, February 4, 1916.

Sir,—The deplorable news of the disaster that has met the Parliament Buildings in Ottawa and the loss of life and other great values thereby sustained induce me to offer to you the expression of my warmest sympathy.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant
(Sgd.) David Bergstrom,
Royal Swedish Consul General.

The Right Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden,
P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa.

Toronto, Ont., 6th Feb., 1916.

The Right Honourable
Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

On behalf of my congregation and myself I beg to offer expression of heartfelt regret at the terrible catastrophe which has befallen the Parliament Buildings of the Dominion of Canada.

Rabbi Jacobs,
Toronto.

Consulate of Norway for Canada.

Montreal, 5th February, 1916.

Sir,—On behalf of my Government I wish to express my sincere regret to the Government and people of Canada at the irreparable national loss suffered through the destruction of the Federal Parliament Building and most of its priceless contents. I also much deplore the grievous loss of life with which this calamity so unhappily was attended, and desire to extend my sympathy to those bereaved on this occasion.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) F. Koren,
Royal Norwegian Consul for Canada.

The Right Hon. Sir R. Borden, P.C., G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 21, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. HAZEN: Explain.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Bill is a copy of the Bill which I introduced two years ago and which passed its first and second readings. It was then referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, but got no further. The purpose of the Bill is to enable captains with coasting certificates to navigate their ships further south than 5° north latitude, which is as far south as the law at present permits them to go. If this Bill passes, it will permit captains holding coasting certificates to navigate as far south as 40° south latitude or to the mouth of the river Platte in South America.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On the Orders of the Day:

SOLDIERS' EQUIPMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) of the contents of a letter which I have received from a certain county in Ontario. I do not care to give any names at the present time. A new battalion is being raised in this county, and my correspondent informs me that subscriptions are being taken up throughout the locality to supply the men with things which it is claimed are necessary, namely: five field kitchens, a motor truck, granite ware for cooking, a mess tent for the soldiers and a mess tent for the officers, signs or markers indicating the battalion to be attached to the coats of the men, and several other small items. I have heard that this is not the first incident of this nature, but that many similar subscriptions have been taken up. In my opinion, all these things should be provided by the Government as part of the equipment of the soldiers. Can my hon. friend give me any information on this matter?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Everything necessary for the soldiers in the field is supplied by the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: These subscriptions are being asked to supply the soldiers with field kitchens, mess tents, signs or markers indicating the battalion, and so on. These seem to be necessities which should be supplied by the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Field kitchens are now supplied by the department. They were not supplied at the beginning of the war, because a great many friends thought they would like to recognize their local battalions by supplying them with field kitchens. These mess tents are really not necessary. If a battalion is to be in camp for the summer, there is no reason why it should not have mess tents, but they are not essential for the soldiers' welfare. We supply motor trucks, but many regiments wanted additional trucks of their own and we allowed subscriptions to be taken up for them in a couple of cases, but only in the way I have mentioned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would suggest to my hon. friend that whatever he thinks are necessities should be supplied by the Government, and that it is bad practice to allow subscriptions to be taken up for whatever is not necessary.

Sir SAM HUGHES: These things are not taken to the front; they are only allowed for the summer camps.

THE LATE MR. B. B. LAW, M.P.

On the Orders of the Day:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It seems apparent that the apprehension which we had as to one of the members of this House, the hon. member for Yarmouth, N.S., Mr. Law, has become a certainty. It was my privilege and my duty, when I spoke in the House on Friday last, to express my very deep regret at the loss which we have all sustained through his death, and also to express the sympathy felt, I know, by all members with the family and friends of Mr. Law in their bereavement. It has been suggested to me that some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who did not find the opportunity to pay a tribute to the memory of Mr. Law on Friday last, would desire the privilege of doing so to-day, and I hope that with the permission of the House they may avail themselves of this opportunity.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): On behalf of the gentlemen on this side of the House who have been associated in the representation of Nova Scotia in this Parliament with our friend, Mr. Law, who was the only victim among the members of this House in the disaster of Thursday night, I desire to express my thanks to the Prime Minister for the opportunity he has given us to say a word or two in appreciation of our late colleague. Mr. Law was the oldest member of this House in point of service, with the exception of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), from the province from which we come. He was the dean of the representation on this side from the province of Nova Scotia. Speaking as one who had the honour and pleasure of sitting in the Legislature of Nova Scotia with Mr. Law's esteemed father some fifteen or eighteen years ago, I desire to say that those of us who come from that province regard Mr. Bowman Law as a man who among all our number was typical of the business people of Nova Scotia. He represented the constituency of Yarmouth where, in the old days, the merchants built their vessels and sailed them on the seven seas. He was the inheritor of a business established in those days, which he extended and developed and

was a type of the men who have made Yarmouth one of the principal sea ports of the Dominion of Canada. By diligence in business he had attained a position, not only in his own county but throughout the whole province, which entitled him to the respect and admiration of all of our people for the splendid qualities he possessed in mercantile life. It was typical of the man that the last words he spoke in Parliament were on behalf of the industry, and of the men engaged in that industry, which is foremost in the constituency from which he came. He was beloved by the plain people in his own constituency and honoured by men of both sides of politics, and so was re-elected to Parliament by increasing majorities and held a commanding position in his county which few men in Parliament have occupied. Every one who knew our honoured friend appreciated how modest he was in regard to the expression of his views. But, modest as he was he was a man not only of great business ability but was possessed of other high qualities which would have enabled him to take a place of eminence in public life, had he directed his abilities exclusively or principally along that line. Exceptionally devoted to the views he entertained and a man of the highest principles and ideals, he was recognized by all who were in close association with him as one of the strongest men in the public life of our province. It is a strange thing that to-day, just after we have listened to the panegyrics on the great Nova Scotian who was at one time leader of this House and Prime Minister of the Dominion, and who passed away recently, by a strange coincidence of fate, we are called upon to mourn the loss of one of the members of the present House from the same province who occupied such a conspicuous place in public life, and who was loved and honoured by the people of that province.

In his private life, those of us who were aware of the relations that Mr. Law occupied with his beloved wife and daughter, who came with him to Ottawa on many occasions, know that these were of a character too sacred to touch upon. We know, however, that the blessings of happy association in family life were given him to enjoy in greater measure than to most men.

Dazed by the calamity of Thursday night, it is hard for us to realize that one who was so closely associated with us is gone and that we shall see him no more. It is one of the strange dispensations of Providence that the finger of death should have touched him in the very midst of his labours. Knowing him as we did we are sure that when the time came for him to go down into the valley of the shadow of death, when there was forced upon him the realization that for him the end of earthly things had come, he entered confidently within the shadow, and he was inspired by the faith which had guided him throughout life and with the certainty of a future which can only be given to men who lived as did Bowman Law. He has passed beyond our ken, beyond the reach of human harm or help,

> To that vast realm of silence or of joy
> Where the innumerable dwell;

and he has left to us, who have been associated with him, as friends and as fellow-representatives nothing but the kindest recollections and a memory which will be cherished as long as life shall last. He has left to his constituents a record of devotion to their interests, of unswerving integrity in business and in political life, well worthy of emulation by us all and by those who come after us. Long after the disaster of Thursday last shall have been forgotten, the name of Bowman Law will be cherished in pleasant memory by the men associated with him and by the men and women of Nova Scotia whom he represented so well in this House.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I had the honour and pleasure of Mr. Law's acquaintance for over fifteen years, and I esteemed him very much indeed. I counted him one of my best friends and his friendship was one of my most precious possessions. I have nothing to say except to join my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in expressing my high regard for Mr. Law's character and my great sorrow at his untimely death.

RE-BUILDING OF THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

On the Orders of the Day,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) if the Government have yet had time to consider the re-building of the Parliament Buildings. That question may be premature, but if so, will the right hon. gentleman give us an opportunity to debate the subject before a conclusion is reached as to what the plans shall be?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We shall be very glad to have any opinions and sug-

gestions that hon. gentlemen opposite desire to place before the Government for consideration.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 17, to incorporate The Canadian Indemnity Company.—Mr. Schaffner.

Bill No. 18, respecting W. C. Edwards and Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 19, respecting a patent of James W. Owen.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 20, respecting Queen's University at Kingston, and to amalgamate therewith The School of Mining and Agriculture. —Mr. Nickle.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions to be answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. McCRANEY:

Did the Minister of the Interior, at Chicago, in January, 1916, make any public statement on the question of enforced military service, with a view to influencing immigration into Canada? If so, in what terms?

Mr. ROCHE: In addressing a conference of our United States immigration agents recently held in Chicago for the purpose of reviewing the immigration situation and making plans for the future, the Minister of the Interior took an opportunity of making a statement refuting the false impression which had been created by articles which had appeared in certain United States papers regarding conscription in Canada.

PORT NELSON NAVIGATION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. On what dates respectively did the first steamboats from outside ports arrive at Port Nelson in the summer season of the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, and what were the names of the said boats?

2. On what dates respectively were the last steamboats cleared at the close of the season for any outside port in each of the said years, and what were the names of such boats so clearing?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. 1912, ss. Beothic arrived off Nelson roads, July 24. For lack of pilot did not proceed up river until July 29. 1913, ss. Bonaventure arrived at Port Nelson August 6. 1914, ss. Bonaventure arrived at Port Nelson August 14. 1915, ss. Bellaventure arrived at Port Nelson August 1.

2. 1912, S.S. Beothic proceeded from Port Nelson to James bay. 1913, ss. Bonaventure, Bellaventure and Sinbad cleared Port Nelson on October 13. Canadian Government survey steamer Acadia cleared October 19. 1914, ss. Bellaventure and Sheba cleared Port Nelson October 17. 1915, ss. Bellaventure, Adventure and Sheba cleared Port Nelson October 22.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS TO UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What was the total amount outstanding as exports and Canadian foreign exports respectively, to the United Kingdom for the calendar year 1915?

Mr. REID: Domestic, $349,916,648; foreign, $11,570,085.

DOMINION NOTES IN CHARTERED BANKS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

Whatwas the total amount outstanding as advances in Dominion notes to Canadian Chartered banks against deposited securities on December 31, 1915, under the Order in Council of August 3, 1914?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The strict answer to the question as worded would be that there was no amount outstanding, but as it is possible my hon. friend desires information as to the amount outstanding on the date mentioned on advances made in Dominion notes under the Finance Act 1914, passed very shortly after the order in question, I have answered the question on that understanding.

Amount of Dominion notes advanced to banks under the Finance Act, 1914, and outstanding on December 31, 1915, was $2,028,-635.

CANADIAN EXPORTS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What were the values of exports of domestic merchandise from Canada for the months of November and December, 1915, under the following heads, respectively: the mines; the fisheries: the forests; animal products; agricultural products; manufactures and miscellaneous. Also the total value in exports of coin and bullion and foreign products?

Mr. REID:

Merchandise.	November.	December.
The Mine	$ 6,634,887	$ 5,632,984
The Fisheries.. ..	2,075,877	2,067,132
The Forest..	4,556,502	3,553,083
Animals and their produce.	12,113,520	9,430,534
Agriculture	53,936,837	49,389,763
Manufactures	13,231,022	21,810,697
Miscellaneous	383,271	287,209
Coin and bullion ..	9,865,896	101,342
Foreign merchandise.	1,504,177	1,423,201

WAR SUPPLIES—SOCKS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. How many pairs of socks are issued to each soldier on his enlistment for overseas service?
2. Are socks supplied to soldiers by the Militia Department after they have gone overseas?
3. If so, under what circumstances and conditions are they supplied?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Two pairs (as per regulations).
2. Yes.
3. On service, socks are supplied from the Canadian Ordnance Depots in England on demand from the officers commanding units in any number required.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

Has the resolution of a public meeting held in Selkirk, Manitoba, on March 29, demanding of the Government the confirmation of the surrender and the immediate issuance of title to the lands of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve sold to private parties, been acceded to?

Mr. ROCHE: Method of settlement of the matter in dispute has been determined and legislation confirming same will be introduced this session.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How much has been expended in the province of Nova Scotia for salaries and expenses in any way connected or arising out of the investigation and distribution of the Fenian Raid Bounty payable to Nova Scotia Veterans, exclusive of the bounty itself?

Sir SAM HUGHES: $8,267.19.

NEUVILLE LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the Government appointed a lightkeeper for the light on the wharf at Neuville, county of Portneuf?
2. If so, when was such appointment made, who is the lightkeeper, what is his salary, and by whom was he recommended?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Temporary July 15, 1913; permanent September 20, 1913; (b) Louis Gauvin; (c) $190; (d) Hon. L. P. Pelletier.

DOCTOR LANGFELDT.

The following question standing in the name of the late Mr. Law was answered by Mr. Roche:

1. Is Doctor Langfeldt, former Canadian immigration officer at Boston, Mass., now in the employ of this Government?
2. If so, in what department and at what salary?
3. What is the name and nationality of the present immigration officer at Boston, Mass., and what salary does he receive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Not in the employ of this Government.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. James M. Stahl. British. Born in Australia. In the employ of Immigration Branch since 1905. Present salary $1,500 per annum.

HALF MOONS FOG ALARM.

The following question standing in the name of the late Mr. Law was answered by Mr. Hazen:

1. Who is superintendent of the fog alarm station at Half Moons, off Blanche, Shelburne County, N.S.?
2. When was he appointed, and at what salary?
3. Has the Government or Department of Marine and Fisheries received any complaints respecting the loss of the schooner Louise in 1915 on those rocks when the whistle was not being blown?
4. If complaints were received, what action was taken by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Jesse Obed.
2. December 18, 1915; salary $980, out of which he must provide for the services of an assistant.
3. Yes.
4. The man then in charge was removed.

VOTERS' LISTS, 1915.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What quantity of the voters' lists for Federal elections was printed in 1915, outside of the King's Printer's office?
2. By what persons or firms was the printing performed, and what were the respective amounts charged by said firms or persons therefor respectively?

Mr. BLONDIN:

Name of District.	Amount paid.	Where Printed.
Hants, N.S.	$299.58	Imperial Publishing Co., Halifax, N.S.
Kings, N.S.	345.55	Do
Yarmouth and Clare, N.S.	407.65	Do
Halifax City, N.S.	612.15	Halifax Herald, Halifax, N.S.
Halifax County, N.S.	518.90	Do
Pictou, N.S.	663.55	Do
Cape Breton South and Richmond, N.S.	193.95	Do
Cape Breton North and Victoria, N.S.	325.15	Do
Westmorland, N.B	660.85	Do
Inverness, N.S.	425.40	Royal Print. & Litho. Co., Halifax, N.S.
Shelburne and Queens, N.S.	366.65	Do
Antigonish and Guysboro, N.S.	426.30	Do
Cape Breton South and Richmond, N.S.	982.50	Do
Cape Breton North and Victoria, N.S.	140.00	Do
York-Sudbury, N.B.	544.60	The Sydney Post, Sydney.
Colchester, N.S.	367.00	Do
Lunenburg, N.S.	257.80	Barnes & Co., St. John, N.B.
Northumberland, N.S.	400.45	Standard, St. John, N.B.
Cumberland, N.S.	656.00	Do
Victoria and Carleton, N.B.	495.10	Do
Charlotte, N.B.	341.78	Do
Royal, N.B.	499.20	Do
Lunenburg, N.S.	260.60	Do
Kent, N.B.	286.90	St. John's Globe, St. John.
Restigouche and Madawaska, N.B.	448.80	Do
Gloucester, N.B.	410.18	Barnes & Co., St. John.
St. John City and Counties of St. John City and Albert, N.B.	1004.35	Do
Brandon, Man.	1163.58	Telegram Job Printers, Ltd., Winnipeg, Man.
Lisgar, Man.	530.78	Do

Lists printed in the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were paid at the rate of 5 cents per name and 50 cents per heading, exclusive of paper.

Brandon and Lisgar lists were paid at the rate of 11 cents per name, including headings and paper.

IMPERIAL MUNITIONS BOARD.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is it true, as alleged, that the Imperial Munitions Board proposes erecting or having erected in Notre Dame de Grace Ward, Montreal, a factory to employ 3,000 men to make fuses, and that if permission can be obtained by the amendment of the city by-laws which prohibit factories at that place undertake to remove or to have removed the said factory within two years after the war?

2. If such is the case, is this factory to be operated by the board? If not, by whom?

3. Who is to pay for the site and factory, and what is the amount to be so paid?

4. Who is acting for the board in this matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have, as a matter of convenience and courtesy, asked the Imperial Munitions Board to give information with regard to this matter, but I would suggest to the hon. member who has asked the question that the information is as much available to him as it is to the Government, as the Canadian Government does not have any control over the Imperial Munitions Board. The information which has been furnished me by the Chairman of the Board on request is as follows:

1. The Imperial Munitions Board propose to erect a factory for the loading of time fuses at Verdun (Montreal).

2. The factory will be operated by a company specially formed for the purpose, the entire capital stock of which belongs to the board.

3. All expenditures for factory and equipment will be provided by the board through the above company. The amount will probably be $300,000 to $325,000.

4. The answer is embodied in No. 3.

MAIL CONTRACT, SHELBURNE COUNTY.

The following question standing in the name of the late Mr. Law was answered by Mr. Casgrain:

1. Were tenders called for mail contract between North West Harbour, Shelburne County, N.S., and Greenwood Station?

2. If so, what are the names of the tenderers, and amount of each tender?

3. Was Thomas B. Perry awarded this contract? If so, for what length of time did he hold same?

4. Why was contract cancelled?

5. Who is the present contractor, and what price does he receive for same?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes.

2. T. B. Perry, $200 per annum; C. H. Kelley, $218.40 per annum.

3. The contract was awarded to Perry, but before it was executed the department

issued instructions to the inspector to withhold action pending further consideration.

4. The department received an offer lower than that of Perry.

5. C. H. Kelly, at $195 per annum.

THE POOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN:

Is the Government aware as to whether or not there is an increasing number of poor people and people out of work? If so, is it the intention of the Government to aid the municipalities where such people live?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government is not aware of an increasing number of people out of work; on the contrary, the information which comes to the Government indicates that there is very much less unemployment than there was a year ago; that in fact, unemployment at the present time is under the ordinary. No applications from municipalities for aid, as suggested, have come to the Government.

WAR CONTRACTS—CANVAS SHOES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has the firm of John Ritchie & Company, of Quebec, been making any canvas shoes for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If so, how many?

2. How many pairs of canvas shoes have been purchased by the Canadian Military Authorities since August 4, 1914?

3. For what special condition of service are these shoes considered to be adapted?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Yes, 60,000 pairs.

2. 485,000 pairs.

3. Rest shoes for use on ship board, in billets or in camp.

RIGAUD RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the respective dates of the tenders of $595 and $700 made by Joseph Cholette for the Rural Delivery, Rigaud No. 2?

2. What are the respective dates of the tenders of $495 and $600 made by Hilaire Seguin, for the Rural Delivery, Rigaud No. 1?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Tender of Joseph Cholette at $595, dated September 21, 1915, and tender at $700, dated September 9, 1915. Tenders were receivable at the department not later than December 24, 1915.

2. Tender of Hilaire Seguin at $495, dated September 21, 1915, and tender at $600, dated September 9, 1915. Tenders were receivable at the department not later than September 24, 1915.

MACHINE GUNS AND ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to ask questions 95 and 96 again. I asked them on Thursday, when the hon. minister suggested that he did not wish to make the answers public, but that he would give the answers to me privately. I note that the remark of the minister does not appear in Hansard, as I think it should. The questions were as follows:

No. 95—1. What make of machine gun is being supplied to the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?

2. How many machine guns are provided for each infantry battalion?

3. Have the infantry battalions now in Britain, Belgium and France been supplied with their full complement of machine guns?

4. Are the infantry battalions now in training in Canada equipped with their full complement of machine guns?

No. 96—1. Are the infantry battalions of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces now in France and Belgium armed with the Ross rifle?

2. If so, what is the mark or pattern of the rifle so in use?

3. With what mark or pattern of the Ross rifle are the infantry battalions of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in Canada armed, and what is the number in use of each mark or pattern?

4. Is it a fact, as stated by the Mail-Empire, that 75,000 Ross rifles have been refitted to adapt them to British Service ammunition?

5. If so, was the refitting done in Britain or in Canada?

PROCEDURE IN DIVORCE CASES.

On the order for the proposed resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, the procedure under which Divorces are granted by Parliament, and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof, are so unsatisfactory, besides being prohibitive to the great majority of the people of Canada, the same should be taken into immediate consideration by the Government during the present session, with a view to reform—Mr. Northrup.

Mr. NORTHRUP: As I have been requested not to bring this motion before the House in the absence of the Minister of Justice, I would ask that it stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

CLAIMS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA SEALERS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, evidence on the claims of sealers of British Columbia under the last treaty with the American Republic.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN: I presume that what my right hon. friend especially wants is the report of Judge Audette on this subject. As there were over 1,600 claims in this matter, involving about $9,200,000, my right hon. friend will realize that there are an immense number of documents and papers. The different papers that my hon. friend wants will be brought down at an

early date; I hope to be able to lay on the table of the House to-day or to-morrow the report which Judge Audette has submitted, and which we received about a week or ten days ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I shall be quite satisfied if my hon. friend will bring down the report of Judge Audette, and any correspondence which has taken place since the report was received.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE AND EXPORT OF HORSES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of all correspondence with the Imperial authorities in connection with the purchase of horses, and the prohibiting of the export of horses.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some of the correspondence may be confidential; any that can be properly brought down, will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

For a copy of all documents, letters, messages, correspondence and reports concerning a conference between the Minister of Agriculture and certain representatives of the Mennonite Church in or about July, 1873, and referred to in a certain letter dated 23rd July, 1873, signed by P. M. Lowe, secretary of the Department of Agriculture, and addressed to Messrs. David Klassen, Jacob Peters, Heinrich Wiebe and Cornelius Toews, delegates from Southern Russia.—Mr. McCraney.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, evidence of witnesses at the investigation, and reports thereon, in relation to the claim of Alexander D. Doucet, of Beresford, N.B., for cattle killed on the Intercolonial railroad on May 25, 1915.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers and documents in the possession of the Department of Public Works relating to a request made by the Nova Scotia Historical Society for permission to place a memorial tablet commemorating the late Reverend Dr. James MacGregor, on the post office building, New Glasgow, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a return showing a copy of the prospectus, rates of interest, the effective interest, the net yield, commission charges, printing charges and other charges, in connection with the Government Domestic Loan of one hundred million dollars, and also in connection with the loan of forty-five million dollars made at New York in 1915.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing the amounts expended by the Post Office Department for that part of the present fiscal year ending December 31, 1915, under the following subheads Conveyance of mails by land; conveyance of mails by railways; conveyance of mails by steamboats; making and repairing mail bags, locks, etc.; rural mail boxes, salaries, travelling expenses, manufacturing postage stamps and postage notes, tradesmen's bills, stationery, printing and advertising miscellaneous bursements, ad maintenance of the service in the Yukon. Also showing the revenue for the same period under the various subheads of revenue mentioned in appendix "A" of the report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 31, 1915.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return of all sums of money expended, respectively, during the present fiscal year by the Department of Public Works chargeable to capital account, for public buildings, and harbours and rivers, by provinces, designating in detail the purposes of such expenditure.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing all sums of money expended during the present fiscal year to December 31, 1915, by the Department of Public Works, respectively, for public buildings, harbours and rivers, roads and bridges, telegraph and telephone lines, dredging and for miscellaneous purposes, chargeable to income, showing said expenditure under the above headings and by provinces. Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Militia and Defence or any of its branches and the Department of Agriculture, in reference to the using of the immigration or quarantine buildings at McNab's island and Lawlor's island, Halifax, N.S., for military purposes, and particularly for their use by the 63rd Regiment, overseas contingent.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a copy of all correspondence with the Imperial authorities respecting legislation by the Parliament of United Kingdom, in answer to the petition of the Canadian Parliment asking for amendment of the British North America Act with reference to the Senate.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a report showing the apportioning of electoral polling divisions in Manitoba, made by judges under authority of the Dominion Elections Act, 7-8, Edward VII, Chapter 26.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of the Order in Council or department order dismissing Mr. Bayfield from the position of Superintendent of Dredging in British Columbia; and also Order in Council or departmental order appointing J. L. Nelson in his place.—Mr. Pugsley.

For a copy of all papers, memomranda, correspondence, reports, etc., in connection with the dismissal of John E. Hallamore, as Postmaster at Upper New Cornwall, Lunenburg county, N.S.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing the number and purpose of all Commissions appointed by the Government since 1911, and the cost of each, together with names of the various members of such Commissions.—Mr. Pardee.

For a return showing the names and salaries of all the officials, assistants and clerks employed in the Intercolonial railway offices in Moncton, including the assistant superintendent's office, dispatcher's office, station and freight house, the names and salaries of the foreman employed in each of the shops, and also the names of all officials, clerks, engine drivers and conductors who have been retired and placed on the pension list since the first of January, 1915, with the amount of the annual retiring allowance to each.—Mr. Copp.

For a copy of all papers in connection with the appointment of Léon Roy as interpreter in

the Department of the Interior; and also a copy of the Order in Council, documents and correspondence relating to his dismissal.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all Orders in Council or Departmental regulations, and amendments thereto, relative to the enlistment for Overseas Service of employees of Departments of Government and the matter of their departmental pay while under enlistment.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, memoranda, Orders in Council, etc., relative to the Transatlantic Mail Service for the winter season 1915-16, and passing between the contractor company and any Departments of Government or Minister of the Crown.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a copy of all correspondence, inquiries, evidence, reports by departmental officials or Orders in Council, relative to the dismissal of Clifford G. Brander of the Customs Preventive Service at Halifax, N.S.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax.)

For a copy of all evidence, correspondence, reports, memoranda or Orders in Council, relative to the retirement or dismissal from the customs service at the port of Halifax, of A. J. Crosby, Thomas Lynch and J. B. Naylor.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing the names of all medical officers appointed and employed for immigration or quarantine purposes at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver and Victoria, together with the date of appointment of each, their salary, and in each case designating whether they or any of them are still in the service of the Government, and whn not, the date when the service ceased.—Mr. Maclan (Halifax).

For a copy of all correspondence, evidence, reports, memoranda and Orders in Council relative to the dismissal of Charles McCarthy from the customs service at the port of Halifax, and in respect to his restoration to office.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a copy of all correspondence, evidence, official reports, memoranda and Orders in Council, in connection with an investigation or inquiry into the conduct of any officials of the customs service at the port of Halifax, N.S., in the latter part of 1915 by Mr. Busby, inspector of customs.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing the number of subscribers to the Government Domestic Loan of one hundred million dollars which were in the sum of $1,000 or under, and the number of other subscriptions in multiples of $1,000.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a copy of all tenders, offers, letters, telegrams, engineers' reports and other documents relating to the construction of a breakwater or boat harbour at North Lake, Prince Edward-Island.—Mr. J. J. Hughes.

For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters and correspondence which led to the convening of the conference of local governments which took place in Ottawa during the month of October last; together with all the proceedings and resolutions of the said conference.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a statement showing the quantity of wheat shipped month by month, during the calendar years 1914 and 1915, from Winnipeg to Fort William and Port Arthur, and by what railways; to Duluth by the Canadian Northern railway or allied system; to Minneapolis and St. Paul by the Canadian Pacific railway, to the seaboard by rail over Canadian territory; and to American ports over American railways.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any department of Government, and the Pilot Commissioners of the harbour and district of St. Anns, in the county of Victoria, during the years 1914 and 1915, in respect to the removal or dismissal of Daniel Buchanan from the office of pilot of said harbour and district.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a return showing how many rural mail delivery routes have been opened during the last fiscal year, in what counties, and at what cost to each county.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other communications between the officers of the customs at North Sydney, N.S., or any of them, and the Department of Customs, in respect to the renting of a room or rooms for the purposes of the said department at North Sydney.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams duties rebated to importers during the present fiscal year up to December 31, 1915, with the particulars thereof.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing the revenue collected during the present fiscal year up to December 31, 1915, from the importation of the following classes of dutiable articles, and under the divisions of general tariff, preferential tariff, and surtax tariff, together with the quantities and values of such importations: iron ore, iron and steel and manufactures of iron and steel; cotton and cotton manufactures; leather and manufactures of leather; wool and manufactures of wool; coal; manganese; zinc; copper, meats; eggs and butter.

Where any of the above items are numerously subdivided in the customs return, the principal items of imports as to quantity, value and revenue need only be given.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all applicants for bounty under the Deep Sea Fisheries Act, from the districts of Ecum Secum, Marie Joseph, Spanish Ship Bay, and Liscombe, county of Guysborough, N.S., for the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, distinguishing between applications that have been accepted and the bounty paid, and those that have been rejected, and also the reasons for such rejections, if any.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence respecting the expropriation of Joseph Griffin for land at Valcartier, Quebec.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

NATIONAL LABOUR BUREAUS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) moved:

That this House recognizes the necessity for immediate national action to cope with new and complex conditions arising after the war and emphasizes the urgent need for a system of National Labour Bureaus.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I must first apologize to the House if I have to speak somewhat at random on the very complex question which I have brought up for discussion. You will understand, however, that after the terrible calamity of Thursday last, I, with many hon. members, lost whatever notes we had on subjects which we thought fit to bring to the attention of the House.

In bringing up this question, I do so at the request of a very important body of gentlemen who, in Montreal some weeks ago, took up this problem of the establishment of labour bureaus so as to facilitate the handling of returned soldiers and of immigration after the war is over. I am sure the House will pardon me if I read some of the opinions which I have gathered in order to come to the conclusion embodied in the motion now before the House. I wish especially to draw the attention of my good friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) to this question, which is of importance to the department which he so ably controls.

This question involves the problem of unemployment and immigration, also that which is nearer to us, of our returned soldiers, and that of the dislocation of some of our industries when this great war is ended. Sir, if I had a text book to speak from on this question, I would take it from the words of the distinguished president of the Association on Unemployment in France, an ex-prime minister, M. Leon Bourgeois, who used this language:

> To relieve is to wait until the evil has befallen to attempt to repair it. To relieve is to wait until misery has come, to give alms to the miserable. But alms remains at best a meritorious deed—not a social act.

It is a social act which this Parliament is called upon to perform by the legislation which, in my humble judgment should, before long, be introduced by the Minister of Labour.

Although it is not possible to predict the end of the war, yet every one admits that when it is ended, and ended satisfactorily and victoriously for us, the old order of things will have passed away and new conditions will have arisen, not only in the countries engaged in the conflict, but in those which have remained neutral. The governments and societies in general will have to face new problems of the greatest consequence, and the time has now come for us to think of those problems and to prepare for the new situation that will arise. To prepare for the new order of things, it seems to me, is the whole question. I was struck the other day with the words used in Montreal by a delegate of the French Government who came to America to study new commercial ventures for France after the war. In explaining the reasons which prompted the French Government to investigate the commercial posibilities in America, he used the following language :

> Nous ne voulons pas être surpris par la paix comme nous l'avons été par la guerre.
>
> We do not want to be surprised by peace as we have been surprised by war.

Peace, as we all know, has its battlefields no less difficult than war. Peace will bring to Canada and the Empire problems no less potent for ill or good than those with which the military leaders of the Allies are grappling to-day. The satisfactory solution of those problems will determine the national welfare and rate of progress for generations to come. We must, therefore, face them with a right spirit and a proper knowledge, and it seems to me that the watchword of every Canadian statesman to-day should be promptness, carefulness and wisdom in solving that great issue.

As to the incoming immigration which since this war began has dwindled to practically nothing, I may be all wrong, but I think I am well within the mark when I say that immediately after the war about 20,000,000 soldiers will be released from military service, and that then the world will witness the greatest flow of immigration that has been seen for many generations. Canada will certainly receive millions of immigrants. Canada is and will be for many years to come the greatest farming country in the world and the immigrants will naturally be attracted by the potentialities of our country from an agricultural point of view. The farmer knows that he can find in Canada broader fields of opportunity and greater rewards for less work than anywhere else under the sun.

I invite the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this point, as I notice that he went to Chicago the other day with that object in view. The Government must be prepared to handle the enormous flow of immigration that will follow the end of war. The Government must not only get ready to receive our returning soldiers, but it must get ready to receive immigrants as well. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will see to it that a catalogue of every acre of arable land is made, that a card index

of every farmer who wants help is prepared, and that when the war is over the department will be in a position to direct the immigrant or the returning soldier to the agricultural, horticultural, ranching or dairying pursuits which he may choose.

Our immigration will not be made up wholly of farmers, but I believe it will be made up in large part of industrial workers and labourers. The Government, in my opinion, should investigate and register every commercial demand, every industrial opening in every city, town and village, where there are industries existent or potential. On this subject, allow me to quote the very wise opinion given by Lord Shaughnessy in a letter published in the Montreal Star of 20th December, 1915:

> The future of Canada, therefore, depends largely on the ability with which we handle the incoming population, the preparedness we make for absorbing the heterogeneous elements whom we may be called upon to assimilate after this terrible racial eruption in Europe. During the past thirty years Canada has more or less successfully absorbed a very large immigrating population, but much energy has been dissipated through lack of co-operation shown between the Dominion Government, the provincial governments, and the transportation companies. We should be busy now thinking out and formulating an organization which should place upon the land or in the industries for which they are fitted, with the least possible friction or loss of time, those individuals or families which come to make a new home in Canada. In the past—

And I call the attention of my two hon. friends, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), to this sentence:

> —we have been too apt to let the immigrant shift for himself and find his place by himself. As a result, many a good farm labourer has been lost to the land and has helped, in times of economic stress, to overcrowd our cities. We have said to the mechanic: "Take the first job that is offered to you," instead of having a carefully organized labour bureau, which would tell him of the place where his skill was needed. This war has accelerated many manufacturing activities in Canada, and there is possibility of a greater demand for highly skilled labour than was the case when Canada depended more completely on her agriculture. Even in the case of the immigrant farmer from Europe we have not always been ready with the expert advice which would enable him to adapt himself without loss of time to his new conditions. We have let men with invaluable knowledge of intensive farming go to waste on homesteads remote from the markets, and have not sufficiently posted our settlers on climatic and soil conditions, the knowledge of which is essential to their success as Canadian farmers. We have, as it were, brought seeds and bulbs and plants from Europe by the ton and planted them indiscriminately in gardens which had not been prepared for them—a method of culture which could only result in a heavy percentage of waste. There is so much to be done to develop this Canada of ours that any waste of energy should be avoided. We must conserve that energy just as much as we must conserve our credit, if our future is to be as great as all true Canadians hope to see.

It seems to me that every word in these two paragraphs should be carefully weighed and noted. Lord Shaughnessy has put the case in a clear and concrete form. In this country, by reason of our past methods, there has been great waste of energy, as Lord Shaughnessy well says. Labour has been misdirected and labourers are congested in our great industrial centres. And, as regards the farmers, we all know, from our experience before the war, that many farm hands had been drawn from rural Canada into the cities and had there created a situation which, in the past two winters, has been exceedingly acute for the municipalities to handle.

I could quote also the opinion of President Falconer of Toronto University, but it is on the same line as that of Lord Shaughnessy, and I will not take the time necessary to read it.

In the United States, from which country we borrow a great deal, they have not acted more wisely on this question than we in Canada have done. I read recently an article written by Mr. John Fahey, President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which deals directly with this question. He says:

> Other countries, even in the midst of a struggle for their very existence, are considering measures for rehabilitation after the war. France has appointed a commission to consider this matter. But America shows an astounding indifference.
>
> With a view to stimulating efficiency along very different lines from military efficiency, the recently appointed Immigration Committee of the Chamber of Commerce has sent out a questionnaire to division passenger agents, travelling passenger agents and others in a position to learn what may be our immigration conditions after the war. The questionnaire includes five queries:
>
> "1. Are those of foreign birth or parentage in this country saving money at the present time with a view to bringing their European relatives and friends to this country after the war?
>
> "2. Does the personal correspondence which they are receiving from Europe indicate that there will be any considerable movement to this country after the war is over, and what, so far as you can get the information, do the estimates indicate as to the volume?
>
> "3. Will such immigration as does come consist of people who have been working on farms, or of those from the factories?
>
> "4. After the war is over, will there be any considerable emigration from this country to

Europe of those going back to live permanently there?

"5. How great will be the movement of those going back to Europe temporarily after the war to look after their relatives, or through sentiment to view the destruction of their early homes, etc., and who will return to this country after a short visit?"

By this means the Immigration Committee believes it may obtain information which will set the current of our thought and action toward the conditions that will follow the war, and which will lead to intelligent means of dealing with them, with some relation to their causes. We are a little behind by way of thinking that we can deal with any new problem by legislation. If we depend upon this method of dealing with the after-war exigencies here, we shall be framing a poor substitute for the patient, constructive and co-operative efforts which the condition demands.

Therefore, in the United States, by the admission of the President of the Chamber of Commerce, John Fahey, they are already facing this problem and trying to remedy it. But the United States' problem is also, in a perhaps even greater degree, Canada's problem. Speaking on the Address at the opening of the session, addressing myself to the leader of the Government, I said:

What reliable nation-wide organization does Canada possess to deal with the following gigantic problems at the close of the war? The replacing of returned troops in suitable occupations, the readjustment of dislocated industrial conditions and the transference of workers from war industries to normal industrial training; the industrial training and technical equipment of potential citizens to meet the strenuous and fierce competition for industrial and commercial expansion; the handling of the stream of immigration which will set in when peace is concluded; the replacing of interned aliens from concentration camps throughout the country.

It seems to me that in the above words I gave a resume of the situation which will confront us very shortly.

Mr. John Fahey speaks of technical education. I do not intend to dilate on that subject as I have a motion on the Order Paper which will come up later on, but everyone will admit, with me, that this question of technical education is more acute to-day than ever before; and if Canada is anxious to play her part in coming world events, the Minister of Labour will have to give effect at an early date to the recommendations contained in the very able report published by the commission two years ago.

In view of the present conditions in Canada and the prospective unemployment, it is very urgent that Labour Bureaus to which I have referred in my motion should be established. I referred a moment ago to the concluding words of Lord Shaughnessy. The conditions to which he adverted will be intensified tenfold at the close of the war when hundreds of thousands of soldiers return, when factories in Montreal, in Quebec, in Toronto, in Winnipeg and elsewhere cease their war work, and the whole fabric of trade and industry has to be reconstructed without a large reserve of wealth to facilitate the process. Sir, the victory will go to that nation or group of nations which devote their energy and resources to industrial training and organization. All the component parts of the British Empire will share in that struggle, and all must participate in the strain. Is it too much to ask that we in Canada, who are so much interested in the future of our young country should now take the necessary measures in order to meet the serious situation which may arise after the war?

Mr. BURNHAM: Why in the course of his admirable remarks does the hon. member say that victory will be to that nation which does so and so? Why cannot he dwell upon the desirability of developing our own resources and obtaining that balance in which alone is happiness?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope my hon. friend will give us the benefit of his views this afternoon. They will be welcome to the House, I am sure. I am only expressing my own views and I will be pleased to hear his. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, in answer to a question of the Mayor of Montreal, the hon. member for St. Mary, stated that there was less unemployment in Canada during the last year or so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A good deal of unemployment a year ago but not since then.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Less unemployment during the last year than a year or so ago. Let me tell my hon. friend that I have here the evidence of Mr. Barnes, M.P., head of the Munitions Workers Commission, who gave a statement to the London Daily News on his return to London from Canada last summer. He used the following language:

And yet it is producing in an intensified form some of the troubles of the Old World. I have never seen in Great Britain such an acute unemployment problem as has been forced upon my attention during the last three months in Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When did he say that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He said that last summer. I have not the date, but I remember taking notice of the statement when it was published. I quite agree with the right hon. gentleman that with the war industries that have sprung up the question of unemployment is perhaps less acute to-day than it was a year ago, but the object of my motion is to meet the very situation which will be raised when the war will be ended, when those temporary industries will be dislocated and thousands and thousands of workers will be thrown on the labour market without any employment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, I do not profess to know the conditions absolutely throughout Canada, but I am sure that during the past four or perhaps five months the representations which have been made to the Government have been with regard to scarcity of labour and not with regard to unemployement.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They may be as regards scarcity of labour for these special war industries, but at all events I do not fully disagree with the right hon. gentleman. I say that the war industries have perhaps settled for the time being the question of unemployment, although there are many hundreds unemployed to be seen in the large centres of Canada to-day. But my motion has for its essential object to bring to the attention of the House and the country the urgency of establishing a clearing house for the labour market, not for to-day but for to-morrow, when this war will be ended, when the war industries will be dislocated, when the soldiers by hundreds of thousands will be returning from the front, and when the vast flow of immigration will be setting in to the prairies of the West. In that regard Canada is sadly behind other countries just as the United States, admittedly, from what I read a moment ago, is also behind other countries. Why, even such a country as Spain has a clearing house for labour, and we must not forget that in Canada the condition of unemployment, the condition of the ordinary labourer, whether he is a skilled or an unskilled labourer, is probably more difficult than in other countries, because of the distance between the important centres. Therefore, Sir, a central labour exchange is necessary to bring the unemployed in contact with the employers. For that purpose I believe that a permanent central organization is needed. It is a delusion, I believe, to suppose that all unemployment will disappear with the return of what we call prosperity or prosperous times. For these reasons: First, in normal times the labour market is being continuously disorganized through the lack of a national policy with regard to immigration, Second, the workers are kept in ignorance of work opportunities at points distant from their places of abode, due to the lack of an adequate system of intelligence regarding employment opportunities throughout their immediate localities and in more remote parts of the country. Third, the labour market is still regarded as an inexhaustible reservoir to be treated much as we have treated traditionally other great national resources. Isolated seasonal trades, lack of training in industrial and manual activities, lack of vocational guidance, and incomplete provision of employment bureaus are some of the continuing causes of unemployment which it is possible to remedy, and which prosperity waves do not obliterate.

A moment ago I was speaking with regard to the unemployed in our large centres. Will you allow me, Mr. Speaker, to draw your attention to the following words which I find in part 1 of the report of the Ontario Commission on Unemployment? I believe that Canada is probably to-day the most favoured farming country in the world; she should attract large numbers of farmers; her destiny is eminently that of a great agricultural country. Yet for the last twenty years or so the urban population has increased at an enormous rate, and has become really a danger to Canada. At page 22, part 1, of the report of the Ontario Commission of Unemployment—

Mr. J. D. REID: What is the date of that report?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It has just been published, in 1916. I received it a week ago. This report states:

> The increase in the urban population is, indeed, one of the most striking facts involved by the census of 1911. Whilst during the decade 1901 to 1911, the rural population increased by 576,163 or 17·20 per cent, the increase in the urban population was 1,25£,165, or at the rate of 62·28 per cent. In the Maritime Provinces and in Ontario, the urban population increased at the expense of the rural, for the latter has actually declined since 1901.

Now let us take the census returns of Canadian population. In 1881 there was an increase of 86 per cent in the rural population, and of 14 per cent urban; in 1891 an increase of 69 per cent rural, and of

31 per cent urban; in 1901 an increase of 63 per cent rural and of 37 per cent urban; and in 1911 an increase of 54½ per cent rural, as against 45½ per cent urban. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) interrupted me a moment ago. Perhaps I might direct his attention to some of the resolutions which are suggested in this very able report published by the Ontario Commission on the unemployment problem. I may inform him that, much to my surprise, I find my good friend Sir John Willison advocating wider markets as one of the measures which would remedy the situation.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is all very well coming from people who do not solve the question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This question, Sir, is a nation-wide question. It is a federal, and not a provincial or municipal question. The handling and distribution of immigrants and labour must not be confined to provincial or municipal authorities. By its very importance, it is a nation-wide question. Mr. Philip Snowden, in a letter written on October 27, 1915, speaking of labour bureaus, said:

> I consider that they are absolutely essential to any system of labour organization, and if properly worked they will be a great help and in no way harm the interests of trade union... As a personal opinion I think it is very desirable that such agencies should be set up as soon as possible in Canada. When I was in Canada last year I was amazed to see the private labour bureau and it was quite clear to me that a Government system was a very urgent need.

I suppose he meant that a Dominion Government system was a very urgent need.

> The state of industrial affairs in this country and in the colonies after the war will make it even more necessary. If you had Government Labour Exchange then there might be arrangements made between them and our system to the mutual advantage of both sides.

I agree with Mr. Snowden, who is an authority on Labour, that such problems are not provincial nor municipal, but nation-wide; and in this country they must be dealt with by federal authority. Such problems are interprovincial in their character; they can not be adjusted by provinces or by municipalities. The responsibility of solving them rests on the Federal Government, in co-operation, if you please, with the provincial and municipal authorities. Unemployment and the conditions of industry are not merely local problems. They involve, in my judgment, the larger unit of the nation. The unemployed must not be left to sporadic organizations, if I may so term them, such as those commercial employment agencies which generally exploit labour. They must not be left to mere chance, or to optimistic reports which are spread abroad. The unemployed must find a way to a central organization, which is defined by all writers who have studied this question as a clearing house for labour.

Nor should we confuse the unemployed with the unemployable. One day in London, just as I was coming from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on my way to Charing Cross, I met one of those famous processions of unemployed. They were passing by the thousands, preceded by the policemen of London, who, as we all know, can always maintain law and order. The unemployed were carrying banners with the inscription: "We want work and we want bread." One of my friends of the English Bar said to me: There are only 25 per cent of unemployed in this large procession; rest assured that the other 75 per cent are unemployable. You must not confuse the unemployed with the unemployable. The unemployable—that is, the vagrants, dependents, defectives, inefficients—should be treated by themselves as a problem of regeneration, but the unemployed should be looked after by those labour bureaus or clearing houses for labour.

Mr. Speaker, the labour market of this country must be organized, and systematized, and this is the time to organize it. Federal labour bureaus must be established that will centralize all the powers and activities of federal, provincial and municipal bodies. Labour bureaus are not a new institution, although they would be new in our country. Let us take the example which has been given us by other sections of the British Empire. They are in operation, for instance, in New Zealand; also in Australia and above all in Great Britain. Great Britain, with her network of 430 labour exchanges, covering the whole country from county to county and from city to city, has proved, through statistics issued, the worth of that system, and its increasing facilities in dealing with future problems, when the Empire shall be girded with a chain of labour exchanges, playing the leading part in the distribution of population and labour throughout the Empire. Let me give you a few figures, which speak for themselves. In 1910 Great Britain had

82 public exchanges; these by July, 1913, had grown to 430. In 1912, 2,432,000 applications for work and 1,286,000 applications for workers were received, a total of about 1,051,000 positions filled, or 77 per cent of all notified. Ninety-six per cent of all the workers were found to have repaid fares advanced by the Government to enable them to reach their positions. In France 162 exchanges have been established since 1910. Germany before the war had 323 exchanges; in 1911, 1,055,000 positions had been filled through the medium of those clearing-houses in Germany.

I said a moment ago that in the United States they were trying to meet the situation which will arise after the war. The experience of the United States in this connection has been a failure. Their experience is a warning to us as to what conditions should be averted in Canada. Sporadic attempts have been made, through the establishment of 13 state labour bureaus and 12 municipal bureaus, to deal with national and complex problems. These halting, ineffective attempts have been seriously crippled by insufficient appropriations, lack of prompt interchange of reliable information, lack of proper transportation, little or no intelligent public opinion and active co-operation in maturing and administering the labour bureaus and, last but not least, inferior, incapable officials. Let us take a lesson from the errors made in the United States.

I understand that in 1914 two delegations met the hon. Minister of Labour in connection with this very question. Several organizations were included in these delegations. Five provincial premiers, the Alberta Legislature in Committee, the Agricultural and Colonization Committee of the House of Commons, the Labour Committee of the Senate, associated boards of trade for Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, affiliated boards of Trade for British Columbia, Union of Alberta Municipalities, Union of Saskatchewan Municipalities, Dominion Trades and Labour Congress president, Canadian Federation of Labour, Canadian Lumbermen's Association, and many others, were received on two different occasions by my hon. friend. The delegations urged the establishment of a public labour bureau system under federal management. This system of federal bureaus has been endorsed by several large and important organizations in Canada. On June 5, 1914, a letter was written to the hon. minister explaining the objects of the labour bureau, which were stated to be: to ameliorate existing unemployment and to provide practical remedies against its recurrence; to provide for the intelligent and efficient distribution of labour; to provide a substitute for the present unsatisfactory and in many cases fraudulent and unscrupulous practices of commercial employment agents. In reply to the delegation of May 18, 1914, the hon. minister said, I am told, that on account of the lateness of the day the promised Bill could not well be introduced until the next session, but that the subject would receive very careful consideration not only from himself but from other members of the Cabinet as well; and that its importance was fully recognized. The letter to which I have referred was signed by the president of the Devonian Society, by the president of the Orangemen's Society, the Ottawa Builders' Exchange, St. George's Society, Overseas Club, Sons of England, Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, Ottawa Board of Trade, St. Jean Baptiste Society, Social Service Congress, Ontario Provincial Builders' Exchange, originator Canadian labour bureaus movement, United Protestant Societies of Canada. The Ottawa Journal of May 20, 1914, gives a summary of the answer then given by the hon. minister, as follows:

> The distances in Canada render it impossible for the Government to advance travelling expenses

Travelling expenses are advanced in Great Britain and other countries. The Journal goes on to say:

> But the minister believes that he has arrived at a solution of the difficulty by getting employers to advance the money. The Minister of Labour has found that to allow persons out of work, especially immigrants, to get into the hands of employment agents has not been in the best interests of the workmen. He found, after going carefully into the matter, that one employment agent in Montreal had made $10,000 in three months out of immigrants alone, charging them as high as $15 and $16 to get them a job.
>
> He has stopped this extortion by compelling agents to take out a government license, and there is now a regular system of inspection.
>
> Mr. Crothers intends to go still further, and will establish Government bureaus at a number of centres of population. Accurate information regarding labour conditions in the various parts of the country will be available at each office, and to these offices those who desire employment will go. Employers also will be able to secure information as to the ability and record of those whom the bureau will recommend to them.

So this question is not new to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour or the Government. Delegations have been received and promises have been made. I do not wish to accuse my hon. friend of lack of diligence or attention, but at all events the

bald fact remains that nothing has been done.

On the 16th December, 1915, the Round Table Conference at Montreal was called by His Lordship Bishop Farthing, of the Anglican Church, and several of the leading citizens of the metropolis were present, also delegates from the various public bodies, both lay and clerical. The conference adopted unanimously the two following resolutions:

1. That this conference recognizes the necessity for immediate national action to cope with new and complex conditions arising after the war, and emphasizes the urgent need for a system of National Labour Bureaus.

2. That a deputation be appointed from this conference to urge upon the Government the immediate establishment of a National Labour Bureau system, with power to co-operate with representatives of other cities throughout the Dominion.

I understand that the delegation above referred to was to meet my hon. friend this very day, but that in view of the catastrophe of last Thursday its reception has been postponed for a few days. I know, however, that a petition has already been forwarded to the Governor-General in Council, the conclusions of which embody a system of Labour Bureaus. I do not know whether my honourable friend has taken cognizance of that petition, and in case he has not I beg leave to read its conclusions:

Therefore we respectfully beg to suggest:

1. That legislation be enacted by the Government this session, providing for a permanent commission, who will be responsible to Parliament to organize and establish a system of labour bureaus for Canada. The salient points to be:

(a) A commission or authority at Ottawa with executive power over the whole of the Dominion.

(b) In the chief municipalities a small local Board representative of the local council, of the employers and of labour with power in agricultural districts to co-operate, a representative of a farmer's association—with the agent of the central authority acting as secretary.

(c) A strict neutrality on the part of the bureaus in the case of lockouts and strikes.

(d) Co-operation with the educational authorities for the better industrial and vocational training of children.

(e) Co-operation with all the Government departments working towards the control and direction of immigration and labour, particularly the post office in the franking of letters and the distribution of bureau literature.

(f) The officers appointed to carry out the system to be tested as to business efficiency and vocational fitness by a board of examiners.

(g) Where necessary, separate waiting rooms shall be provided for men and women, with proper supervision.

(h) Owing to the number of women engaged in industry, it is recommended that a woman be a member of the commission and local boards.

2. That your Government take such steps as they, in their wisdom, may deem expedient, in order that some immediate action be taken to ameliorate our present conditions, and with greater efficiency and success meet the new conditions arising after the war.

This petition, and the resolution unanimously passed at the Round Table Conference on the 16th of December, 1915, were endorsed by the Montreal Board of Trade at their last sitting. The prayer of the petition, which was endorsed, is as follows:

That legislation be enacted by the Government this session, providing for a permanent commission, who will be responsible to Parliament to organize and establish a system of labour bureaus for Canada.

I stated at the beginning of my remarks that the problem this country would have to face to-morrow is threefold: first, replacing our returned soldiers in civilian employment; second, the consequence of the displacement of the munition workers to the extent of at least over one hundred thousand; and third, a very large influx of immigration. Each of these three problems requires much thought and study, but I think that the salient points which are to be found in such a system of National Labour Bureaus as I have mentioned will be adequate to solving them all. The salient points are:

1. A Commission or authority at Ottawa with executive power over the whole of Canada.

2. In every municipality or district a small local board, representative of local council, labour and trade.

3. Wherever possible, the present machinery to be used and the co-operation of the Provincial Governments invited.

4. A strict neutrality on the part of the Bureaus in the case of strikes and lockouts.

Such are the chief features of the system the establishment of which I strongly advocate. I repeat that I thoroughly re-echo the sentiments that were expressed at the round table conference held at Montreal in December last. I believe this question is a vital one, involving our future as a nation, and that it is one which should be taken into very serious consideration by the Government of the day. The war has created new conditions; let us be ready for its aftermath.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr.

Lemieux) has brought this subject to the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman has had a good deal of experience, having been closely connected with the Department of Labour when he was a member of the late Government, and his judgment on a question such as is being discussed this afternoon is therefore of considerable value. I am also glad, because it gives me the opportunity of correcting some misapprehensions that exist concerning this question of the establishment of labour bureaus.

My hon. friend has referred to some delegations that waited upon me some two years ago. I think there were five delegations altogether. They were all inspired by the same individual, who had a personal object in view. He desired a position under this Government at a large salary. The same individual, I am advised, many and many a time waited upon my hon. friend when he was in the late Government, and also upon my predecessor in this office, pressing upon them the advisability of establishing such a system of labour exchanges as my hon. friend has advocated to-day. I do not know whether I should congratulate my hon. friend upon having changed his opinion since he was in office, and when he had the power of granting the request made by this individual. At any rate, he did not grant the request. It does not appear to have struck him and my predecessor so favourably when they were in power and in a position to grant such a system of labour exchanges.

My hon. friend from Rouville has referred to conditions in Germany, Great Britain and Australia. It is very often said that there is in Australia a federal system of labour exchanges, but such is not the case. The Commonwealth of Australia has made no enactments whatever for the establishment of labour bureaus, but I believe that two or three of the separate states have. In Great Britain and Germany, where there are systems of labour exchanges, they are coupled up with a national system of unemployment insurance, sickness funds, and several other provisions for the amelioration of the condition of the working people. While I do not speak with certainty, I think that these matters are within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures, and not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament.

My hon. friend has also referred to conditions in the United States. In the year 1907 the United States established a system of labour bureaus, although it is not a perfect one, as my hon. friend has stated. During the last eight years, according to a report recently made, they have provided positions for about 40,000 men. We have in this country an agency at work which, during the same number of years, although we have a population of only eight millions as against ninety odd millions in the United States, has provided positions for about 130,000 men. My hon. friend is aware that the Immigration Department of this Government has for years been engaged to a large extent in providing positions on the land for the unemployed who desire work, and beginning with the year 1907, when the late Government was in power, the positions furnished have averaged about 16,000 a year, excluding the excursions that go out to the West every year to assist in harvesting.

My hon. friend has referred to the conditions which will exist when this war is ended. While I think it is right that we should begin now to think about those conditions, there is no certainty whatever that there will be anything like the immigration about which my hon. friend speaks almost with certainty, and I do not think it is wise at present to arrange by legislation for conditions which may not exist at the close of the war. We are taking steps in that direction not only for the soldiers who return invalided, but for those who will return when the war is over. My hon. friend knows that a Military Hospitals Commission, under the presidency of Senator Lougheed, was established by this Government some months ago. A conference of the Premiers or other representatives of the various provinces was held at Ottawa, and all the provinces were represented with the exception of British Columbia, from which we received a letter explaining why no representative could be sent. These representatives held a separate conference, the result of which was that they offered to undertake the work of securing employment for disabled soldiers. Since then, as I understand, a provincial commission has been appointed in each of the provinces, and these commissions in turn have appointed local committees. For instance, there is a commission in the province of Ontario, and I had a little experience of a local committee appointed under that commission in my own city of St. Thomas. The local committee is instructed to meet disabled soldiers at the station on their return, and it provides comforts for them in the meantime,

and undertakes as far as possible to find employment for them. The problem is a very difficult one, as hon. members can understand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is for soldiers who are invalided home?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes. The Government has shown its keen appreciation of the importance of these matters by referring them for definite consideration and action to the Military Hospitals Commission, called specially into existence for the purpose, which, under the chairmanship of Senator Lougheed, has already met in conference the Prime Ministers and other representatives of the various Provincial Governments and is arranging a carefully considered plan whereby the Dominion Government, the provinces, and the municipalities will be enabled to work effectively together in discharging the debt which the country should honourably pay to the men who have risked their lives in the defence of the Empire.

It has not been overlooked that the conclusion of the war may give rise to other economic problems in Canada, plans to meet which may well be in course of prepartion at the present time, and the Government has created a body known as the Economic Commission, which, again under the chairmanship of Senator Lougheed, is giving careful consideration to those matters with a view to advising how best this Dominion may be enabled to meet economic emergencies.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the principal object of this Economic Commission? Is it to meet such contingencies as that of the dislocation of war industries, when the war is ended?

Mr. CROTHERS: The Order in Council appointing this commission sets forth fully the different branches of work they are to engage in. One, for instance, is immigration; another is settlement on the land; another is taking care of the soldiers when they return at the end of the war. I have not it under my hand, but if I can procure a copy for my hon. friend, I have no doubt he will read it with interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has it been laid on the table of the House?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was laid on the table the Monday after the House met.

Mr. CROTHERS: The commission is gathering from many sources important information and expert advice, and it will be better able to frame a conclusion when this portion of its work is completed. In addition to the work the immigration offices are doing throughout the country, locating on an average 16,000 men a year, as compared with an average of 5,000 in the United States under their system, some of our provinces have already established labour bureaus. They have not gone into it very thoroughly yet, but if my hon. friend has read the report of the commission appointed by the Government of Ontario to inquire into the question of unemployment, he will remember that they recommend a system of provincial labour exchanges. They indicate hope that at some future time, when the various provinces have established similar exchanges, the whole may be linked up, with Ottawa as a sort of clearing-house.

My hon. friend has referred to statements of an officer of the Trades and Labour Council, who was present at one of the delegations referred to, but if he will consult that gentleman I think he will find that he is not in favour of those bureaus at all. The Trades and Labour Congress passed a resolution at its last annual meeting; and if I remember well, they passed a similar resolution at their previous convention, not saying in so many words that they were opposed to a national system or to a provincial system of bureaus, but declaring that they were in favour merely of a municipal system of labour exchanges.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was not present when the delegation waited upon the Government two years ago, but I was present the other day at a meeting in Montreal of the Montreal Trades and Labour Council, at which a representative of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, Mr. Foster, was present, and that gentleman gave support to the proposal I have read.

Mr. CROTHERS: He is only one member; but the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, when it met last summer at Vancouver, and the year before, when it met at St. John, passed a resolution in favour of municipal labour exchanges. I know Mr. Foster very well; he resides in Montreal, and is a member of the Trades and Labour Council there. But the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, perhaps the largest body of wage-earners in the Dominion, is opposed to a national system of labour exchanges.

I was pointing out that the Dominion immigration offices are locating about three

times as many workers, with a population of eight millions, as the system in operation in the United States is locating with a population of a hundred millions. We have some labour exchanges established in the various provinces. They are not very completely at work yet. We have municipal exchanges in several places, and we also have a large number of private exchanges.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CROTHERS: When the House rose at six o'clock, I had referred to some of our facilities for the distribution of labour. I had pointed out that our immigration officials last year had placed 17,250 labourers, and that in the year 1914 they had placed 17,350; that something had been done in the way of developing provincial labour exchanges, and that the prospects were that there would be a very much greater development in the near future; that we have municipal bureaus that are doing a good deal in this direction; that the Trades and Labour Congress favour municipal bureaus and not provincial or Dominion bureaus; that under our system of distribution of labour, a very much larger number of labourers have been placed during the last eight years, in fact, three times as many, as have been placed in the United States under a system which they adopted in 1907. Undoubtedly there is much valuable work to be done in co-ordinating and systematizing the work of these agencies. This, however, is a work which falls in the first place on the provincial authorities, under whose authority these agencies have been established and are or may be licensed, inspected and regulated. The Dominion Government seeks opportunities of co-operating to the same end, and from this point of view availed itself three years ago of its powers under the Dominion Immigration Act to bring private employment agencies under a system of Dominion inspection, in so far as the agencies might deal with immigrants. This action was taken because of cases which had come to light, in which immigrants had been victimized by these agencies. Enforcement of the new regulation is believed to have worked very effectively for the protection of immigrants. Otherwise the agencies remain subject to provincial control.

There are besides numerous agencies of a voluntary or semi-philanthropic nature, such as the employment bureaus of the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Salvation Army, etc.

The Department of Labour, though not exercising or claiming any jurisdiction over these various classes of labour exchanges, is endeavouring gradually to establish a system by which monthly reports are secured from them, the results of which are tabulated and printed from month to month in the Labour Gazette. For instance, for the month of November last, nine employment bureaus, provincial or municipal, reported 4,668 vacancies notified and 3,782 persons placed; twelve Salvation Army labour bureaus reported the distribution of 1,402 casual jobs to 890 persons, and Y.W.C.A. officers reported 1,217 vacancies notified and 253 women and girls placed. It is hoped to develop this system of reporting, and it is not impossible that, by keeping in this way and otherwise closely in touch with labour distribution agencies, opportunities may be found where the facilities of the federal authorities may be advantageously exercised. While, however, there is apparent advantage in the co-ordination, so far as may be possible, of the various and numerous classes of agencies now working to the same end, there is perhaps some ground for the view that the assumption by the Dominion of practically all responsibility with reference to the distribution of labour, in the manner suggested in many published statements on this subject, would lead to a cessation of the excellent work resulting from existing enterprises, particularly those of provincial and municipal bureaus.

In conclusion, it may be said that unemployment is less at the present time than normally; existing facilities in labour distribution are large and of a nature permitting extension as occasion requires. The Government is not unmindful that the future may bring emergencies, means to meet which are a matter of careful and immediate consideration.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) spoke of unemployment. There is practically no unemployment in Canada to-day. Many employers are looking for labourers and are unable to find them in as large numbers as they desire. In this respect things are very different from what they were fifteen months ago. About a year or fifteen months ago there was greater activity in the direction of efforts to establish these labour exchanges than

there is now. One can easily see that with conditions as they were fifteen months ago, that is with a surplus of labour everywhere so that there was no place where you could direct one hundred men to go and find work, these labour bureaus would be of no use; and, when there is a scarcity of labour you do not need any labour exchanges. To-day no man who is able and willing to work need be idle—and that is to a large extent the case at all times. There are exceptions, but as a rule the man who is out of work does not want to work. We had some experience of that kind in Ottawa a year ago, when we had sixty-four bona fide applications from farmers in the Ottawa valley for men to go out and work on the farms, yet during the whole winter we could only find fifteen men who would go to fill sixty-four places. There were scores of men going to the city hall every morning to get a loaf of bread, but they would not go out to work for the farmers at $20 a month and their board. I know of a case where a man offered to hire fifty men out of work and to give them $20 a month and board and lodgings. But they said: No, we prefer to remain here and to go to the city hall every morning and get a loaf of bread to working on a farm for $20 a month and our board. My hon. friend referred to the problem of getting men on the land at the close of the war. We will have an opportunity to discuss that on another motion to be proposed by the hon. gentleman. But it seems to me, that the important problem that will face us when the war is over, will be to get men upon the land where they will cause two bushels to grow where there is only one growing now. That is the effort we shall have to make. We do not want to bring men to this country who will go into the cities, who know nothing about the land and do not want to work on the land. As I have said, our great problem will be to get men upon the land, to make land productive which is not productive now. Of course we have fish and timber and minerals in this country, but I believe that our richest natural resource is the soil and that it is the duty of the people of Canada to see to it that our great open, vacant spaces are filled up with men who will produce something out of ground that is now producing nothing.

My honourable friend referred to technical education, but that subject also will be discussed on another motion of my honourable friend's, so I shall not deal with it now.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, as a representative of labour, organized labour especially, I will say at the outset that we do not want these employment bureaus. There are many reasons for that position, but they are too long to enumerate. From the information I have gathered from members of the House of Commons in Great Britain, and from other Dominions, this system is not working as well as it it is supposed to be in those parts of the world. We came to the conclusion that it would be one of the finest political machines that could be invented for a political party. Of course it may not be looked upon in that way by all, but I know it could be worked in that way and my honourable friends on both sides of the House know that too.

I wish to speak especially on the question of non-employment and I may say at once that I do not quite agree with the Minister of Labour in respect to non-employment. I will admit that there are fewer men walking the streets to-day than there were a year ago, but we must bear in mind the positions in which many of these men have been placed. A great many men who were receiving a living wage prior to fifteen months ago, have had today to accept half a living wage. Many who were working for about $3 per day eighteen months ago are working for $1.75. There is no doubt that the number walking around the streets is less now than it was then, but we must remember that these men have been forced by circumstances which we all appreciate to accept positions altogether inferior, so that they have not now the same power to buy the necessities of life for their families. That is probably why we do not see so many men walking the streets to-day. We must also bear in mind that great numbers of men left the country at the outset of the war, and two and a half or three months afterwards there might have been a sudden shortage in the supply of labour. I have always noticed, in my experience in life, that if employers of labour want men, even for two or three weeks, they have it published in the newspapers all over the country that there is a big shortage of labour. It is not a question of how long they intend to employ those labourers; it is a question of employing them there and then; it is not a question of what they are going to do after the work, however short

it may be, is over. In the large cities to-day —I know that there are some in Toronto, and also in Montreal—there are men asking every day for positions. They say: can you find me a position, at labouring or anything at all. Of course there are positions in connection with shell making and so on, but I take this occasion to state that if one of those men does not happen to have a recommendation from one who supports the Government he does not get the job.

Mr. ROGERS: I would like my hon. friend to give us some names or some evidence in support of that statement, because I do not think it is a correct statement. The Government are taking no part of any kind or description in the making of shells. I think that is a very unfair statement to make.

Mr. VERVILLE: I can give my hon. friend names and places. I am stating exactly what happens. I do not say the Government are responsible; I do not know that. I am not accusing the Government when I say that a man who does not have a recommendation from one who supports the Government cannot get a position. I do not say that the Government have given instructions to that effect.

Mr. ROGERS: Give us a case in point.

Mr. VERVILLE: I will give to my hon. friend privately or publicly, next week if he likes, the names and places. Whether it is the fault of the manager of the works or of some subordinate, I do not know. I am not going into these details now, but I have come to the conclusion that if one of those poor men wants to get a job anywhere he has to see his own member and get a lettter of recommendation. I am merely stating a fact, and my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong, when I say that there are a certain number of men unemployed in the cities at the present time. It is quite a problem I know. I could never see that it was possible to prevent men from getting positions if the men were really wanted.

This question of unemployment is going to be one of the most acute questions that ever came before any Parliament in any country in the world. So far as immigration is concerned, I do not anticipate that we are going to get the very big influx of immigrants that some people expect. That is my personal view. I cannot help wondering how many men will be left in the home land after the war is over. At the present time there are organized in Britain and also in France institutions to prevent if possible immigration, because they recognize that after the war everything will have to be reconstructed. Therefore, I do not anticipate the big influx of immigrants that others do. My view is that it is the men at home that we shall have to look to. Industries connected with construction work have practically ceased operations during the past two and a half years, and the trades connected with construction are the trades that we base our opinions upon. I admit that many of the men who were employed in construction work are now engaged in other industries, such as making shells and munitions of war, but after these industries stop we will have a tremendous number of men out of work. Probably by that time the country may be in a position to provide public works to employ the greater part of those men; it will probably come to that, but it is a very big problem to face.

I want to come back to the question of employment bureaus. Where they are controlled by private individuals, these employment bureaus are absolutely wrong. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour knows that in the city of Montreal some of the individuals running those private institutions were dragged before the courts for levying exorbitant charges on the men. They used to send the men to places where there were no positions to fill. I claim that every one of these institutions should be abolished. I have no objection, and the labour men of this country have no objection—I am speaking now for organized labour—to municipal bureaus if they can work in harmony with the different provinces, because they form a kind of family circle in which the problem can be handled very much better than by private individuals. We have a municipal bureau and a provincial bureau in Montreal, and both work in harmony. I can assure you, Sir, that they are not strike-breaking bureaus. What organized labour fears, and rightly fears, from their experience, is that if those bureaus were established by the Federal Government throughout Canada, it would be an easy matter, four or five or six months before some labour trouble threatened, to send a number of men as strike-breakers.

My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) made a reference to the attitude of the Trades and Labour Congress. I am sorry to say that he must have been mis-

informed. The president of the Trades and Labour Congress may have said, speaking as an individual, that he was in favour of employment bureaus, but if he made that statement he had no right whatever to speak for organized labour in this country. My hon. friend attended the meeting in Montreal. I was asked to attend that meeting, but I would not go. He attended that meeting, but he was non-committal. The president of the Trades and Labour Congress had no right to commit the labour men in that respect, and I do not suppose he did to the extent which my hon. friend imagined. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour spoke at the different associations that at the present time operate as bureaus, and he mentioned the Salvation Army and other organizations. I would advise the Salvation Army to keep to their spiritual work and not to bother about placing people at work. It would be a great deal better for the working men of this country if they did so, because experience has proved that these people were more interested in getting so much per head some few years ago, if not now, than in where the men were to go. If we are going to solve this precious problem, if I may so term it, we shall have to face it in a manly way. The taxes are increasing and bearing more and more upon every working man, woman and child, and I believe, as many others believe, that if the taxation was lowered, and the people were afforded wider markets so as to enable them to secure the necessities of life, it would be a step towards solving the problem of employment.

Of course, there is a school made up of persons who think they know how to settle this problem altogether. First of all, they say that if we want the staff of life we must own all the mills. But after we obtain ownership of the mills we shall have to own all the fields and grow the wheat ourselves; we shall have to own the bakeries, and everything of that kind. Well, at the present time I do not suppose that any government is ready to go that far. That is why the liberal-minded men of the country have been always in favour of the nationalization of public utilities; and I believe that that should be the first step. According to the last report of the Minister of Labour, the cost of living has increased throughout the country; the report, issued, I believe, in August, showed an increase of about five per cent. That report showed what is would cost the workingman with a salary of $800 to live, taking into account some 28 articles which it was necessary for him to buy. We know that at present there are any number of men who are obliged to accept positions at a much lower wage than they received prior to the breaking out of the war—and the cost of living is still increasing. Rents are increasing, too; though some may say that they are not. What we call the big rents are not increasing, but the economic conditions have forced certain classes of people to move, we will say, to another street, and while formerly they were paying $40 a month, they were forced by economic conditions to move to a street where they should pay $25, but they are paying $27 a month. And a man who lived on that same street and who formerly paid $25 was obliged to move to a section of the city where the rents should $15, but where he pays $17. So you will find that the lower rentals have increased to the extent of two or three dollars a month. Rents, therefore, have decreased for the class of people who can best afford to pay, but they have increased for those who can least afford to pay.

Different associations in Canada to-day, including all sorts of church denominations and benevolent societies, are asking for such a provision as that which is suggested by the hon. member for Rouville, but they are all asking for something that they do not want, and something that is not wanted by the people who ask for it. True, it is a good thing to bring the matter up and get the decision of the House upon it, so that the people of the country will know once for all what the labour man wants; but if the House passes a measure of that kind they will do it against the will of those who are most interested in the matter.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): My apology for making some remarks upon this question is that I have devoted many years to the study of it. I have been very seriously impressed with the fact that whilst nowadays we apply scientific principles to the study of every other subject, to the economic problem we continue to apply all the old haphazard methods that have endured for so long.

I was much struck with the opening remarks of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). He spoke of what he called the industrial victory, saying that if we in Canada were to do in the future as we should, namely, accomplish some wonderful conquest, or obtain some great industrial victory, then we must pre-

pare accordingly. The fundamental error of the whole economic question is just that idea. If we are not going to treat this question in the true democratic spirit, namely, that of mutual help as well as of self-help, there is no possibility of settling the question either upon an economic basis or upon a benevolent basis. We must eliminate this idea of competition. It is this free competition race which the world is endeavouring to run, with the strong always in the lead, that is producing and has produced the sad condition that has existed for so long a time, and that is getting worse as the world becomes more thickly populated. The ideal condition in nature is that of equilibrium—it is not necessary to state it. If we can find a balance, whether it be in financial matters, in economic matters, in mathematics, in physical science, or in natural science, we have found a solution. Philosophy and poetry have gone their way long since. They are inexact; they are simply the fruits of fancy or emotion; they are in many cases idle speculation. Year after year and century after century new theories of philosophy came up and went down; even now we have turned back to an ancient system which stands like the pyramids of Egypt—monuments of an ancient and solitary grandeur. This, however, is not the spirit of this age. The spirit of this age is systematized, scientific knowledge. The application of all the remedies that might be suggested would take almost in infinite time, and produce as great a variety of results. But until we realize that, like the cell in the natural makeup, the unit must be considered, we must only wander far from our base and really never reach a conclusion. The unit, as we understand it, is the man and his family. The natural desire of the man and his family is to have a free scope for their activities. So long as they are in a normal and healthy condition and have a free scope for their activities, they attain the highest point of which they are capable. In order to have this great scope for their activities, however, it is necessary that they shall be able, according to the more modern system, to interchange the products of those activities with the products or originators of other activities. This they should do not upon a reckless, ill-considered basis, or according to no system at all, but according to that well-balanced system which is known as state control.

I will recall, if you will allow me, the reference which I made heretofore to the simple case of profit. Profit, as everybody must admit, is the taking of something for which you do not give an equivalent; the minute you give an equivalent there ceases to be profit. Yet the whole world, economic and otherwise, is striving for profit, and when a man has made great profits and heaped up riches, we congratulate him as a success, whereas economically he is a failure, philanthrophically a criminal.

When we have succeeded in analysing these conditions, we shall not commit what I say, with all due respect, is the extraordinary blunder of trying to relieve unemployment by immigration. That, to my mind, is one of the saddest commentaries upon the discussions we have had here from time to time. On the one hand, we are advised to prepare for immigration, to arrange for it, to encourage it rather than to prohibit it but at the same time to assimilate it. On the other hand, we are advised to prepare for unemployment. As immigration is the sure guarantee of greater unemployment, you are endeavouring to destroy what we are pretending to build up. It is these errors which cannot possibly exist once we have adopted a scientific system. Once the state understands that the fundamental is that a man should be allowed scope for his activities, then all legislation will tend to that end. How idle it is, to my idea, and I say it with all due respect to the minister himself, to say: Oh, get the people on the land. Surely it is not necessary to repeat, that by putting people on the land you might raise five thousand times as much as is raised at present. But who is going to eat all that? There is no market for it. The proposition is absurd on the face of it. It is said at the present time, that in many quarters, especially in our middle West, agriculture, except in an exceptional year, does not pay. That means that economically speaking, there are too many people on the land already. To say that in immigration we have found the solution for unemployment, or that putting people on the land will solve our other difficulties, is saying something that to my mind is grossly erroneous. Until a man raises what he can, either on the land, or off the land, by virtue of his mechanical knowledge or otherwise, and is able to exchange what he has raised, he has not reached a state of economic perfection. The natural man is he who desires simply enough, according to nature's laws, to enable him to live; and when he has accomplished that, he has fulfilled the law of nature. That is the true basis of it all. Beyond that, it is advancement, civili-

zation, luxury, development, or what you will. But this is something that can be handled only by the people themselves, and the people can handle these things only by means of a central organization, and that central organization is their Government. And unless the Government says: this must be done, and that must not be done; unless the Government finds out how all these units may interchange their affinities and activities so that the different parts of the body of the state may work together in unison and harmony, they have not accomplished the first step in economic science. It is useless, therefore, to talk of bureaus, or benevolent societies, and all these other so-called agencies or remedies for the public good, when the seat of the disease has not been ascertained. And the seat of the disease has not been ascertained, because the seat of its occupation has not been ascertained. As we all know, there was a time when throughout the world physical disease was treated according to symptoms. Sometimes the symptoms gave certain ideas to the doctor, and if he was a little lucky he might perhaps hit what was the matter and treat it accordingly. By and by a Frenchman discovered, and a German also, that disease proceeded from the deposits of certain germs. When that was ascertained, it was simply a matter of finding the germ and the deposit and applying the neutralizer. That was scientific; the other was guess work, experimentalism, empiricism. From that date medicine ceased to be an empirical science, falsely so-called, and became a natural science. Economic science too must be a natural science. It must find the germ of the trouble, and the body in which it lies, and then apply the neutralizer and allow nature to have its full scope. Otherwise there will be no natural development and, consequently, no permanent development. Surely we have seen to be utterly useless the various theories promulgated since the beginning of the world which were in opposition to nature. Nature governs, nature is clearly and admittedly the expression of the will of God. For men to eradicate nature, to set it at naught, is clearly so absurd that at last the world found it out.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM: Why not try theology on it.

Mr. BURNHAM: I will come to you in a minute. These things have been found out by scientific men at various times, and until this labour problem is determined in a similarly scientific manner, there is no possibility and no hope of a solution. Theology is, of course, a little uncertain, but I would expect the hon. gentleman to turn to theology, as it coresponds best with his state of mind, which is somewhat chaotic and decidedly nebulous. I would expect the gentlemen who do not give much thought to these matters and who read less about them, who think what is is, and that what is not ought not to be, to ignore absolutely what stares them in the face, what appears in every magazine, what newspapers even furnish from day to day, what cheap text books enable them to learn; and that is: that the age of those things we have been speaking of has disappeared, and a new age has arrived, and the economic problem must be treated in a new way.

To repeat, before I close. Just as in nature and in all science the aim is to find out what will produce a happy state of rest, satisfaction or equlibrium, so we must strive to find out that which will produce in the economic body known as the industrial portion of the state that equilibrium, that natural compensation which alone can produce satisfaction. Otherwise we can never hope to attain rest.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the philosophic arguments of my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). The hon. gentleman's remarks are always very interesting, but whether his remarks will help us to arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not labour bureaus should be established throughout this country is a question. I remember hearing the question of labour bureaus discussed in this House last year, and I do not intend to make any remark in regard to that phase of the question, except to say that I have always understood that the object of establishing labour bureaus throughout the country is to enable men to go to that portion of the country where they can obtain employment. If that is the object, I do not see why the system should not be given a trial. I do not think the Minister of Labour can argue against it on the grounds of expense, because, it being a fact that labour bureaus are established in some of the provinces to-day, all that is necessary would be to establish an organization in connection with the Labour Department in Ottawa. This organization could co-operate with the provincial labour bureaus, and in that way the matter of

expense would be reduced to a minimum. Notwithstanding what has been said by the Minister of Labour to-night, I see no valid objection to the establishment of this system for the purpose of distributing labour throughout Canada.

At this point it seems to me only fair to correct an impression that, I think, was left by the honourable member for Maisonneuve (Mr Verville) in regard to the Salvation Army. Although I do not know under what conditions the Salvation Army bring immigrants into this country, I know that they have brought many immigrants who have located in western Canada—I am not so sure about the East. As regards the organization of the Salvation Army, I know that they have done a great deal in the way of distributing domestic help in the western cities of Canada and also in finding employment for all kinds and classes of men.

At the present time the question of unemployment is not very serious in this country. I understand that in the eastern cities no man need go without employment to-day, and that the same can be said of Winnipeg and the smaller cities with which I am familiar in the province of Saskatchewan, although I cannot say anything about the cities of Calgary and Edmonton. Before the war the condition of labour was abnormal, in my own city hundreds, and in Winnipeg thousands were out of employment. We all remember that some 9,000 men—if I am exaggerating the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) will correct me—marched to the legislative buildings in the city of Winnipeg demanding employment and other assistance from the then Provincial Government. In the eastern cities of Canada practically the same condition of affairs existed, large numbers of men being out of employment. Since the war started, by reason of the manufacture of munitions and also because a large number of our unemployed enlisted for overseas service, we have not had those conditions of unemployment. I am not however, very optimistic, as to the condition of affairs in Canada after the war is over. I believe that when peace is declared, when the manufacture of munitions in this country ceases and when our soldiers return, we are going to have conditions of unemployment here, although I do not agree with my honourable friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that for that reason we should not bring immigrants into this country.

The Minister of Labour said, in reference to the Military Hospitals Commission, that this Government is doing something for the returned soldiers, but I understand that the work of this commission is confined to looking after soldiers who are invalided home. I would not for a moment suggest that the Government is not doing what it should in regard to looking after returned soldiers, but it is not entitled to all the credit with regard to the formation of the Military Hospitals Commission, because if I am correctly informed, the men who are doing the work in connection with that commission are the local organizations of each province, and I believe, when the various provincial representatives met the representatives of the Dominion Government here some months ago for the purpose of forming this commission, the resolutions were framed and all the work in connection with the organization was done by representatives of the various provinces.

Mr. CROTHERS: I thought I made it clear that what the various provinces undertook to do was simply to find work as far as possible for the invalided soldiers and to aid us as far as they could in opening up institutions for the blind and the insane, the Government paying them for any patients who might be taken in. The Military Hospitals Commission provide convalescent homes of which they are operating a large number now, and they are also undertaking to re-educate men, and do other work of a similar nature.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I understand that the Dominion Government is paying the cost of all this work, and I am not finding any fault in regard to that. I believe it is better that the work should be handled by the local authorities, because they can get more readily into touch with the men who come back from the front.

Let me refer briefly to an experience of mine in connection with the Military Hospitals Commission, and in doing so I must refer to the Militia Department. Some time ago I wrote to the Minister of Militia in regard to three men who returned from the front, one of them being discharged in September, one in October, and one in December. Each of these men had about a hundred dollars coming to him by way of back pay—I have forgotten the figures because my correspondence has been destroyed. Now, I have been trying for the last three or four months, through the city organization of the Military Hospitals Commission, which is looking after the welfare of the returned soldiers, to get this

back pay, but have failed in my efforts, and these men are depending simply on local charity. It is perhaps not in order to deal with a question of this kind at this stage, but I thought of it when speaking of the Military Hospitals Commission.

Other commissions have been mentioned during the course of this debate. I do not think that I heard the commission with respect to the High Cost of Living mentioned by the Minister of Labour, but that commission went throughout the country; it was in the city of Regina, although the information which it got in that city did not amount to much, because it did not get into touch with the proper people to give it information as to local conditions. So far I have not seen any report of the work of that commission, and I hope that the Military Hospitals Commission will show better results. The Minister of Labour also referred to the Economic Commission, the powers of which are wide enough to include almost everything, so that we should expect some results from that august body of men chosen by the Government to look into questions of economics. I believe, as my hon. friend from West Peterborough has suggested, that this commission will deal with economic questions in a practical manner.

The present Government might very well make use of the valuable reports submitted in a number of volumes by the Commission on Technical Education appointed some years ago by the late Government. When our soldiers return from the front without employment, and some of them without sufficient means of subsistence and without a trade at their back, valuable assistance could be given them if the Dominion Government, in conjunction with the Provincial Governments, would establish some system of technical education whereby these men might be taught some method of making a living.

I wish to refer for a moment to the question of immigration. I do not agree with my hon. friend from West Peterborough when he says that there are too many men on the land, and that that is the reason why farming does not pay.

There is a general impression, and to some extent it is justified, that farming in certain parts of this country does not pay. I can advance very substantial reasons for that condition. The reason is not that there are too many men on the land, but that in the part of the country I come from farmers are too much hedged about by restrictions.

[M. W. M. Martin.]

By the lack of free wheat—perhaps; the Minister of Public Works says: "perhaps." But he knows what the people of western Canada think of free wheat, and if the hon. minister told fully and frankly what he believes on this subject I have no doubt that he would agree with me in favour of free wheat. If I mistake not, the Minister of Public Works at one time almost promised the people of Manitoba free wheat, or some kind of free trade with the nation to the south. But we will deal with that later in the session.

There is another condition which causes farming, perhaps, to be not so profitable as it might be, and that is that the farmer —at any rate the farmer in western Canada—pays a higher rate of interest than is paid in any competing wheat-growing country in the world, and a noticeably higher rate than is paid by the manufacturers of eastern Canada. The farmer of western Canada who has any honesty about him at all is just as good a risk for $1,000 as is the manufacturing institution for $100,000 or $1,000,000—and many of these manufacturing concerns get tremendous sums of money from the banks, when the farmers in my part of the country cannot get $1,000. The bankers will say that they give every man credit who deserves it. I know something about business, and, having transacted legal business in western Canada for the last thirteen years, I know something of the business the banks are doing. Though the banks are fair as a rule, there are many instances in which they are unfair. They do not take the same risks at all with the western farmer that they take with the manufacturing plants in eastern Canada. Something must be done if we are to settle the West. Our farming lands are those upon which we must put our immigrants, and not send them into the cities, to which immigration has been drifting for twenty years. We must surround farming in this country with such conditions as to put it on the same basis as the business of the average business man or merchant. If we cannot do this by means of the business and financial institutions that exist now, then, I submit, the Dominion Government, in co-operation with the provincial governments, must devise a system by which cheap money can be got to the farmers on the prairies of western Canada, to enable them to carry on their business at a reasonable rate of interest. This question has been dealt with in other countries; Aus-

tralia, New Zealand, Russia, Algeria, and France have done something in this line.

An hon. MEMBER: Even Bulgaria.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: And Ireland.

Mr. MARTIN: These countries have taken up the idea of doing something to keep the people on the land. Take the case of western Canada. If an immigrant goes in and is to establish himself as a farmer, he must have capital. The best immigrant we have in the West is the American farmer, and one great reason is that he has sold his farm in the United States and the money he brings with him. So he has capital with which to establish himself. But it is impossible for a man to go on the land and get a sufficient outfit without capital. I do not think it is beyond the power of the statesmen of the Dominion to devise some system whereby the immigrants who may come to this country after the war is over can be provided with the capital they need, at reasonable rates.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: I am sure the House appreciates very much the importance of the question brought to its attention by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Both sides of the House are most anxious to take any measure, in the public interest, which will assist in preparing for the conditions which will arise at the close of the war. But the hon. gentleman in his resolution makes a definite statement and it is evident from the statement of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), and others who are taking part in this debate, that there is somewhat of a difference of opinion. With the consent of my hon. friend from Rouville and of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) I would suggest that the resolution be amended to read:

> That this House is of the opinion that the Government should carefully consider the advisability of establishing a system of national labour bureaus to cope with the new conditions arising after the war.

If that is satisfactory to my hon. friends the member for Rouville and the Minister of Labour, I think the House will approve it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I accept with pleasure the suggestions made by the leader of the House (Mr. Rogers) in view of the spirit with which my motion has been received. I am sure the Government and Parliament will do its duty when the question again comes before the House for its action.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has done me the honour to ask me to second his resolution, which I cheerfully do, with the amendment which has been proposed by the Minister of Public Works and accepted by my hon. friend. I am not sure but that the Minister of Public Works would like to have the discussion closed, with a view to going on with other business. It seems to me, however, that the question is not only very important but is well deserving of discussion by the members of this House. It is not often we are afforded an opportunity in this House to discuss these questions of social and economic importance. Not many days are allotted to us for the discussion of private members' business, and especially for the discussion of matters of this character. When these questions do come up we are very likely to be told, as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has told us in this case, that the Government has appointed a commission, rather putting it to the House that this shows the keen interest the Government is taking in the matter. The Minister of Labour mentioned the Economic Commission which is to make recommendations to the Government as to action to be taken to deal with questions raised by the war. He referred also to the commission to deal with the cases of disabled soldiers. It seems to me the Government ought themselves to bring these questions to the attention of the House, and ought themselves to deal with them. Some time ago, when the people thought that conditions were ripe for beginning the work of building the Georgian Bay canal to connect the city of Montreal with the Great Lakes, so as to make the most direct and shortest waterway from Montreal to Fort William and Port Arthur, and everybody seemed satisfied that the work was deserving public support, the Minister of Public Works told the House that a commission had been appointed to investigate the whole subject, and thus the matter was shelved.

And so with regard to the question raised by the resolution. The Minister of Labour says there has been a commission appointed to consider the cases of disabled soldiers, and another to consider the whole state of the country, and to recommend something to be done after the war has been concluded. I do submit that the people of this country expect their representatives in

Parliament to deal with these important questions. Parliament is the great council of the nation. The representatives of the people are sent here from all parts of this country, and I think it is their duty to discuss, and I think the Government should take the lead in having discussed, these questions which are of importance to the future of Canada. Therefore, I am glad that my hon. friend has brought this question before the House, and I am glad it has been discussed to the extent it has. I hope the discussion will continue, because it deals not merely with the question to which the hon. member for Rouville devoted the most attention, that is the question of the employment of labour, but it also deals with the whole question of how the people of this country can best prepare to meet, in a satisfactory way, those conditions which will exist in Canada after the war has been concluded. It deals directly with the question of immigration, to which my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) has devoted some attention. No subject is more deserving of the attention of this Parliament than that of the best method of settling the public lands of this country, in conjunction, of course, with the different provinces. I quite agree with the Minister of Labour as to that; where I disagree with him is that he does not hold out to us any hope that he or his colleagues are going to take the lead and come before Parliament with some definite and advanced proposition along these lines. My own view is—and, while I have entertained that view very strongly for a considerable time, yet I have hesitated to advance it because it may not meet with popular approval—but my own opinion is that the day has gone by when our lands should be given away as free homesteads to everybody who chooses to enter upon them and occupy them.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite agree with you.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad indeed to hear the Minister of Public Works make that statement.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: What would you do?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In conjunction with the different provinces, with a view to promoting immigration and the settlement of our own people upon the Crown lands, I would have a careful examination made of the Crown lands in the different parts of the Dominion; I would fix the prices for those lands at what would be reasonable; I would extend the terms of payment over a long period of time, twenty, thirty, or even forty years; I would make the rate of interest low, and then I would encourage the settler who could be induced to go upon the land. I would put under cultivation a certain area which would be all ready for him when he went to settle on the land; I would build him a house; I would encourage him in the early years of settlement in making a comfortable home. And I would take, in the name of the Crown, a mortgage on his land and upon his improvements and extend that mortgage over a long period. Sir, it is in the earlier years of the settler's life upon the land that much of his time is wasted. He becomes heartbroken in many cases and, in many cases having become heartbroken and discouraged, he leaves the land and goes back to the city. Under such a system as I have suggested land which to-day is being given away for nothing would produce to this country in the course of fifteen or twenty years from $15 to $20 per acre, yielding a small rate of interest in the meantime; and at the end of forty years you would have more money out of the lands than would pay off our national debt three times over. And you would be doing the very best thing possible for the settler because, as I have said, in the earlier years you would be giving him an opportunity to use his labour to the best advantage, to make his land most productive; and in this way you would be benefiting both the country and the settler by reason of the assistance you would give him. I would re-survey the lands of the West so that instead of having the settlers separated from each other by long distances you could have the settlers in colonies, perhaps with roads running like the spokes of a wheel from a central point which would become the social centre of the community, where you would have the store, the doctor, the church, and the schools and the centres of social life. Thus life upon the prairie would not be so lonely for the settler and especially for the settler's wife and family as it is to-day. This, in a very few words, is the course which I should pursue. But my hon. friend from West Peterborough says: Oh, you do not want immigrants. In reply, I say Canada was never so prosperous as a few years ago when settlers were pouring into this country, not merely by the thousands but by the hundreds of thousands; then the factories of the East

were steadily employed supplying western people, the wholesale merchants were busy supplying the western retail merchants and the retail merchants were busy selling to the settlers and there was prosperity all around.

Mr. BURNHAM: My hon. friend refers to one kind of immigration only.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am referring to the immigration which I think is the best, that is the immigration of people who can be induced to settle on the soil. If my hon. friend limited his objections to undesirable immigrants I would quite agree with him.

Then there is another question which I do not think ought to be allowed to wait but should be taken up by the Government, that is the question of rural credits. I do not find so much fault with the banks as many people do by reason of their not giving farmers that amount of credit which it is necessary they should have in order to carry on farming operations successfully, because the banks of the country receive large amounts of money on deposit. They must keep this money in the form of liquid assets so that they can respond to the demands made on them. But the credit to the farmer, to be of value to him, must extend, not for two months, but for years; and he must get his money at a low rate of interest. Therefore, the only way in which rural credit can be established satisfactorily is by the creation of a banking system which would be entirely separate from and independent of the present chartered banks of the country. I would do as they are proposing to do in the United States. I would establish a number of central banks or reserve banks in different sections of the country. Then I would establish in the different localities where people are desirous of having them, branches of these banks. But I would go further than they are proposing to go in the United States. I would allow the Government to stand behind those great central banks and give a reasonable guarantee, so that the bonds which those banks would issue to provide the necessary funds for lending to the farmers would be sold at the very highest possible rate, and upon the most advantageous terms in order that the great interests of the farmers would benefit.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: That is the American system. The credit of the nation is behind it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, I think my hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was in the Bill which was passed by Congress last session, but it was vetoed by the President, and the Bill which has been introduced during the present session of Congress leaves out the provision of national credit. There are a good many members of Congress who are in hopes that they will be able to get the Bill changed, so as to have the national credit, but they very much fear that they will not be able to do so, and some are in favour of accepting the Bill without the national credit provision in it. I think if my hon. friend looks at the Bill he will see that I am correct.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: There is provision made for large deposits of Government money in this new system of banking. In that way great sums of national money can be issued for the use of the farmers in connection with farm credits. But I see the point my hon. friend is making with regard to improved security.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friends on the Treasury benches pardon me if I remind them that before the Solicitor General became a member of this Government, before he became Solicitor General, he stated to this House that he was in favour of introducing a Bill, and of having it passed by this House, to provide for agricultural credits. There is no one better qualified to draw a Bill along these lines than my hon. friend the Solicitor General. He has become the legal adviser very largely of this Government. He occupies a very prominent position in this House, and no doubt is influential in the Government. But since he has become Solicitor General we have had no word of the provision of agricultural credits, no word of the provision of a banking system for the benefit of the farmers. Why is this? Some member of the Government might enlighten us, and let us know whether the Solicitor General, who has become a member of the Privy Council, and therefore a member of the Government, has changed his mind, and whether the Government has abandoned the idea of introducing a Bill along those lines. If the Government has abandoned the idea, and does not intend to submit the matter to Parliament, it will become a question for other members of the House whether they should press the matter

upon the attention of the Government, and endeavour to rouse public attention in favour of the enactment of such a measure. Of course it will be well understood that a Bill of this nature would have to be introduced by the Government. The most that other members of the House could do would be to agitate for the measure in the hope that the Government would later on see its way to take some action. At all events, if they should not do so during their—they will pardon me for saying it—their short tenure of office.

Mr. ROGERS: Smile when you say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then it could be brought to a successful conclusion by their successors.

There are other matters in regard to which this Government ought to ask Parliament to prepare for the future, and to prepare immediately. We should not wait until this war is over. You will agree with me, I am sure, when I say that we should not wait until we have thousands and hundreds of thousands of men coming back from the front, many of them with no work to engage in, many of them who left their occupations to go to the front, and who have no occupation to take up when they return. We should not wait until that day arrives; we should be looking ahead and making preparations. In addition to a broad and comprehensive plan for the settlement of our young men upon our Crown lands, there are surely other lines of industry which ought to receive consideration by the Government. Take the matter which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred to some three or four years ago when he took such a lively interest in such matters. You will remember the occasion, Sir, when he said that he had the smell of the salt air in his nostrils, and that he wanted to assist in the building up of a great ship-building industry. Surely, Sir, we ought not to wait many years, we ought not to wait until the war is over before we take up that question. To-day there is a tremendous demand for a mercantile marine in this country, and surely this Canada of ours with its thousands of miles of coast line on the Atlantic and the Pacific, ought to be encouraged by the Government to engage in ship-building. We should proceed with the establishment of a mercantile marine. That would give employment to many people, not to disabled soldiers, but to many people who might want to come to this country, and to many soldiers when they return from the front after the war is over. It would not require very much encouragement upon the part of this Government to induce people to establish shipyards upon both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. Has the Government thought of this question at all? I fear not, Sir. I have it from a gentleman in my own city, who would like to take some steps towards the building of sailing vessels with auxiliary engines, that he is met at the very outset with a very heavy handicap. Many sailing vessels which are built in the United States to-day and which are engaged in the Atlantic trade use sails, but they also use the Deisel oil engine as auxiliary power, and they have to pay a duty of something like 35 or 40 per cent on the Deisel oil engine. These engines are not manufactured in Canada, and the man who wants to engage in shipbuilding in this country must pay a duty, as I say, amounting to 35 or 40 per cent before he can bring in the necessary equipment to enable him to build a vessel which would successfully navigate the ocean. These sailing vessels could be built for a comparatively small sum of money compared with the cost of steel ships. Allow me, with the very best of feeling, to suggest to the Government that they take up this question, give attention to it, and see if they cannot do something to encourage and promote the establishment of shipyards in Canada.

I might go on and speak of many other things which this Government might do, and I beg of them, if anything occurs to them, not to appoint a committee or a commission for the purpose of shelving the question, but to deal with these questions effectively; to submit them to Parliament, to invite discussion upon them. I assure the Government that, so far as the members on this side of the House are concerned—and I believe I can say the same for all the members of this House—any measures which they submit, looking towards the development of any industries in this country, looking toward giving employment to the people of this country and to the additional thousands whom we hope to have before long, will be heartily supported. Proposals on a broad and comprehensive scale will be heartily supported by all the members of this House, and I feel sure by all the people of this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): The resolution as proposed originally by the hon. member for Rouville was limited, but there was this to say in favour of it, that it was practical. The hon. member for Rouville evidently had in mind specifically the matters of immigration and labour

Accordingly, he ended his resolution with emphasis upon the urgent need for a system of national labour bureaus. At the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Public Works, however, the latter part of the resolution has been eliminated, and we are left with a pure abstraction. In order to make the resolution completely idealistic, I suggest that it be further amended to read as follows:

That this House recognizes the necessity for immediate national action to cope with new and complex conditions arising during and after the war.

I insert after the word, "arising" the words, "during and," so that we shall have reference within the resolution to all the present and future ills which may happen to this country in consequence of the war.

The hon. member for Rouville based his argument this afternoon—I must say I did not follow him throughout the length of his remarks—upon a great immigration into this country after the war. If he or the Minister of Public Works wishes this House to understand that the new and complex conditions which will arise after the war will be entirely referable to an unusually large immigration, I feel that the resolution is of very little value. I rise chiefly to express in a word or two my views upon the subject of immigration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My motion has reference not only to immigration after the war, but also to returned soldiers, and to the fact that dislocation will take place in the existing war industries that will throw out of employment a very large number of workers.

Mr. MACLEAN: I quite understood the hon. gentleman to discuss the particular which he has just mentioned; nevertheless I heard him distinctly say on more than one occasion during the course of his remarks that we should undoubtedly have a very large immigration into this country after the war. Now, I say it is very important that we have some definite and intelligent view upon the question as to whether or not we shall have a large immigration after the war. If we do not have immigration, then the new and complex conditions which the resolution states will arise after the war will be of one kind; if we do have immigration, perhaps we may have another set of complex conditions to deal with. The statement has been made frequently by hon. gentlemen in this House during the present session, as well as by many citizens of this country outside of Parliament, and by many of the newspapers of Canada, that we shall undoubtedly have a very large immigration after the war. As I have already remarked, it is important that we know, so far as it is possible to know, what is the future of this country in respect to immigration after the war. I have never yet heard any hon. gentleman in the House or any person outside of the House, give any reasons to justify the opinion that after the war there will be any substantial immigration, or even a moderate amount of immigration, into Canada. It is quite possible—I think it is quite probable—that for a number of years after the war we shall have practically no immigration into this country. I trust that I am in error—I am not so entirely pessimistic as to be beyond conviction—but I do say that those who argue that we are going to have a large amount of immigration into Canada after the war ends should give some reason for the opinion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I submit that every condition rather points to the conclusion that immigration into Canada will be very very small indeed for many years after the conclusion of the war. It is not improbable —this is the view held by many men in the United States—that in that part of the North American continent there will be not immigration, but emigration. I say that the matter of future immigration is a fair matter for inquiry on the part of the Government. It is possible, I think, to obtain by investigation some facts which will indicate as to whether the European countries will permit emigration after the war and whether we are likely to obtain any of it if it comes to this side of the Atlantic. It is useless to predicate public policy upon the probability of a large immigration into Canada after the war unless that probability is prima facie established. It would be a misdirection of public energy, and, possibly, a misuse of public money, to attempt to provide any remedy for abuses coming from a very large immigration before determining whether we are going to have that immigration or not.

The resolution now—I understand that the Minister of Public Works agrees to my amendment—is sufficiently wide to enable one to discuss almost any matter, and there

are just one or two subjects to which I wish to refer very briefly. One has reference to industrial conditions in portions of Nova Scotia. I have in my mind the county of Cape Breton, wherein are located the collieries of the Dominion Coal Company and the plant of the Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation. There has been a very creditable and generous enlistment for overseas service on the part of the employees of these two corporations. The enlistments have been so very heavy that during the past few months, and perhaps at the present time, the operations of these corporations have been very much endangered. The same conditions may prevail in other Canadian industrial centres; they may be applicable to some particular industry in another portion of the country. Notwithstanding the existence of war, this country must pay special attention to production. In order to pay the interest upon our indebtedness, it is necessary to export at least $150,000,000 worth of products a year, and in order to carry on the life of this young nation it is urgent and imperative that the productions of the country be kept to the highest possible level. Just here I wish to say that recruiting should be more directly under the control of the Government than it is. I do not suggest that some responsibility should not rest upon the citizens of the country, but I think that recruiting should be controlled to some extent by the Government, particularly in order that enlistment may be discouraged at certain points if the national interest so demands, or controlled in such manner that labour may be transferred from one point to another in the event of recruiting weakening the industrial strength of the country at one or more particular points. This is a matter which, I imagine, may become very acute in many sections of the country; therefore it is a question deserving the immediate consideration of the Government. The Minister of Labour this afternoon referred to the Hospitals Commission, and the hon. member for Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) also made a passing reference to it. I am told by those having experience with the duties assigned to this Hospitals Commission, which is working in conjunction with the Commissions appointed by the Provincial Governments, that the work is not being satisfactorily performed. In my judgment that was likely to be the natural result of control by a Federal commission, particularly a commission of the character appointed by the Government. The personnel of that commission consists of very estimable and capable citizens of this country—among the very best people in the country I should think; but they reside in different cities and far apart, and I say it is impossible for this Hospitals Commission properly to do the work assigned to it, and it should be immediately dissolved. As the hon. member for Regina has already stated, the work up to date has in reality been performed by the commissioners appointed by the Provincial Governments, that is, so far as obtaining employment for the men who have returned from overseas is concerned, and I think that is the only practical work that could have been done by any person. Whether that does or does not include all the work that has been done by the commission, or could be done by the commission, I say that a commission like this, composed of men who reside a considerable distance apart, is not likely to be very successful. I would suggest that there be established under some one of the present departments of the Government, the Department of Militia, or of Labour, a bureau having control of the work which this Hospital Commission is supposed to perform. It would then be possible for the organization in the several provinces to get quickly in communication with the administrative head in Ottawa and have prompt action taken—something which I submit is utterly impossible in the present circumstances. I say—and I am not making this criticism in any censorious spirit, or suggesting that the Government made a grave error of judgment in appointing this commission—but I say that a little experience has proved that the Hospitals Commission as now constituted is utterly impracticable and incapable of doing the work, and it ought therefore to be dissolved.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): I just wish to say a few words on the matter from my point of view. The resolution suggests, and the members who have already spoken on it have also suggested, that now is the time to take into consideration the condition that will exist after the war. I think the resolution has been amended to read "conditions that will arise during and after the war." There is one condition that is certainly going to exist after the war, and that is an enormous public debt, and enormous public taxation, and it would, perhaps, be well to consider whether the country is getting value for the

expenditures it is making, particularly in the Militia Department. We know that in the early days of the war the expenditure was very large, and under the circumstances it probably could not be controlled; but now that conditions are becoming more settled it is a question whether the country is getting full value for the exceedingly large expenditure that is being made. I think all will admit that the Minister of Militia and Defence is not a man who values expenditure. While he may have, and doubtless has, many qualities that fit him for the position he occupies, economy is not one of the hon. gentleman's characteristics. In the system of recruiting throughout the country, for instance, there appears to be no well-defined principle. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has referred to that to some extent, and I want to mention a few things that have come under my own notice. In the city of Ottawa I see in khaki very old men, some of them seventy years of age I should think. I do not know what military duties they could perform, nor do I know whether they are drawing pay or not, but I have seen these men on the street, in the hotels, and in the House. Furthermore—I do not wish to be too particular—I have noticed several members of Parliament dressed in khaki; for instance, the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), the philosopher, I might call him. I presume he would be able to give good military service. Now, whether these men are drawing double pay or not I do not know, but I say that this is a time for economy, a time when men should not try to make their patriotism pay.

We are asked to consider the condition of the labouring men of this country. We are asked to consider the case of the soldiers who are returning, and who will return in greater numbers after the war is over. But we should also consider the position of the tax payer, who, after all, makes up four-fifths of the population. We know that he will have to bear exceedingly heavy burdens, and we also know as a matter of fact that this war is producing millionaires in Canada. It is producing men who have not only military titles, but titles of distinction, such as knighthoods, which involves a high scale of living. All this is going on at the present time, and it is a serious question whether greater economy could not be practised, greater value received for the money that is being voted so generously by the people of this country for the conduct of the war. That is a question that might receive consideration now. It is a question that could be considered at any time. It concerns the ordinary taxpayer—the farmer, the fisherman, the miner, the mechanic—the man who is trying to support his family, and who, after all, pays the bulk of the taxes. He has to carry the burdens whatever they be, and the burdens will be heavy, and this country will not again for many years, perhaps forever, be a cheap country to live in. These are conditions that might very well be considered now in order to ensure, as my hon. friend from West Peterborough said, that every man shall give value or an equivalent for that which he receives. We know that this has not been done for the past year and a half; that value has been received for which an equivilent has not been given. As I already stated, perhaps that could not very well be avoided in the beginning of the great crisis through which we are passing, but it can to a large extent be prevented now provided that the Government tries seriously to prevent it. I thought perhaps I would be justified in presenting this view of the case, because it is of importance and consequence to the class of the community which I represent, that is, the ordinary people, farmers, fishermen, mechanics and men of that class, who have to bear their full share of the burdens that are necessarily being imposed.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, having listened to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes), I share the hope which he has expressed, as I understand him, that this country will not become a cheaper country than it is just now, because if ever I heard anything which, to my mind, is a cheap statement to a deliberative assembly, I heard it a few minutes ago when this hon. gentleman presumed to sneer at the members of this House who wear the uniform of His Majesty. I too, Sir, represent a large population of all classes, of the labouring class, of the farming class, of the artisan class, just as good people, I am sure, as those represented in this House by the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) and who, I feel certain, does not represent his constituents in the sentiments he has uttered here. I will answer the question which he has asked in so sneering a way, as to why some of us are wearing the King's uniform in this House. I can answer it from my own standpoint;

I can tell him that I am wearing the King's uniform, because I heard the call to duty sent out by my King. I read the appeal of the King to the manhood of Canada, and to the manhood of the Empire, to come forward and do their share, and although it is thirty-seven years since I first put on the King's uniform and thirty-one years since I was privileged before to give field service to the King, I felt that I could, without any offence, and least of all without offering offence to the House of Commons, offer my services again to His Majesty. I have the uniform on because I desire to give an example to the younger men of my community, and as evidence that those to whom they look as their natural leaders are prepared to do their part.

I feel sure, Sir, that there is no service which any member of Parliament can give that will be of more value to the military authorities than that he himself should put on the uniform, thus to show to the people of his district, who are invited by this Parliament as well as by the Imperial Parliament, and by the King, to give military service, that their natural leaders, whom they honour with public positions, do not shirk their duty, but are prepared, when the call comes, to put on the King's uniform and render service in the field as well as service in the Parliament of Canada.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Tuesday, February 8, 1916.

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

EXTENSION OF THE TERM OF PARLIAMENT.

ADDRESS TO THE KING.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, in the following words:

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:
Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that you may graciously be pleased to give your consent to submit a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to amend the British North America Act, 1867, in the manner following, or to the following effect:

"An Act to amend the British North America Act, 1867.

"Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

"1. Notwithstanding anything in the British North America Act, 1867, or in any Act amending the same, or in any Order in Council, or terms or conditions of union, made or approved under the said Act, or under any Act of the Canadian Parliament, the term of the Twelfth Parliament of Canada is hereby extended until the seventh day of October, 1917.

"2. This Act may be cited as the British North America Act, 1916, and the British North America Act, 1867 to 1915, and this Act may be cited together as the British North America Act, 1867 to 1916."

All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration.

[Mr. Taylor.]

He said: The motion which I am proposing to the House is obviously of a very unusual and important character, and can only be justly based on the extraordinary events through which the Empire is passing at this time. We believe it to be the duty of the Government to bring it before Parliament, and it is, of course, for Parliament to determine after full consideration what may be the path of wisdom and of safety. It is hardly necessary to say that it is a motion which we should not press if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House should oppose it as a party. In that case I should feel it to be my duty to withdraw the motion, and then it would naturally be for the Government to consider its course.

With these preliminary remarks I may observe that since 1867, it has been the usual course in this country to hold elections after the fourth session of any Parliament. That, I think, is a rule which has been departed from on perhaps not more than two occasions. After the redistribution which was effected in 1914, it might even have been thought proper that a new mandate should be immediately asked from the electorate of this country in the autumn of that year. In that connection it is appropriate to call attention to another consideration. On the outbreak of war, the Government of Canada pledged the assistance of the Dominion to the Empire, and when the subject of war was brought before Parliament in the August session of 1914, the Government presented proposals regarding assistance to the Empire in the war upon a larger scale than had ever before been proposed or undertaken. It might

have been urged by persons who are specially influenced by constitutional usage that a mandate from the electorate should have been then sought for that reason. However, the Government considered that public opinion was practically unanimous in supporting the course which the Government proposed. So far as Parliament was concerned no question was raised as to the propriety and wisdom of the course which had been marked out by the Government at that time. During that session my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated expressly on the floor of the House that he supported the Government in the action which had been proposed. On August 19, 1914, he set forth the position of himself and his friends in these words:

> This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed, to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the Mother Country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her. Speaking for those who sit around me, speaking for the wide constituencies which we represent in this House, I hasten to say that to all these measures we are prepared to give immediate assent. If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done or should be differently done, we raise no question, we take no exception, we offer no criticism, and we shall offer no criticism so long as there is danger at the front.

So, with the feeling that public opinion in the country approved the course which the Government had proposed, and with this assurance from my right hon. friend, speaking for himself and for those who sit behind him on the other side of the House, we determined that no election was necessary during the autumn of 1914, and accordingly, no election was held.

I shall return to such considerations at a later stage; but at the moment I desire to give to the House and to the country such information as is in my possession, that is, such portion of it as may properly be made public, respecting the probable duration of the war. I sought information on that subject before my visit to England during the past summer. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when Lord Kitchener took office as Secretary of State for War, in the Government of the United Kingdom, he declared that he would consent to serve for three years, and he added something to this effect, that if the war should continue beyond that period, he might find it desirable to transfer to other hands the duties which had devolved upon him in that most important position.

During my visit to England last summer I had more than one purpose in view. I had the purpose of any necessary discussion with the British Government which might assist the co-operation of Canada with the rest of the Empire in this war. I had also the purpose of discovering to what extent the necessary preparation for carrying on the war had been made in the United Kingdom, and at what date that preparation would probably be complete, so as to enable the whole force of the Empire to be thrown into the war. And lastly, I had the purpose of obtaining such information as might be forthcoming from the highest authorities as to the probable duration of the war. As to the other matters, I have already spoken in this House. As to the probable duration of the war, it is already realized in this country, as in Great Britain and throughout the Empire, that the task which confronted us in August, 1914, has proved to be much more formidable than we at that time imagined, or than was imagined at that time by the authorities, both military and civil, of the United Kingdom. Having regard to the enormous preparation for this war, which had evidently been made by those who are opposed to us in this struggle, the only wonder is that the allied forces were not absolutely overwhelmed in the first three months or six months of the war. I believe that when that effort of Germany and Austro-Hungary failed, they lost their only chance of victory. I do not intend to imply the least doubt in what I am saying as to what the eventual outcome of this war will be. I have no doubt whatever that the attack which Germany and Austria-Hungary combined to make upon the civilization of the world will absolutely fail in the end. But, I believe that the war will last for a very considerable period in the future. No man can, with any certainty, predict the date of its conclusion, but I believe we can with some certainty reach a reasonable judgment as to the period during which it will certainly last. From all the information in my possession, and from all that I could derive when I was in England during the past summer, I do not believe that we are more than half way through this war at present. It is altogether likely that it will last not only during the year upon which we have entered but during a considerable

part, at least, and perhaps the whole of the year which will succeed it. I say that because I am absolutely convinced that we are not yet prepared to throw the whole weight of the strength of this Empire into the struggle; and I believe that I am not trenching too far upon the confidence which was reposed in me on the other side of the Atlantic, and that I am not going too far, in saying that the Empire will not be able to throw the whole of its strength into this conflict until nearly, if not quite, two years shall have elapsed from the date at which the war commenced.

Coming back from Great Britain, impressed with that conviction, I sought an opportunity of conferring with my right hon. friend on the other side of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as soon as was possible after an illness from which he at that time was unfortunately suffering. I had a conference with my right hon. friend on the 14th October and, later, on the 2nd November. Certain correspondence took place between us with which, as we agreed, neither he nor I need trouble the House or the country at the present time. Generally speaking, the discussion which took place between my right hon. friend and myself was along these lines; as to the advisability of an extension for one year after peace, or for one year absolutely; the avoidance of any general election during the war; the proposal that by-elections should not be contested in the meantime and that each party should retain the seats it now holds, or had held previously to the vacancy; the suspension of party warfare during a war which obviously threatens the existence of the Empire; and, lastly, the restriction of legislation to matters arising out of the war, or occasioned thereby, or directly connected therewith, except possibly minor matters or matters of urgent need and unavoidable necessity as to which I would desire to consult with my right hon. friend.

Our proposal, as embodied in the resolution which I am presenting to the House would extend the term of Parliament for one year. The writs for the general election in 1911 were returnable on the 7th day of October, and an extension for one year would involve the extension of the Parliamentary term to the 7th day of October, 1917. By the terms of the British North America Act, section 50, which is familiar to hon. gentlemen and which I need not quote, the life of the present Parliament is confined to five years from the date of the return of the writs.

As to the precedents for the course which we propose on this occasion, there are only two as far as I am aware, one a precedent of nearly two hundred years ago and the other a precedent recently established in the British Parliament. The most striking precedent is that of the Septennial Act of 1716. By a British Act passed in 1694 the duration of Parliament was limited to three years. The situation which confronted the British Government and the British people in 1716 was that without some amendment of the Act a general election could not be deferred beyond 1717. The United Kingdom was in a certain state of unrest at that time. There had been a good deal of activity amongst those who were opposed to the Hanoverian succession. The Jacobites had made themselves pretty active, they were known to be pretty numerous and eventually a measure was proposed to Parliament by the ministry of the day which involved the extension of the parliamentary term from three years to seven years. A striking part of that proposal was that it extended not only to the Parliaments which should be summoned in the future but to the Parliament which was then sitting. Thus the terms of that measure applied it not only to future Parliaments but to the then sitting Parliament whose life, at the time at which it had been summoned, was limited to a period of three years. The passage of that measure has been attacked by some constitutional writers and has been justified by others. The justification by those who support it is put upon the ground that the measure was passed for the public security and for the tranquillity of the state. These are the grounds advanced by Mr. Dicey, who is a well known authority upon the British constitution. The measure was accepted by Parliament, and by the country; and the Parliament which had been summoned in 1714 to sit for a period of three years had its life extended from three years to seven years by the passage of that Act.

The only other precedent is that recently afforded in legislation recently passed by the British Parliament. Apparently, the

first proposal of the British Government was for a much longer extension of time than that eventually adopted. In fact, when the measure was brought down in the British House of Commons in the first instance it provided for an extension of one year. That was afterwards reduced to a period of eight months, upon the theory suggested by one of the members of the House that the extension should be for one parliamentary session only, the idea being that at the next session any further extension, the necessity for which was fully acknowledged during the debate, should be dealt with. The measure as passed by the British House provides for an extension of eight months. Here, we are asking for an extension of one year. Hon. gentlemen in this House will bear in mind that an extension of one year would give us only one additional session—exactly what the measure passed in Great Britain effects—unless it should become necessary for any reason not now foreseen to hold an emergency session of our Parliament between now and next January.

It must also be borne in mind that after the completion of this war 150,000 or perhaps 200,000 or 300,000 Canadian troops must be brought back from Belgium, France, and Great Britain and transported to and settled in their various homes in the northern half of this continent. It is unquestionable that such a task, a very great one in itself, will occupy no inconsiderable time. Therefore we are proposing to Parliament, as a not unreasonable measure, that if there is to be an extension at all it should be for a period of one year. It may eventually become necessary here, as in Great Britain, that a further extension should be made if an election during the war is to be avoided.

A further consideration in that regard which should be borne in mind by the House and the country is the inevitable delay in securing an extension of our parliamentary term, which, under our constitution, can only be accomplished by legislation of the Imperial Parliament. The situation which confronts this Parliament is one which is inevitable under the federal institutions by which the various provinces of Canada are united for federal affairs. Any province of Canada can amend its constitution and extend its parliamentary term by a measure enacted by its own legislature, and without any resort to the Imperial Parliament. The reason for that is that is the express provision in the British North America Act that any provincial legislature may amend its constitution in any respect, except one or two. One exception that occurs to me is with respect to the office of Lieutenant Governor. That cannot be affected by any legislation of the province.

But we have to depend upon legislation of the Imperial Parliament, and it is with that in view that I have proposed the resolution to the House in the terms which appear on the Order Paper. I entirely admit that no extension should be asked for by a Government in Canada, or should be approved, unless it appears to have the support of public opinion, and unless it is approved by both political parties. As to public opinion I have sought to make myself acquainted through the press, and particularly through the press which supports my hon. friends on the other side of the House, with the condition of public opinion in this country respecting a proposal such as this, and I trust the House will pardon me if I read a number of extracts from important journals, all of which I think are supporting hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The first to which I call attention is an article which appeared in the Montreal Herald of December 14, 1914:

> It is characteristic of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that in his address at the Montreal Reform Club on Saturday evening he refused to contemplate the possibility of a Dominion Election just now. The soul of honour himself, he finds it impossible to believe that any Cabinet minister could be so base as to urge an election at a time like this, when men of both parties are standing shoulder to shoulder performing those great duties, that to-day fall to the lot of the people of Canada.

The Free Press, Ottawa, May 11, 1915:

> Sir Robert Borden still has an opportunity to win the esteem of the people of this country, both Conservative and Liberal, by a definite and emphatic announcement that, as Prime Minister, he is opposed to the holding of a general election until the close of the war, and that at the next session he will introduce enabling legislation extending the life of Parliament.

The Bulletin, Edmonton, February 11, 1915:

> An Ottawa despatch cites the possibility that the Canadian Parliament may follow the example of the British Parliament and extend its term so as to avoid a general election until after the war. Undoubtedly that ought to be done.

The Chronicle, Halifax, April 12, 1915:

> We need not pause to remark that election day should not come until the war is over. Every decent-minded Canadian, regardless of party, knows and admits that.

The Recorder, Brockville, April 21, 1915:

Let the election be held at the close of the war, but do not let Canada make herself ridiculous in the eyes of the world by holding an election while the Empire of which she forms a part, is taking part in the most tremendous conflict in the history of the world.

The Herald, Montreal, April 22, 1915.:

The problems arising out of Canada's participation in the war are enough to keep our ministers absorbed in work. Both the country and the Empire have a right to expect their undivided attention to the duties to which they have been elected and to the trust conferred upon them, since the war began, by the united action of the two great political parties. If they prove recreant to that trust—if they say that the business of Canada and of the Empire can go hang while they neglect their duties and stump the country stirring up political strife and hatred—then they deserve the fate that would fall to a soldier who failed his country in the hour of need.

The Globe, Toronto, October 23, 1915:

The Globe has no warrant to speak for the Liberal party but it has every reason to believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is unalterably opposed to unlocking the door of office with a bloody key, as he himself put it some time ago. The rank and file of the Liberal party are as strongly opposed to a war-time election as the leader.

The Star, Toronto, September 9, 1915:

There ought to be no election during the war. There ought to be no talk about the next election. There is no need for any such talk now.

At present all we need to say is: "No election now. No party politics now. No election durthe war. No party politics during the war."

The Star, Toronto, September 13, 1915:

We do not want a partisan election during the war. We want to see unity, not conflict, in Canada. We want to see the energies and capacities of our public men working together, not one against the other. We want no election now. We want no election during the war.

Manitoba Free Press, September 18, 1915:

If, as is highly probable, the two political parties at Ottawa come to an agreement by which the life of the present Dominion Parliament will be extended for a period covering the balance of the war, it will be followed by a condition of political stability which has been sadly lacking during the past twelve months. There has been in reality no political truce in Canada since the outbreak of the war. At best we have had a condition of armed neutrality, breaking out from time to time in open war.

Toronto Globe, November 27, 1915:

No portion of the address of President A. J. Young was more warmly received than that in which he said: "Parliament has still a year of its legal life to live, and before then we hope the war will be over; but if by unhappy chance it still continues, authority can be obtained to prolong its life from year to year, one year at a time, until the close of the struggle. The thoughts of an election are particularly distasteful in these dark hours. With financial burdens piling up, our sons fighting and dying in France and Belgium, recruiting calls from one country to the other for more men to feed the insatiable monster, with fathers, mothers and wives sacrificing their time and treasure, and giving their loved ones at their country's call, this is a time to forget party and think only of the great object to be obtained—victory.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Manitoba Free Press, December 6, 1915:

That an arrangement will be made at the coming session of Parliament to extend the life of Parliament may be regarded as a political certainty. With the country looking on, in no mood to tolerate partisan manœuvrings, neither political party will dare to be stubborn or selfish in its attitude. It has been reported that the Opposition may, as a condition of their consent, attempt to secure a measure of control over the legislation to be enacted during the added lease of life—that is to say, they will ask for certain guarantees. The wisdom of any such course is very problematical. If Parliament continues in existence beyond next October, the Borden Government's relationship towards Parliament should remain what it is. It should have power to pass such legislation and do such things as please it—subject always to its ultimate responsibility to the people. The Liberals can secure control, wholly or in part, only by an election, which would not be desirable; or by a coalition, which is not practicable. The Liberal parliamentary party will be well advised to leave the Borden Government in complete control of the national affairs and with a full measure of responsibility for its legislative and executive acts.

The Daily Star, Toronto, January 12, 1916:

If the House of Commons unites in a request for the extension of the life of Parliament for one year on account of the war, the Senate should naturally be influenced by the same patriotic considerations as have weight with the Commons. But aside from that, what concern has the Senate with election? It is not an elected House and should keep its hands off such matters.

The Globe, Toronto, January 15, 1916:

The Parliament of Canada is not the place, and the present session is not the time, for the played out games of party politics.

The Globe, Toronto, January 18, 1916:

The Globe hopes that Sir Robert Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be able to curb the impatience of those of their followers who would turn the thoughts of the Canadian people from the all-important problems of national defence to party strife at the polls. Canadians of all parties and of no party must unite to vanquish the common enemy instead of engaging in faction fights. Let it be said truly of this people as of the Romans in their times of crisis: "Then none were for a party; then all were for the State."

If Sir Robert Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and their respective followers unite in asking the Imperial Parliament for an extension based upon "patriotism first," the Canadian people will be found behind them with hearty and undivided support. This is no time for

paralysing the national effort against a ruthless foe through the continuation of partisan feud. Above all parties is the nation.

The Globe, Toronto, February 1, 1916:

To avert a war election by prolonging the life of the present Parliament is obviously the duty of all members, irrespective of party interests, leanings, or affiliations. A general election would be a most unfortunate disturbance at a time when the entire strength of the Dominion must be concentrated against a powerful enemy.

During the past year a number of telegrams were sent out by an enterprising journal in the province of Ontario to mayors of cities and towns, reeves of municipalities and other persons occupying representative positions. About two hundred replies were received, and although, of course, it would be altogether unwise for me to attempt to inflict any large number of them upon the House, I will read a few of the replies, of which the vast majority, I think about 95 per cent, are of the same tenor. One mayor telegraphs as follows:

It would be a grave mistake to hold federal elections during the progress of war. Let Canada stand as one man till our Empire has won the victory.

Another mayor telegraphs as follows:

Would be a national crime to hold elections during war.

Another mayor says:

No election nor time for election during war time.

Another says:

This is too serious and critical a time to have united Canada divided by party strife.

Still another says:

To hold an election during progress of the war would be nothing short of a crime.

From the public utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite during the parliamentary recess, I have gathered that the views which are expressed in the journals from which I have quoted and in the messages from the mayors which I have just read, are held also by a number of them. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking at a federation of Liberal clubs in Toronto on the 21st of May, 1915, is reported to have used this language:

I speak honestly that which I believe is in the interests of the country when I say there should be, there ought to be, a change of Government or a different policy pursued, but I do not care, for my part, so long as the war lasts, to open the portals of office with that bloody key.

But I have this to say to the Prime Minister and his colleagues: I do not care for an election. Let the Prime Minister and his colleagues say that there shall be no election as long as the war shall go on, and I will pledge myself and the party that we shall stop all preparations and think of nothing but the war.

My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), in an interview to the Manitoba Free Press, is reported, in an issue of that journal of the 15th of September last, as having said:

The present circumstances are so grave from the standpoint of Canada and the Empire that it would be deplorable, in my opinion, to have the people divided upon party questions.

Another of the reasons why I favour putting off an election until after the war is because I think it would be a great pity to hold one just when the energies of all the people of Canada, and especially the members of the Government who are primarily charged with the duty of attending to the recruiting and equipment of the soldiers should be devoted to this one end.

I am particularly appreciative of the view which my hon. friend from the city of St. John has expressed with regard to the arduous nature of the responsibilities which devolve upon the Government at a time like this. His long experience in official life would enable him to understand, perhaps as well as any man in Canada, the magnitude of the task which has devolved upon many members of the Government during the past eighteen months, and the necessity that their time should be given unremittingly and unflaggingly to the duties which press upon them not only from day to day but from hour to hour. I may say that in the early months of the war I believed that the great stress and strain upon the Government, particularly upon myself as the head of the Government, would relax from time to time as the war went on, but I declare to my fellow members of this Parliament that the responsibilities and duties and labours cast upon the members of the Government during the month of June last, immediately before my departure to England, were as great as they were during any of the earlier months of the war; and the same condition of affairs still continues from day to day. It is manifestly impossible that the members of the Government, charged with responsibilities such as those to which I have alluded, could adequately fulfil their duty to the country at a time like this in the midst of a general election.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), in an interview reported in the Toronto Star, said this:

An election, while the struggle is raging for liberty and humanity, would be a crime. An election during the war would divide the Do-

minion. There should be no election during the war.

Now, I have expressed as well as I can to my fellow members of the House the reasons and considerations which have led the Government to propose this resolution. It is proper to say that the proposed extension of the parliamentary term incidentally involves the postponement of the date at which the Government shall render an account of its stewardship to the people. There are those who may regard that circumstance as exercising an influence upon the Government in the action which we propose. On the other hand, there are, doubtless, some who may consider that the political fortunes of the party in power may be unfavourably affected by the proposed postponement. I do not dwell for a moment upon any of these considerations; I do not pause even to take them into account. The struggle in which our Empire is engaged is of so tremendous a nature, the issues and consequences which it involves are so far-reaching and momentous, and the sacrifices which it entails are so enormous, that all considerations as to the fortunes of any political party, here or elsewhere, dwindle into absolute insignificance.

Lest, however, there should be any misunderstanding as to the position of the Government, let me say this. We do not come before Parliament in any sense as suppliants. The Government is quite prepared and willing to submit its record to the judgment of the people, whenever that course becomes necessary or desirable in the public interest. We are thoroughly conscious of the tremendous responsibilities imposed upon us during the past eighteen months. We are equally conscious that we have fulfilled those responsibilities to the best of our ability, and that we have unsparingly and unremittingly devoted ourselves to their fulfilment, without regard to any consideration but the conscientious performance of our duty. That mistakes may have been made, especially in the early weeks of the war, is more than probable, but I speak with a full sense of my responsibility when I say that in this Dominion as few mistakes have been made in the conduct of the war as in any part of the Empire. I hope that the House and the people will adequately realize the tremendous task which has been undertaken and carried out. Both military and civil authorities in Great Britain agreed that if the Empire should become involved in a European war, the maximum expeditionary force which could be sent overseas by the British Islands would be 160,000 men. It was the opinion of many that the force should be limited to 80,000 or 120,000. Canada has under arms nearly 250,000 men, and has already sent overseas forces numbering more than 125,000 men, all fully armed and equipped, except in the provision of artillery for the later divisions, as to which, by arrangement, we depend upon the British Government. The task of carrying out this tremendous effort by a department of the Government whose organization had not been prepared for one-twentieth part of the work, entailed efforts and labours which can hardly be realized or understood by those who have not taken part therein. Nor have these great labours devolved upon the Department of Militia and Defence alone. I would ask hon. gentlemen to bear in mind that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), during the past eighteen months, has had responsibilities and labours cast upon him which, I venture to say, have never been placed upon the shoulders of any other minister of finance since this confederation was founded in 1867, and those labours have been performed and those responsibilities fulfilled, in my judgment, with great ability. There may be differences of opinion between ourselves and hon. gentlemen on the other side as to the measures which have been taken, but as to the sincerity of my hon. friend's belief that the meaures which he took were in the best interests of the country, there can be no possible question, nor can there by any question as to the devotion and energy with which he addressed himself to the task that lay before him. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has also had unusual burdens and responsibilities placed upon him. He has had not only very difficult and intricate problems to handle in relation to transportation, but he has had also to take into account the great and varied problems which will arise after the conclusion of the war, and as to which, I know, his labours have been indefatigable. The Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Hazen) has also had very heavy duties to perform, as also has the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who has had charge of the internment operations involving great responsibilities and not a little labour and attention to detail. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) has had imposed upon him weekly, if not

daily, questions which have had to be taken up with the Government of the United Kingdom, concerning the prohibition of exports, and many other matters relating to his department. The good offices of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) and his department have been sought by the British Government with reference to the large orders placed by that Government in this country. There are other departments of government upon which great responsibilities exceeding those that are usual in times of peace have been placed during the past eighteen months.

The Government do not dread an appeal to the electorate, if it should prove necessary, but in common with the great majority of the Canadian people they feel it their duty to take every possible step and to use every legitimate means to prevent such a necessity during the continuance of the war.

One who has seen 150,000 Canadians under arms, the very flower of the country's youth, whether on the plains of Valcartier, or at Shorncliffe, or holding the trenches in Flanders, one who realizes to the full the uplifting spirit of unity and patriotism which has animated the Canadian people ever since the Empire sprang to arms, cannot but shrink from taking a course which would pour upon the glowing fire of united patriotic endeavour the waters of party strife and bitterness.

It is for this reason, and in this spirit, that the Government submits this proposal to the House for its consideration and approval, in the hope that the resolution will be accepted in the same spirit.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, when the Fathers of Confederation sought the sanction of the Imperial Parliament to the plan which they had devised for the union of the British provinces of this continent, they declared, in the very preamble of the Act, that the new Dominion should be endowed with a constitution similar in principle to the constitution of the United Kingdom. It is well to mark the words, Sir, because the intentions of those men, who had the moulding of Canada's destinies in their hands, was that the British constitution should be the pillar of fire by night and the pillar of cloud by day which should guide the young country to union and to nationhood. In the mass of rules and maxims, statutes and precedents, which make up the British constitution, there was one feature which particularly seemed to have attracted their attention, and that was that the maxim that the life of the elected branch of Parliament should not exceed limits rigidly fixed by law, and, as a corollary, that there should be at least one session of Parliament every year. These provisions of the British constitution had been evolved in the long struggle of the British people for constitutional government, and they were intended to put a check upon the power of the King and of Parliament. They were intended to subject the King to the control of Parliament and to subject Parliament to the final arbitrament of the people. The great and eminent men, wise and prudent also, who were then moulding the destinies of our own country, recognized the importance of these dispositions by making them fundamental features, permanent enactments of our constitution, and went so far as to place it beyond the power of this Parliament to repeal, to alter, or to ignore them. By section 50 of the Constitution they provided that:

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

By section 20 they provided also as follows:

> There shall be a session of the Parliament of Canada once at least in every year, so that twelve months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the Parliament in one session and its first sitting in the next session.

These two provisions are part of our constitutional law, and it is not in the power of this Parliament to ignore, to repeal, or to amend them.

The last elections took place in September, 1911; the writs were returned in the following October; therefore this Parliament must cease in the month of October next. The only authority by which these provisions may be altered is vested, not in this Parliament, but in the Imperial Parliament. Such is the law to-day.

Yet, in the face of this imperative disposition, there have been evidences as numerous almost as the days of the year that on the part of the Canadian people there is a growing disinclination to have an election during the war. The reason for that view seems to be this: in all things human, even the most excellent, the infirmity of our nature, is never completely absent. We prize our system of parliamentary government. We believe that the institutions

which we have obtained from Great Britain, if not absolutely perfect, are undoubtedly the best and wisest that ever were devised for the government of men; yet they betray the imperfection of our nature. Our own experience has proved that in every election there is some displacement of the public economy of the community; there is an unsettled state of business, more or less pronounced; there is violence to a greater or less degree in the clash of opinions and the clash of parties. And at a time when the energies of the nation should be bent towards one end, and one end only, the very thought that there might be an election, with all its concomitant strife and division, was alarming to a large section of the community. This feeling on the part of the public was aggravated, if not entirely caused, by the uncertainty that existed as to the intentions of the Government—an uncertainty for which I think they deserve some censure, because it was in their power to dispel it at once by a simple word frankly spoken. I say "uncertainty"; I should say rather "certainty," because for many months it seemed that the intention of the Government was to dissolve Parliament and to have an immediate election. I can not otherwise interpret the action of members of the Government.

4 p.m.

The reasons which the right hon. the Prime Minister now gives as to why there should not be an election were just as applicable in the month of April last as they are to-day; and everybody remembers that in the month of April last my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) spoke very emphatically on this subject. He said this:

> Is it, then, any wonder that the cry comes, from every individual that one meets and that understands the conditions, in tones louder than thunder, demanding that this Parliament be dissolved, that the rights and liberties of the people of this Dominion be granted to them under our form of democracy, and that that form of democracy be restored to them?

This language, coming from such an eminent member of the Cabinet as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works—who, I believe, is credited with having a large share in the framing of the policy of the Government—such language, used in the presence of his colleagues, must have meant, if it meant anything, that the minister had the authority of the Cabinet for so speaking. Otherwise, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister would have taken his colleague in hand and taught him his responsibility.

But that is not all. Some weeks afterwards the hon. Minister of Public Works went to the city of Montreal, where he is reported to have spoken after this fashion:

> Mr. Rogers said, in view of the action of the irresponsible majority in the Senate, the Government had decided to appeal to the people last September, but its plans were changed owing to the outbreak of war. If the Opposition had played a loyal part, and had assisted the Government in the emergency, there would have been no talk about an election at the present time.

In my judgment, these words meant only one thing: that the Government had resolved to try the fortune of a general election. But, whatever may have been the object of this attitude on the part of the Government, the response was not what had been anticipated. On the part of a large section of the community there was a sense of irritation that, at such a time, the Government should think of launching the country into the turmoil unavoidable from a premature appeal to the people. Therefore hon. gentlemen opposite changed their minds, and it was with no surprise that we heard from the speech of His Royal Highness the following declaration:

> The life of the present Parliament expires in the autumn of this year, and, under existing legislation, a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of the opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the present requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.
>
> That purpose can only be effected through the medium of legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. A resolution authorizing and requesting the enactment of such legislation as will extend the life of this Parliament for the period of one year will be presented to you.

In view of the expressions of public opinion to which my right hon. friend referred during the course of the remarks which he made this afternoon, it is possible that the proposal for an extension of the term of Parliament not for the period of the war, but simply for a period of twelve months, will occasion some disappointment. But, in my judgment, and, I believe, in the judgment of every one who values British institutions, a proposal for the extension of the term of Parliament for the duration of the war would be absolutely unacceptable, and if such a proposition as that should be brought before Parliament, I would deem it my duty to oppose it to the last. If this

course were taken, we should substitute for an evil which we wish to avoid an evil still more to be dreaded. Whatever we may do, we cannot deprive the people of the supreme command which they must have over their legislatures, the members of which they elect. We cannot deprive them of periodical elections. The period may be extended, or restricted, but, we cannot have an indefinite proposition such as would be involved in a general proposal to have the term of Parliament extended during the whole duration of the war. We do not know how long the war may last. We all hope that it will soon be over; certainly it will not be over so soon as we at first expected. But we have reason to believe that the words of Lord Kitchener, true and good soldier as he is, and knowing his business as well as any man, will come true and that the war will be over within three years, and that would be towards the end of 1917.

The proposal of the Government to which they ask our sanction in the resolution is that the term of Parliament should be extended for one year from the end of the present Parliament. When the speech from the Throne was delivered I deemed it my duty, though my own views were pretty well formed on the subject, to consult those who do me the honour of giving me their confidence in this House. At the conference which we had on this subject there was, as of course there must be in every party, differences of opinion. My right hon. friend quoted in his speech the views held by the Liberal press. One would assume from this that the views held by the Conservative press were the same, since he did not think it advisable to quote them to the House, but everybody knows that the Conservative press was not unanimous upon the subject, and that there were organs of Conservative opinion which were averse to any extension. The same division of opinion prevailed elsewhere. But whatever may have been the division of opinion amongst us, there was a general consensus of opinion—I think I may say so without betraying any secret—that the matter should be left to my own judgment. This was placing upon me a heavy responsibility, a responsibility which it is not my intention to shirk or to seek to avoid. I will endeavour to discharge it according to the dictates of my conscience, and certainly also with due regard for the rights of the people, as I understand their rights.

In the position which I occupy in this House, enjoying as I do the confidence of a large section of the Canadian Parliament, I am a servant of the state, a servant of the people; and to the state and the people I owe duties—duties which, while differing from those appertaining to the members of the House who occupy the treasury benches, are nevertheless equally binding upon me, and not inferior in responsibility. When war broke out I had a clear vision of the path I should follow, and from that path I have never deviated, though very often I encountered the taunts of foes, and sometimes the doubts of friends. Standing before me were facts which illuminated my course and pointed the way. There was first of all the fact that England did not engage in this war from any motive of ambition or from any desire for aggrandisement. England went into this war from a sense of the duty which she owed not so much to herself, as to Europe and to mankind at large. There is nothing so sure in history, nothing so much beyond controversy—that Sir Edward Grey, a statesman whose judgment, moderation, and lofty thought, already since the war began have been tried a hundred times, a hundred times found true, did everything it was possible for a man to do to preserve peace. He appealed again and again to the German through our embassador and chancellor with the view of inducing him to use his great authority in Europe to have peace maintained. He appealed to him in the name of all that was sacred on earth, but he found the German mind poisoned by the lust of power, by the hope of huge indemnities after the victory, and by the allurements of booty and glory, if, indeed, there be any glory in the modern methods of German warfare. He appealed in vain. Sir, there was a time, not so long ago, when Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, came back from Berlin bringing a treaty which he presented to England, and which England accepted as "peace with honour." When the German chancellor, speaking in the name of his nation, and of his Emperor, contemptuously stated that treaties were nothing but scraps of paper, to be respected so long as they suited the German purpose, but to be discarded as soon as they came in the way of German ambition, what was there for England to do? Nothing but to return to Berlin with victory and honour.

And what was Canada to do? Sir, I need not comment upon that. Many times upon the floor of this House I have expressed my views. There was no obligation, no compulsion. Canada was free, absolutely

free: free to go in, and free to stay out. But what use are we to make of our liberty? We knew that England was engaged in mortal combat with an enemy strong in preparation—even more prepared than we had supposed hitherto—an enemy animated by the black ambition of universal domination. Under such circumstances there was nothing for Canada to do but to do what she did; to place at the disposal of England all her resources in men and money. Men there are to-day who sneer at the thought of Canada exhausting her resources to defend the Empire. Sir, who talks of Empire to-day? There are other things greater even than the Empire, great as it is. Civilization is greater than the Empire, and civilization is the issue. Who can doubt, who can deny, in the face of the declarations and pretensions set up by German writers in their books, in face of the vain and childish declarations of their most renowned professors, of the brutally frank avowals of their military leaders; who can doubt but that if Germany were to win it would be the end of all we hold sacred. Who can doubt that it would be the end of that individual liberty, that personal dignity, that independence of thought and action which citizens of all British countries value more than life itself. For my my part, I re-echo the words lately spoken by that workman of the docks of Liverpool, who discussing compulsion in England put an end to all doubts, by exclaiming: "If Germany should win, nothing on God's earth would matter." I speak my whole soul and heart when I say that if Germany were to win I would be thankful that Providence should close my eyes before I saw the sun rising on such a day.

But, Sir, there is more. Need I repeat that I am a Canadian of French origin? It has always seemed to me that those in whose veins courses the blood of France, as it courses in my veins, should have been even more eager than their fellow-citizens of English origin to stand behind England in this contest. Why should I say so? We of French origin have always had pride in our race. We have always affirmed it, not obstreperously, but with dignity, and certainly there never was a time when we had greater cause to be proud of the land of our ancestors than in these days when France, tried in the crucible of adversity, is perhaps greater than she ever was in the days of her greatest triumphs. She astonishes the world with her courage and heroism, and she shows to the world not only all the virtues that we knew her to be possessed of, but virtues that we thought she lacked. These are some of the reasons which at all events influence me. It was a day of joy for us of French origin when England and France, who have done so much to bring civilization to the high plane it has reached, at last put an end to their quarrels, buried, and buried forever, their old enmities, and proclaimed to the world their never-ending friendship. That day, the last pang of bitterness passed away, and there arose new hopes and new aspirations to nobler and broader views.

But there came days of anxiety. As was well said the other day in a most admirable speech by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), on the 28th of July, 1914, when Germany declared war on France, there seemed to be hesitation on the part of England, and doubt as to whether or not the entente cordiale was anything but a broken reed. Anxiety there was as to what seemed to be hesitation. But there was no hesitation on the part of England. It must be remembered that Great Britain is a democratic country, and that in all democracies public opinion is the last supreme arbiter. There has been for the last sixty years in England a party of peace—a party of peace at any price—which was represented in the Cabinet, and before the Cabinet could declare war they had a ministerial crisis. Two important members of the Government, Lord Morley and John Burns, declined to serve and they resigned rather than participate in the policy adopted by the British Government. But, as was stated by my hon. friend from Kamouraska, the moment England declared war upon Germany, anxiety was replaced by enthusiasm, and from that day every Canadian of French origin, worthy of his origin, has stood behind England in the war.

But that is not all. When our troops crossed the seas what was their mission, what was their object, where were they to go? Their mission and their object was to go to France, to fight for France, nay, if need be, to die for France and,—I do not know whether I should say it in joy or sorrow—thousands of them, and more of British origin than of French origin, have given to France the last measure of their devotion, and have died for her.

Yet, that is not all. It is a fact well established by the testimony of history that there is no greater bond of union between men than danger met and supported in common. Men there are to-day in France,

men of French origin, and of English origin, all united in a common allegiance, standing shoulder to shoulder struggling to maintain the integrity of France and to preserve her from dismemberment and humiliation. I say without hesitation what I believe to be the true sentiment of all human hearts, that when these men divided as they are by race come back to Canada, when the war is over, they will be more united than when they left, and Canada will have the manifold blessings of that union.

These were the sentiments which animated me; this was the vision which I had of what was to come, when, at the special session of the Parliament of 1914, I took my seat. Then I declared what should be the policy which I and the friends who give me their confidence would follow in this emergency. I expressed my views in words which have been very often quoted; they were even cited to-day by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I need offer no excuse if I should quote them again in view of what I shall have to say afterwards. On that occasion I stated the policy which we intended to follow in these words:

> This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed, to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the Mother Country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her. Speaking for those who sit around me, speaking for the wide constituencies which we represent in this House, I hasten to say that to all these measures we are prepared to give immediate assent. If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done or should be differently done, we raise no question, we take no exception, we offer no criticism, and we shall offer no criticism so long as there is danger at the front.

These opinions which I then expressed have sometimes received a very singular interpretation. One interpretation of them which I have heard on the floor of this House this very session, would simply amount to making us mechanical automatons, mere clerks to register the decrees of the Government. I need not say that to such an interpretation we of the Opposition do not intend to pay any attention. We are here, the representatives of the people, we see very clearly the duties which we have to perform, and we are still an Opposition. My words were very plain, and I can repeat what I said then, exemplified by what has happened since, and by what we shall do again. All measures which have for their object the successful prosecution of the war we are prepared now, as in the past, to support; all measures, all actions, which in our judgment may be detrimental to the successful prosecution of the war, it will be our duty to oppose. As to all such things as have no improper character, as to all such things as might be differently done, though not done wrongfully, we shall raise no question. But, Sir, to all wrongs, to all frauds, we shall offer determined opposition—these can not be condoned, they must be exposed, and, when exposed, they must be treated accordingly. These are the views we have held in the past, and which we now hold, and I appeal to the testimony of both friend and foe whether we have not remained true to these views to the present day. We have objected to no measure of the Government except their fiscal policy, and we objected to the fiscal policy introduced by the Minister of Finance last year, because in our judgment it would impair our trade relations with England, injure the trade of England, and to that extent injure the successful conduct of the war.

I come to the measure which is before us, and which proposes to extend the term of this Parliament for twelve months. It must be remembered that this is a graver question for us in Canada than was the parliamentary extension measure for England. The extension that is now sought, as I must again remind the House, is not in our own power. We are seeking an amendment to the Constitution, which was provided by the Fathers of Confederation, and as to that we must be very careful. The Constitution is the Ark of the Covenant, enclosing the tables of the law, and no one can touch it except at his peril. For my part, in the words which were quoted by my right hon. friend a moment ago—and he might have quoted them again and again, for I have always spoken the same way on that subject—I would deprecate an election during the war. Still, were the war to be protracted unduly beyond what was contemplated, no one would suppose that the right of the Canadian people over this Parliament would be in abeyance for all that time. We have this to consider. It is a different thing to force an election when it can be avoided, and to face an election when the law compels it. Moreover, do not let us forget that there is dignity and grandeur in a people carrying on in

time of stress their laws and their constitution just as they would in time of peace. In olden times, during war, even Rome suspended its constitution, but to the credit of England be it said that in no circumstances has she ever actually suspended her constitution. My right hon. friend has cited the example of Great Britain twice in her history extending the term of Parliament, but that is not a stretching of the British constitution; it is quite within the powers of the British Parliament. During the Napoleonic Wars, and the French Revolution, which lasted with scarcely an interruption from 1793 to 1815, England went on as usual. Again, throughout the whole American Civil War, our sister republic, the daughter of Great Britain, maintained her laws and institutions just as in peace. But, great as were those wars, terrible as they were, they were as nothing compared with the present war. The present war is an exception to all things, and it is in that spirit of exception that I, for my part, am disposed to judge the resolution which has been proposed by my right hon. friend. It is in that spirit that I am disposed to offer no opposition to it.

I may say to my right hon. friend that among the reasons which he has given, there is one which does not particularly impress me, and that is, that before the term of Parliament which it is now proposed to extend is over, there may be some two hundred thousand or three hundred thousand of our soldiers still in Europe. These men would not be deprived of their votes in the event of an election, because the law that was passed last session provides for their being allowed to vote. There are other considerations, however, of greater moment, and which strongly appeal to me. I would observe, first of all, that it is not proposed here to alter the principle of the constitution. It is not proposed to override the control which the people have over Parliament. It is simply proposed to suspend for the time being the operation of the constitution. If it were proposed to make away altogether with that principle which is embodied in the constitution, certainly I would oppose such an attempt with all my might. But no such thing is proposed. This measure simply proposes that the constitution shall be suspended for twelve months, at the expiration of which time it will resume its full force.

There is another consideration. If we pass this resolution I take it as a pledge from the Government that we shall be delivered from the threat which was held over our heads last year, of an instantaneous and premature dissolution at any time the Government thought fit. If the Government asks us to extend the life of Parliament, I take it that there will be no election until the fall of 1917. We shall then know exactly where we are, and shall not be subject to all the uncertainties which have been hanging over us for the last twelve months.

Important, however, as these considerations are, they are not the one consideration which more than all appeals to me, and which has practically influenced my judgment. No one can have escaped the significance of the words of the Prime Minister when he said a moment ago that if the resolution was not adopted unanimously, he would think it his duty to withdraw it. I can conceive that. If this resolution was not adopted unanimously, even though carried by a majority of this House, and even if my right hon. friend himself were to carry it to the foot of the Throne, I have no doubt whatever that in the face of such a minority as would be arrayed against it, the British Parliament would never grant the power sought. The British Parliament, I am sure, will never, under any circumstances, alter the constitution of this country, except upon a unanimous resolution of the two branches of the Canadian Parliament. To say that, is paying no compliment to the British Parliament; it is only the spirit of the constitution; it is only the spirit which has always been displayed by Great Britain. To say that the British Parliament would oppose this measure unless presented to it with full unanimous support as I have mentioned is simply rendering bare justice to the Imperial Parliament, to the King, to the Lords, and to the Commons of Great Britain. But, Sir, if this Parliament not unanimously but by a majority pass this resolution and if in England they refuse then to pass it, or if the resolution is withdrawn from Parliament in the face of opposition from this side of the House, what would be the consequence? The consequence would be that we should at once have an election—an election during the war; and that election would take place not upon the broad questions of the war, not upon the great ideas which have been suggested by the war, not upon the conduct of the war by the Government, not upon the problems which are

facing us on account of the war, but upon the refusal of the Opposition in the Canadian Parliament to grant an extension of the term of Parliament. That would be a miserable incident to go to the country upon, and I say, therefore, that instead of having the country divided upon such an incident, better by far—not only for the greater reasons, but even for the narrowest reasons of all—that we should preserve the unanimity which we have had in this House up to the present time.

After all, what is it that is being sought of us. It is sought of us, not to do away with the control of the Canadian people over this Parliament, but simply to suspend for a short twelve months the verdict of the Canadian people upon the Administration, upon its policy, and upon the general questions arising out of the war. For all these reasons, Sir, in view of the responsibility which has been placed upon my shoulders by my hon. friends; in view of the rights of the people, and in view of what I think best for the country, after giving this question the best judgment that I could, I am not prepared to oppose the resolution, but will allow it to pass unanimously in this House. I am well aware that the question is an important one; but, important as it is, it pales before the great problems which are still before us; it pales before the magnitude of the duties which the Allies have still to discharge.

Let us for a moment consider the progress of the war. The campaign of 1914 went in the favour of the Allies. The battle of the River Marne shattered the plans which had been long prepared and premeditated by the German General Staff for an easy and a rapid victory, and the end of the year 1914 found the Kaiser and his staff piling up corpses by the hundreds of thousands in the marshes and swamps of Flanders, in a vain effort to reach Calais. On the eastern front the Russians had gone from victory to victory; they had taken possession of Galicia; they had reached the summit of the Carpathian mountains, and they were ready to invade Hungary. Such was the condition of affairs at the end of 1914. The campaign of 1915 was not as favourable to the Allies on the western front: notwithstanding most brilliant victories won by them, notwithstanding glorious feats of arms in which our Canadian troops won undying fame, the two armies remained practically in the same position without marked advantage either on one side or the other. On the eastern front the Russians fought at great odds. They were forced to abandon Galicia; they lost Poland; they suffered even an invasion of Russian territory; but at the end of the year they had checkmated the German forces and were prepared to take the offensive, and they have taken that offensive now. We are now at the beginning of the third campaign, and at this stage we may well appropriate to ourselves the invocation of the American poet:

> Our fathers' God! from out whose hand
> The centuries fall like grains of sand,
> We meet to-day, united, free,
> Loyal to our land and Thee,
> To thank Thee for the era done
> And trust Thee for the opening one.

In the words of the poet, we meet to-day, united, free. These words were inspired by a very different occasion: they were written on the occasion of the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876 to perpetuate the first century of the republic. An era was done: a new era was opening. The poet was not alone in his conception, and his hopes and his trust; the most enlightened opinions of the most enlightened countries, England, France and the United States, were full of faith that this era would be one of peace, and that it would see an approach, a permanent approach to that brotherhood of man, long sought, long hoped for and long prayed for, but never attained. These nations, the most enlightened on earth, were so absorbed by this idea and had such an abhorrence of war, that they would not even prepare against it, being full of confidence that the demons of war would never again be let loose on the world. But there was one power upon whom all appeals fell in vain, a power unreasoning in its mad ambition for conquest and domination. And the day came when it opened the gates and let loose its long prepared legions, and all the infernal furies rushed out in their wake. The issue is still pending and, so long as it is pending, so long as Belgium has not been restored to her independence, so long as France has not recovered her lost territory, so long as the enemy has not been thrown back beyond the Rhine within its own borders, for my part, and I speak again as I have spoken always—my supreme thought will be to give all the assistance in our power to Britain in the struggle which she has undertaken against the common enemy of mankind.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their honours that the House has passed an Address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, praying that he may graciously be pleased to give his consent to submitting a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend certain provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, in the manner therein set forth, and requesting that their honours will unite with this House in the said Address, by filling up the blank therein with the words "Senate and."

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY AND TERMINALS EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How much has been expended to date by the present Administration in dredging and lighting and other improvements in Port Nelson?
2. How much additional is estimated to comthe said dredging, lighting and harbour improvements?
3. How much has been expended by the present Administration in connection with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway to date?
4. What additional amount will be required to complete the work?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The following is in so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned:

1. $5,018,711.74 to January 1, 1916.
2. $5,000,000.
3. $9,957,340.69, railway only to January 1, 1916.
4. $5,500,000.

FRESH FISH FOR AMERICAN MARKET.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Has the Government considered the question of assisting the transportation of fresh fish from the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia to the American market?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Since the examination and discussion of this question that we had two years ago the Government have given no special attention to it, although, generally, it has been kept in mind.

ESTIMATED POPULATION OF CANADA.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What was the estimated population of Canada up to January 1, 1916?

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have followed the practice for a number of years of giving an estimate of the population based upon the results of the preceding decennial census and the immigration figures. This year, we have not attempted an estimate; because the immigration has fallen to a minimum and large numbers of our people have gone out of the country, as we all know, engaged in the war. This has rendered impossible an estimate upon the bases we used before. The quinquennial census in the Western Provinces will be taken this June, and after the results of this are known, it will be possible to make a pretty close estimate of the present population of Canada.

TRANSCONA RAILWAY SHOPS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. (a) Have the Transcona Railway Shops been leased to any individual or company? (b) If so, to whom?
2. If to a company, who are the directors of said company?
3. For what purpose were they leased?
4. What is the rate of rental?
5. What are the other terms of the lease?
6. What amount has been received by the Government on account of rental up to date?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. (a) That portion not required at present in connection with railway operation, being about one-twentieth of the floor space, comprising the frog shop, and the south bay of the freight car shop, at Transcona, in the province of Manitoba. (b) To the Transcona Shell Company, Limited.
2. The department has no information as to the directors, but the lease was executed by G. R. Drenon, president, and W. A. Petrie, secretary.
3. For the manufacture of shells.
4. The Company to pay $6,780 per annum and insurance premium on $113,000, and as rental for any of the machines which may be used, an annual sum estimated as 20 per cent of the cost of such machines. No machines are to be used without the approval of the general manager.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. $6,780.

THE HUDSON BAY ROUTE.

Mr. GRAHAM:

Does the Department of Railways and Canals intend making any reply to the report of Mr. Anderson, of the Department of Marine re the Hudson Bay Railway project?

Mr. COCHRANE: No reply is contemplated. Our Chief Engineer, Mr. W. A.

Bowden, in a memo. to the Minister of Railways and Canals, reports as follows:

Mr. Anderson has presumably reported upon conditions as he found them. His work as a hydrographic surveyor naturally took him into bays and inlets where conditions would be quite different from those obtaining on the main steamship lines.

Owing to this circumstance, Mr. Anderson's recently published report contains very little information, apart from the rectification of charts, having any bearing upon the navigation of the Hudson Bay route.

Thus in the beginning of the season it appears that Mr. Anderson's work took him into the neighbourhood of Cape Chidley and the Button islands and Port Burwell, on the south side of the eastern entrance. It is well known to all navigators of experience in these waters that in the early season the strait should be entered on the north side, which is usually clear of ice several weeks earlier than the Button island region. This was confirmed by the passage into the strait on August 4 of six vessels operated by the Department of Railways and Canals, five of which were of light construction without ice strengthening of any kind, on which day Mr. Anderson, in the ice breaker Acadia, was still ice-bound.

Mr. Anderson appears to have been equally unfortunate towards the close of the navigation season, when, on October 13, he encountered the "closely-packed extremely heavy Fox channel ice," which forced the ice breaker Acadia to heave to, and was, he states, such as would cause serious trouble to any ordinary freight steamer. The vessels operated by the Department of Railways and Canals were more fortunate.

The ss. Durley Chine, outward bound, was off the western entrance of the strait on the night of October 10. She cleared the eastern end on the morning of October 13. Steamship Bellaventure, inward bound, was off the eastern entrance of the strait on the evening of October 9; she cleared the western entrance shortly after noon on October 12. Steamships Sheba and Bellaventure, outward bound, arrived off the western entrance on the afternoon of October 22, and cleared the eastern end in the early afternoon of October 25.

The Durley Chine and the Sheba are single deck cargo vessels, without any beams or ice strengthening whatever, and they suffered no injury. The time of transit includes, of course, all delays from ice, gales, fog, and snowstorms referred to by Mr. Anderson, as well as running time, and proves that these delays were negligible.

It would seem that Mr. Anderson's report has been found susceptible of perversion by prejudiced readers, who, by abstracting isolated paragraphs, are enabled to draw inferences quite at variance with his deliberately prepared expressions of opinion.

Just previous to starting upon his last voyage to Hudson strait, Mr. Anderson was engaged upon the preparation of a Supplement relating to the Hudson Bay and Strait to the Arctic Pilot, a work published by the Admiralty as a guide to mariners. In this work he expresses as his mature conclusion, from information acquired during several seasons' work in Hudson bay and strait, and the consideration of the reports of others covering a great many years, that 'there is sufficient information on hand now to decide upon the period during which Hudson bay and strait can be navigated with comparative safety,' and concludes that 'the period during which properly constructed vessels could enter Hudson strait with comparative safety may be taken to extend from July 15 to November 15, with a slight extension at either end according to the season.'

It can hardly be supposed that Mr. Anderson would abandon this deliberately expressed opinion on account of difficulties experienced by him on survey areas during a single season. More especially would this be surprising since in that same season thirty-seven passages through the strait were made by vessels operated by the various departments of the Government, besides a number of other vessels, without any of them sustaining serious injury.

I think it is most unfair to Mr. Anderson that his report of his season's work during 1914 should have been subjected to such perversion.

PRINCE GEORGE, B.C., RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Has the site of Prince George, B.C., railway station, as recommended by Mr. D'Arcy Scott, the Chairman of the Railway Commission, been confirmed?

2. Has any application been made to the Dominion Government to change the site of the station, as settled by the Railway Commission?

3. If so, has the Government come to any conclusion respecting such application?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. This order requires no confirmation. It has not been carried out by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and at the instance of the property holders interested, and so that it may be enforced as a court order, the order of the Railway Commission has been made a rule or order of the Exchequer Court.

2. Yes. By petition to the Governor in Council by the corporation of the city of Prince George, B.C.

3. No.

CABLE AND WIRELESS RATES.

*Mr. FRIPP:

1. Is the Government aware that the cable companies operating the lines between Canada and the Mother Country, as also the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company operating between Canada and Ireland, have cancelled or suspended their deferred rates and week-end letters, thereby imposing an extra burden upon Canadian citizens who have sons at the front or in England, and who may desire to communicate with them by telegraph?

2. Has the Board of Railway Commissioners authority over Atlantic or wireless rates?

3. If so, will the Government move the Board of Railway Commissioners to compel the cable and wireless companies to restore deferred and week-end letter rates?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Prime Minister stated yesterday that information had been asked for with reference to that

matter from London, but that it had not yet arrived.

WESTERN PROVINCES LIQUOR PROHIBITION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Government received a request from the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba for an amendment to existing laws, which would prohibit the importation and manufacture of intoxicating liquor in provinces where prohibition has been brought into effect?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to act on this request?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think it may be stated that the Government has received no request from the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba for an amendment of the existing law.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. DEVENISH.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Of what nationality is Mr. Devenish, the new superintendent of the Mont-Joli, Campbellton, Moncton division of the Intercolonial railway?
2. Is he naturalized? If so, when and where?
3. Is the minister aware that the great majority of the people on that division are French Canadians?
4. If so, is it his intention to replace the said Devenish by a French-Canadian employee of the Intercolonial railway competent to perform the duties?
5. What reply did the minister make to Mr. H. Boulay, M.P., when the latter opposed the appointment of the said Devenish?
6. Is this Devenish the same person who held the position of secretary to Mr. Gutelius on the National Transcontinental Commission?
7. What amount did he then receive in his capacity of secretary to the said commission?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Irish.
2. Always a British subject.
3. No. Superintendent Devenish's division includes 290 miles of main line, only 92 of which are in Quebec; also 362 miles of branch lines—Canada Eastern, International, and St. John Valley road—none of which are in Quebec.
4. Should the position become vacant, capable French Canadian employees will be considered in making appointment.
5. No information in the department.
6. Yes.
7. $2,400 per annum.

THE QUEBEC FISHERIES.

Mr. MARCIL:

Has any agreement been reached with the Government of the province of Quebec in the matter of fisheries in that province? If so, what is it?

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. HAZEN: An agreement has been made with the Government of Quebec to submit questions for the opinion of the Provincial Court of Appeals, which will define the respective rights of the province and of the Dominion. The Provincial Government has undertaken to introduce the necessary legislation to enable an appeal to be taken direct from the Provincial Court of Appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

For a copy of all letters, papers, and other documents relating to the application of Wasyl Pinianski for the patent of the southwest quarter section 5, township 25, range 4, west second principal meridian, office file No. 1752484.—Mr. MacNutt.

For a return showing the names of contractors for supplies, meats and other provisions required for the dredges of the Department of Public Works, working in the East River of Pictou or elsewhere in Pictou county, during the year 1914 and 1915, respectively; and amounts paid respectively to each of said tenderers.—Mr. Macdonald.

OCEAN SHIPPING AND THE WAR.

On the motion of Sir George Foster for the adjournment of the House:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman who is leading the House (Sir George Foster) to a cable which I received this afternoon from a gentleman interested in the pulp industry, who is at present in England. He says that the pulp interests in both Canada and Great Britain are distressed by reason of the fact that many ships, even those of small tonnage, are being requisitioned by the Admiralty, and asks me to impress on the Government the importance of this matter. Steps should be taken to relieve the trade of that incubus. Of course, I understand the exigencies of the case, but, at the same time, trade must not be paralysed. I will communicate later with my hon. friend with a view to seeing whether something can be done to free the pulp trade from this difficulty.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The matter has been brought to my attention and to the attention of the Government, not only with reference to pulp, but, I regret to say, with reference to a great many other products, which, though not as much individualized as the pulp industry is under the present conditions, are yet most important to this country. A little while ago a vessel was

procured by the Elder-Dempster line to carry on its monthly service to South Africa. The cargo was allocated and ready for shipment, but Imperial necessities intervened; the vessel was requisitioned and the goods which comprised the cargo are now lying at or on their way to the city of St. John, and there is no boat to receive them. Later the steamship Parthenia of the Donaldson line was requisitioned. The cargo had been allocated and was ready for the vessel, but Imperial necessity again intervened. The Admiralty, when the matter was laid before them, regretted the disturbance of trade which had been caused, but pointed out the necessities of the case. Whatever can be done I am certain will be done; but, as my hon. friend knows, the war and its necessities take precedence.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: We anticipate, of course, that the war may last for a considerable period of time, and as time goes on the conditions with reference to transportation may become very much more serious than they are to-day. I am told that wooden ships are being very successfully operated in the United States, where ordinary sailing vessels are being built and equipped with auxiliary power. They are using what is known as the Diezel oil engine, which is the most modern engine for that purpose. It is not manufactured in Canada. I would suggest that the Government consider seriously whether it would not be wise to encourage the building of sailing vessels by taking off the duty upon these Diezel oil engines so that they may be brought into Canada free of duty from the United States, where they are manufactured. I believe that with proper encouragement there could be built in Canada in a few months a fleet of wooden vessels which would be a material factor in lessening the cost of the transportation of grain, lumber, pulp, paper and many other things which can so well be produced in Canada and for which a good market could be found abroad. It is to be deplored that there has been practically no shipbuilding in Canada for quite a number of years. As the minister knows, the building of wooden ships, which was a great industry in Canada not very many years ago, was destroyed by the building of steel vessels. Now that there is such a great demand for tonnage, I think it would be worth while to endeavour to stimulate in some way the building of wooden vessels. Being equipped with auxiliary engines, they could cross the Atlantic in perhaps double the time required for the passage of ordinary sailing vessels.

5 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can assure my hon. friend that this matter has not escaped the attention of the Government, or of a great many people who are deeply interested in transportation. There are some difficulties in the way, however. In the first place, it takes time to build even a wooden vessel, and, in order that the vessel shall be a really effective factor in transportation, a considerable amount of capital is necessary. One of the chief difficulties is the uncertainty that exists with reference to the ending of the war. Capital will not rush forward to put itself into the building even of wooden vessels unless there is a reasonable possibility of opportunity to operate them for a considerable period of time at a fair profit. If the war should cease quickly, in a few months or six months, the capitalists would be uncertain as to the prospects of operating the wooden vessels thereafter. These are some of the difficulties which present themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In order to impress my hon. friend with the urgency of this request, I may add that the pulp firms which have asked me to present their views before the Government state that they have large ten-year contracts with the largest publishing firms in England, and that, in view of the embargo which has lately been declared, the situation is most acute. That is why I ask my hon. friend to strain a point on behalf of our Canadian industry.

Motion of Sir George Foster agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.06 p.m.

Wednesday, February 9, 1916.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 22, to incorporate Edmonton and Southwestern Railway Company. — Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 23, to incorporate The Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 24, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 25, to incorporate the Western Canada Telephone Company.—Mr. Green.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

ATLANTIC CABLE AND WIRELESS RATES.

*Mr. FRIPP:

1. Is the Government aware that the cable companies operating the lines between Canada and the Mother Country, as also the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company operating between Canada and Ireland, have cancelled or suspended their deferred rates and week-end letters, thereby imposing an extra burden upon Canadian citizens who have sons at the front or in England, and who may desire to communicate with them by telegraph?
2. Has the Board of Railway Commissioners authority over Atlantic or wireless rates?
3. If so, will the Government move the Board of Railway Commissioners to compel the cable and wireless companies to restore deferred and week-end letter rates?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I expected to have had the answer to this question today, but, although the telegram containing the information has been received, it has not yet been put in form to present to the House.

FOREIGN STEAM TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Were any steps taken by the Government in 1915 to prohibit foreign steam trawlers from purchasing coal and supplies in Canadian ports?
2. If so, what has been done?

Mr. HAZEN: No new instructions were given in 1915. In view of claims made regarding treaty obligations with France, it was not considered advisable to deny coal to French trawlers; but a regulation was adopted by which all steam trawlers are required before obtaining a clearance to give an undertaking that they will not fish within twelve miles from land, and supervision has been exercised to prevent breaches of this undertaking.

CENSORS AND DECODERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many decoders were employed by the Department of Militia in Canada during the year 1915?
2. How many censors were employed by the Department of Militia during the year 1915?
3. Have women been employed as decoders or censors? If so, how many?
4. How much has been expended in connection with the services of censors and decoders during the year 1915?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Forty-nine.
2. Including assistant censors, 65..
3. No.
4. $138,400.14 (for calendar year).

Note.—The foregoing figures show all the persons employed during 1915, and include a number of persons who left the service before its close. On November 30 the staff was: deputy chief censor, 1; censors, 11; assistant censors, 35; decoding clerks, 36.

RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Is the Minister of Interior aware as to whether or not certain promissory notes were given by certain Galicians to one R. H. Keay for obtaining homestead in the Riding Mountain timber reserve?
2. If so, is the minister aware as to whether or not any of such notes are held by the Union Bank for collection?
3. Is the minister aware as to whether or not the said bank brought action on any notes of the nature referred to, or is attempting to enforce the payment of the same?
4. If so, does the minister propose to inquire into the matter above referred to, and if he finds such action is being taken by the said bank, does he propose to take steps to protect in any way the makers of such notes?
5. Referring to the minister's statement, published in Hansard of 1915, Vol. 11, page 1580, what steps has the minister taken to carry out the line of policy therein set out?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Have been so informed.
4. Matter has been referred to the Justice Department.
5. Matter has been referred to the Justice Department.

SOLDIERS AT ST. LEONARD, N.B.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How many soldiers have drilled at St. Leonard, N.B., during the year 1915?
2. How many of these soldiers were called upon each day during said year to watch the International Railway Bridge between Van Buren, in the state of Maine, and St. Leonard, N.B.?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Authorized strength: 1 officer, 26 other ranks.
2. Present strength: 1 officer and 18 other ranks, supplying one sentry by day and two sentries by night. Detachment was never over authorized strength of 1 officer and 26 other ranks.

STEAM TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is the declaration required to be given to the customs officer by the master of a steam trawler on obtaining a clearance from Canadian port, in writing?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Has the International Conference promised in the speech of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, delivered on April 9, 1915, relating to steam trawling regulations, ever been invited or called?

Mr. HAZEN: The Imperial authorities were requested to arrange for such conference; but it was considered best to postpone the matter until after the war.

DUTY ON PEARLS AND DIAMONDS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

What is the customs duty, and what is the war tax on pearls and diamonds, both set and unset, when imported into Canada?

Mr. REID:

648—Pearls, pierced, split, strung or not, but not set or mounted—Preferential, 7½ per cent plus 5 per cent war tax; French treaty, 10 per cent plus 7½ per cent war tax; General, 10 per cent, plus 7½ per cent war tax.

648a — Diamonds, unset: — Preferential, free plus 5 per cent war tax; French treaty, ——plus 7½ per cent war tax; General, free plus 7½ per cent war tax.

647—Diamonds or pearls, mounted or set: —Preferential, 22½ per cent, plus 5 per cent war tax; French treaty, 30 per cent, plus 7½ per cent war tax; General, 35 per cent, plus 7½ per cent war tax.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

For a return showing the different rural mail routes in the Strathcona constituency, their location and date of establishment, and all rural routes under consideration at the present time. —Mr. Douglas.

For a copy of all documents, letters, messages, correspondence, reports, etc., regarding the cancellation of the subsidy contract to the Compagnie de Navigation Trans-St. Laurent, and the granting of a like contract to another company, for service between Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and other ports on the north shore, including all correspondence exchanged between the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Post Office Department, or the ministers of such departments and the two above-named companies.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a return showing the name, port of registry, tonnage and name of the master of all steam trawlers that cleared outwards from the port of Canso, Nova Scotia, in the year 1915. Also a copy of all reports and declarations under the hand of the master or chief officer of each of the said trawlers so clearing outward from said port since April 16, 1915, required to be signed by such masters under the provisions of an Order in Council passed on the 16th of April, 1915.—Mr. Sinclair.

HUNTINGDON PREVENTIVE STATIONS.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon) moved for:

All correspondence and reports relating to the closing of the customs preventive station at Vicars, Quebec; the opening of customs House office or preventive station at Frontier, Quebec, county of Huntingdon, and subsequent protest against the closing of the office at Vicars. Also for a return showing reports since 1912 of inspectors and collector as to the administration and ability of preventive officer of customs John W. Curran, recently dismissed, at Vicars, Quebec.

He said: Though this may seem to the members of the House just one of the ordinary motions for the production of papers, to the people of the township of Havelock, Howick, St. Chrysostome, and all that section of country that has been continuously served for the past twenty-six years by the Customs station at Vicars, it is a very important matter. Early in December, when the announcement was made that the preventive station at Vicars was to be closed, there was a division of opinion in the community. Conservatives pointed out with pride that this Government was economizing; others said: Our Government friends at Ottawa have at last recognized that we were right in 1910, when we sent a deputation to the Government asking for reciprocity, and they are now going to give us reciprocity by closing this Custom office, and they will continue to close others all along this road. But a few days afterwards, when it was learned that the Government had reopened another office 3¼ miles along the road, and out in a field, there was a hurried convention of the faithful Conservative friends, and resolutions were passed and sent to Ottawa protesting against the closing of the office at Vicars. It might interest the House to know that for some years prior to 1882, there was a preventive customs officer at Vicars. In 1882 the then officer, Mr. Boardman, resigned, and Mr. Arthur Roberts was appointed in his place. Mr. Roberts lived at Frontier, and died in 1889. Alex. Fiddes was then appointed customs house officer there, and he held the office until he died in 1906; and if there was one man in that community more than another who was an active Conservative it was Alex. Fiddes. Not only was he a good worker himself, but he had a large family and connection, and they were all active workers whenever there

was an election. Fiddes held that office for seven years under a Conservative Administration and for ten years under a Liberal Administration. All that time he was undisturbed, and free to take part in elections at election time. In 1906 Mr. Fiddes died, and Mr. John Curran was appointed in his place. Mr. Curran held that office until it was abolished in December last. No reason was given to him why the office was abolished; all he received was an official letter from the Department of Customs at Ottawa, saying that there was no complaint whatever against him, but that the office had simply been abolished. Vicars is on a road leading direct to the United States. It is a splendid road, and has recently been macadamized right up to the international boundry line, and it is along this road, where the Vicars office was, that all the automobile traffic and business from the United States goes. The new office opened at Frontier is 3½ miles from Covey Hill, and it is not on any direct road leading to the United States. Whatever explanation the Government may offer, I think they will have a hard time with their political friends in Havelock to justify the removal of the preventive station from Covey Hill to Frontier, unless it be that the Government are repentant and now wish to allow our farmers to trade undisturbed with the United States.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): I have no objection at all to bring down any papers in connection with this matter. For many years there has been a great deal of smuggling from the United States into Canada all along the frontier from New Brunswick to Ontario. There are, of course, many roads leading from the United States into Canada, and it is not always easy to decide upon the best place for an office. It is, of course, impossible to have an office on every road leading from the United States into Canada. From the remarks made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robb) I gather that for many years there has been a difference of opinion even in that particular locality. He has told us that the Customs office had been at Vicars continuously for twenty-six years, and that it was then changed to a place called Frontier, which is three and a half miles west of Vicars. My officials tell me that there has been a great deal of smuggling on the road that leads from the United States past Frontier Corners; that right at the very spot where the office is now established a very large seizure was made a few years ago. In fact, nearly all the seizures that have been made in that part of the country have been made along that road leading from the United States.

Mr. ROBB: The seizure that my hon. friend refers to was made by John Curran the dismissed officer, at Vicars corners. There are no corners at Frontier.

Mr. REID: My officials tell me that the seizure was made just about the spot where the office is now. I may also say that frequent verbal representations have been made to me, that the office should be moved from Vicars to Frontier, because all the traffic from the United States had to pass along that road. For that reason, after consulting my officials, I came to the conclusion that Frontier Corners was the proper place for the customs preventive station in that district. I sent my officials to look over the locality and, on their return, they showed me on a map the different routes from the United States, and it was on their advice that I made this change. There was no complaint against Mr. Curran while he was officer at Vicars. My hon. friend knows that it is very difficult to prevent smuggling in that locality, and the fact that my officers advised me that Frontier Corners was the proper place for a preventive station is the only reason I have to give why the change was made. I do not know what petitions have been received; I have not received many, if any. I shall be very glad, however, to bring down at an early date whatever papers there are in connection with the matter.

Motion agreed to.

PREFERENCE TO RETURNED SOLDIERS IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in all future appointments to the Civil Service of Canada, preference should be given to those properly qualified candidates who have served with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in the present war.

He said: My object in placing this resolution upon the Order Paper is two-fold: First to elicit an expression of opinion from this House as to the advisability of securing for those who have already enlisted a simple measure of adequate justice, and secondly to stimulate recruiting by giving publicity to the fact that those

who in future enlist will receive preferential treatment at the hands of this Government in the filling of all vacancies in the Civil Service of Canada.

We have been urging the citizens of this country, by public meetings and by private solicitations, and in every manner which we thought best, to give preferential treatment to those of our Canadian Expeditionary Force who are fortunate enough to return from the front. If it was a proper thing to urge private corporations and firms employing labour to give that preferential treatment, we certainly should set the example as a state, and the state has a splendid opportunity of so doing by filling all vacancies in the public service with men from the Canadian Expeditionary Force. As all those who return will not be able to secure appointments in the Civil Service, we shall have to create a preferential class among them, and in doing so, no doubt we shall take into consideration the fact that those who have been wounded, but who after a certain period will be able to perform the duties appertaining to civil servants, should be given preferential treatment among those who have served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. One naturally looks about for precedents in bringing up a resolution of this kind, but if there were none, the tremendous sacrifices and the general upheaval of the traditional order of things consequent upon the present struggle, would be sufficient justification for us to create a precedent; but fortunately in nearly every country preferential treatment has been given to ex-soldiers and ex-sailors who have served in any of the wars of their country.

In July, 1877, a select committee of the British House of Commons had under consideration the following questions:

1. Whether a better class of men would be induced to enter the military or naval service if the prospect were held out to them of civil employment after a certain period of meritorious service.
2. What would be the effect on the civil service of the introduction into it in a greater degree than hereto of persons who have served in the army and navy.

In regard to the former they reported:

That there is reason to believe that if it were well understood that a considerable number of suitable civil appointments were to be given to soldiers when their term of service expired, the effect on recruiting would be good and some men of a better stamp might be induced to enter the army.

With regard to question No. 2 they reported:

That a preference should be given to ex-soldiers and sailors for appointment to the different positions named in the said report.

A second committee was appointed in 1894 to report upon the results which had followed the recommendations of the first committee, and also to report what further measures were desirable for the purposes of extending the employment of soldiers and sailors to the civil departments of the State and for helping them to obtain service with private employers of labor. Among other things this committee reported:

(a) That in annually sending back to civil life so many thousands of reservists the State contracts towards these men a moral obligation which it should not hesitate to discharge.
(b) That it would greatly popularize the service in the army and improve the status of the soldier if serving with the colours can be made under ordinary circumstances a condition of appointment or employment in the departments of the public service.

Many other recommendations were made, all with a view of assisting ex-soldiers to preferential treatment in the Civil Service and other branches of Government employment.

Another committee in 1883, reported in favour of employing the army and navy pensioners in the outdoor and non-clerical branches of the Civil Service.

In 1906 a further special committee of the British House of Commons which went into the matter very exhaustively reported among other things:

It is the duty of the state to set the best example in the method of treating its servants and it seems to us essential that is should at once take steps to carry out such important recommendations, and to place itself on at least as favourable a footing as regards its employees as that of other employers.

We therefore most earnestly urge that definite instructions should be issued to the various departments that ex-soldiers and sailors are to be given a prior claim to employment in the various posts in the Government service to which we alluded, and to any others for which their services may be suitable. For we are persuaded that such preference, given as it is by many employers of labour and public bodies, is all the more imperative on the part of the State. We feel, however, that by this means only can the State relieve itself of the moral obligation which is placed upon it for those who have borne arms and endangered their lives in its service.

Some of the recommendations of this committee were:

1. That an association which would be financially assisted by but not under the control of the Admiralty, and the War Office, should be

created for the provision of employment for ex-soldiers and sailors.

2. That the Government should direct the various public departments to fill vacancies in the appointments detailed in appendices 2 to 5, and any others which may be suitable, by ex-soldiers and sailors of good character, and that only in the event of such candidates not being forthcoming are the posts to be filled by civilians.

Among other recommendations of this committee were:

3. All future vacancies for customs preventive men should be filled by ex-soldiers and sailors.

4. That at least half the vacancies for outdoor customs officers should be set aside for ex-soldiers and sailors.

5. That the majority of vacancies for assistant clerks should be similarly dealt with.

6. That all established messengerships should be so filled.

7. That county and burough councils should be urged to reserve a number of appointments for ex-soldiers and sailors.

So far as my research has gone, it has satisfied me that these recommendations have all been from time to time carried out by the British Government. I tried to learn what had been done by the United States Government after the Civil War in 1865. I find that the recommendations made by the American Government in 1865 are still part of the Civil Service regulations in force on the 15th of August last. After the Civil War, or, perhaps, before it was over, a resolution was moved and passed in the United States House of Representatives, which was afterwards enacted verbatim as section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as follows:

Persons honourably discharged from military and naval service by reason of the disability resulting from wounds or sickness incurred in the line of duty shall be preferred for appointments to civil offices provided they are found to be possessed of the business capacity necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of such offices.

That is still the law of the United States, and it is followed in the administration of the Civil Service. A resolution was passed on the same day, afterwards embodied in the law, and now appearing as section 1755 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as follows:

In grateful recognition of the services and sacrifices and sufferings of persons honourably discharged from the military and naval service of the country by reason of wounds disease or the expiration of the terms of enlistment it is respectfully recommended to bankers, merchants, mechanics, manufacturers, farmers, and persons engaged in industrial pursuits to give them the preference for appointments to remunerative situations and employments.

[Mr. Middlebro.]

It is gratifying to note that the United States, before making recommendations to others, first declared by resolution and by law that they would do that which they asked others to do. In looking over the French legislation, I find that, at least since 1870, the year of the Franco-Prussian War, there has been legislation upon the French statute books giving preferential treatment to ex-soldiers and sailors, wounded or partially incapacitated when on service at the front. That law is in effect at the present time. On November 15 last the Chamber of Deputies passed a Bill on this subject, which, as it is very short, I ask leave to put on Hansard. I do not know that this has been finally enacted into law through subsequent action of the Senate, but I understand that it has been, and certainly it is not likely that the Senate would make any very material amendments to a measure which was passed unanimously by the Chamber of Deputies. A free translation of this Act is as follows:

Relating to the reservation, under certain conditions, of employments to the men in the Army and Navy invalided No. 1, or retired by reason of wounds or infirmities contracted in active service during the present war.

The Chamber of Deputies has adopted the Bill drafted as follows:

Section 1. The military men of the Army and Navy invalided No. 1, or retired through wounds or infirmities resulting from wounds or illness caught in front of the enemy shall benefit, for a term of five years, dating from the end of the hostilities, by a right of preference for the obtaining of all positions reserved by statements E, F, and G, annexed to the law of the 21st of March, 1905, whatsoever be their rank or the length of their services—such right of preference to be granted in the first place in favour of fathers of the most numerous families.

They may be admitted to the benefit of said positions, even though they had, on the first day of August, 1914—

The date of the order of mobilization of the land armies and navies.

—passed the age limit as it is determined for obtaining the certificate of professional quannication under section 14 of the rule of public administration of the 26th of August, 1905, amended, to be in force under section 60 of the law of the 21st of March, 1905.

Section 2. A rule of public administration, which shall intervene within three months after the enactment of the present law, shall determine the classification of wounds or infirmities allowing to compete for the obtaining of a position reserved according to the terms specified in the herein above section.

Such rule shall likewise determine the manner in which to obtain the certificate of professional qualification, and the conditions under which the candidates shall be entered on a special list established for each position, by the commission created in conformity with section 70 of the law of the 21st of March, 1905.

Section 3. A right of preference shall be

granted to such military men as are provided for in section first of this law, to compete for the obtaining of positions not reserved by the law of the 21st of March, 1905.

The administrations provided for in statements E, F and G, annexed to the law of the 21st of March, 1905, as well as the industrial and commercial undertakings holding a monopoly or a Government subsidy from the Department of the Commune, shall determine such lists and terms and conditions of access to positions as are apt to be granted to said military men, and they shall notify the Minister of War thereof, within four months after the enactment of the present law.

Section 4. No industrial or commercial undertaking shall, in the future, be granted a monopoly or a Government subsidy, from the Department of the Commune, except on condition of reserving to military men, who are the object of this law, a certain number of positions to be determined by the specifications in which account shall be taken of the situation of the fathers of numerous families, as provided for in section 1.

Section 5. All provisions contrary to the present law are repealed.

Adopted in Public Assembly, at Paris, November the 19th, 1915.

The President.

(Signed) Paul Deschanel.

The Secretaries:

(Signed) Petral, Peyroux, Le Cherpy.

The effect of this Act is to provide that for the period of five years after the termination of hostilities a preference shall be given to military and naval men who have been wounded while on active service, and who are qualified to fulfill the duties of the office in the Civil Service. That means that they shall have the right to make application for positions which are vacant during a period of five years after the cessation of hostilities. It also means that a preference shall be given in the preferred class to those persons who have the largest families, and, in the third place, it means that all public corporations which held any kind of monopoly or which have been granted in any way a public bonus are required to reserve a certain number of their positions for men who have been wounded at the front. I do not know that we could use that provision, because we are not in the habit of granting monopolies. It is true that certain undertakings have received bonuses, but whether or not it would be right to apply this provision to them and make it retroactive, I am not at all prepared to say. I do think, however, that we would be quite justified in making the provision that preference shall be given to the men having the largest families.

It would be quite impossible, of course, to make provision for all those who served in an expeditionary force numbering from 250,000 to 300,000 men, much less to make provision for all those who have been wounded, and it necessarily follows that we must make some selection from among them for the very limited number of positions in the Civil Service that will be open to them. Broadly speaking, those who will return may be divided into four classes: able-bodied men who shall not have been wounded or incapacitated, for whom situations and positions shall have been kept open by patriotic employers. These men would naturally receive preferential treatment after the other classes have been provided for. Second, able-bodied men who were out of work at the time of their enlistment, or who have been superseded in their absence, and invalided and wounded men similarly situated, who will recover after a period of convalescence. Third, invalided and wounded men who are unable to follow their previous occupations by reason of some disability, but who will be capable after a certain time to take up other work. Fourth, men who will be permanently disabled and unable to earn their living under any circumstances. I presume it would be impossible for us to make any provision for the latter class in the Civil Service; they would have to rely entirely upon their pensions.

I know that employment commissions for returned soldiers have been appointed by the various Provincial Governments. The object of these commissions, as set out in pamphlets distributed throughout the country, is to ask employers to give preferential treatment to the wounded men returning from the front, and who will, after a certain length of time, be able to attend to their ordinary avocations. But while we have appointed those commissions in the various provinces, I am not aware that we ourselves are doing the things that we are asking these commissions to do. In the province of Quebec there has been appointed an employment commission, of which the Hon. G. A. Simard is chairman. Mr. Simard has with him a committee of seven prominent men of the province, among whom I am glad to see the name of my hon. friend for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). This commission is doing good work in the province of Quebec. In all the other provinces similar commissions have been appointed under the designation of military hospitals commissions. It is our duty, I think, to pass a resolution of the kind I now offer, so that those who have enlisted will be entitled to a preference in the Civil

Service. Besides, it will be a great stimulus to recruiting if we show the men that we appreciate their efforts and sacrifices, by passing a resolution providing that returned wounded soldiers who, when convalescent, will be able to perform the duties of a civil servant, will receive preferential treatment at the hands of the Canadian Government.

The first and paramount duty of Canada to-day is the prosecution of this war to a successful conclusion. We are urging private individuals and corporations to reserve for returned soldiers occupations previously held by them, and generally to give preference to those who have served on the Canadian Expeditionary Forces. The State should be the first to set this example, and the way is open to the State through the medium of the Civil Service, and anything which we can in reason do now as a reward for those who have offered their lives in behalf of their country, and as a stimulus to further recruiting, is not only justifiable but is a duty.

This is a fight for national life. If we lose, some one else will appoint our civil servants, but we will still have to pay them. If we win, those who fought for and retained for us our power of appointment should be the appointees; at any rate, they should receive preferential treatment. No citizen of the State performs a more noble act, or better measures up to the supreme test of citizenship, than he who offers his life for his country in the present crisis, and hence he is entitled to preferential treatment at the hands of the State. Those applicants for Civil Service employment, who could have, but have not, offered their services to the State, can not complain if preference is given to the man who was willing to sacrifice his life for the State at a time when the national life was at stake. Who is more entitled to a position in the gift of the State than the citizen who has been so maimed fighting for the State that he is unable to carry on his previous occupation, though able to fulfil the duties of a Civil Service official?

I am sure that every day the real meaning of this war is more forcibly brought home to us. Every day members of this House receive a list of casualties, and they look over them for the purpose of ascertaining, perhaps, if there are any casualties amongst men who have enlisted from their own particular constituencies, or amongst persons with whom they are acquainted. I find that there are 29 names in the list of wounded to-day; the addresses of the men whose names appear in this list are as follows: Hants, N.S., Winnipeg, Man., Beamsville, Ont., Vancouver, B.C., Spencerville, Ont., Peterborough, Ont., St. Faustin, Que., Sherbrooke, Que., Pawtuckett, Rhode Island, Campbellton, N.B., Liverpool, England, Kamloops, B.C., Edmonton, Alta., Belleville, Ont., Halifax, N.S., Leeds, Eng., Norfolk, Eng., Fife, Scotland, Liverpool, Eng., Ratho, Scotland, Elie, Scotland, Stornoway, Scotland, Glasgow, Scotland, Maidstone, Eng. Those whose addresses are given as England or Scotland are those who were the first to take up arms: Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, some of them reservists, no doubt, who gladly and voluntarily enlisted at the commencement of the war and went with the first expeditionary force. This list of thirty wounded men in one day is the result of the ordinary normal every-day fighting on the western front. At this rate, over 10,000 men are wounded in a year, without taking into any account any pitched battles or special engagements. At this rate, in three years' time we should have 30,000 wounded soldiers to take care of, and I have no doubt that that is not half the number of men that we shall have to provide for in connection with the present war. So I say that it comes home to most of us as it has never come before, that we must do something to provide for these men who will return from the front. Thousands of families after this war will appreciate as they never appreciated before the full meaning of the poet's words:

> Oh, for the touch of a vanished hand,
> And the sound of a voice that is still.

We cannot do anything for those who have fallen, but we can do something for their relatives; we can do something for those who are willing to offer their lives in defence of their country by providing that upon their return they shall be given a preference in the matter of appointments to the Civil Service if they shall be able to perform the duties of a civil servant.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition has said that this war has been a revelation in many respects. It has been a revelation in this respect; that notwithstanding the fact that we were living in an age of wealth, ease and luxury, we are glad to know to-day that the best traditions of the British Empire and of the British race have been more than upheld in the present great titanic struggle. We were apt to think perhaps that conditions

in the city of Paris gave us a true insight into the character of the French people. But a snapshot of the city of Paris is not a photograph of France, and a photograph of France is not a picture of the mind or the heart or the soul of the French people. You may photograph the materialistic exterior, but you cannot photograph the mind or the soul or the heart of the people. Only when a great emergency comes upon us do we really know the inner feelings and qualities of the people. I am glad to say that France, England and Canada have all more than measured up to expectations and to the best traditions of these races.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think I make a very reasonable request when I ask for the affirmative opinion of this House—I hope it will be unanimous—upon the suggestion that after the war is over those who have served in the Canadian expeditionary force shall, other things being equal, be given a preference in the matter of appointments to positions in the Canadian Civil Service.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): I am sure that the House has been very much interested in the remarks of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) as well as in the matter of his resolution. The circumstances under which we now find ourselves have, in a way, made a new Canada. We view things from a different standpoint; we seem to have got closer together as a people. While doing our part in the great struggle in which we are engaged, we are knitted in a closer web, than ever before has bound us. The idea of altruism seems to have spread not only in this House, but throughout the entire Dominion.

We perhaps may have been taught the lesson, and it may possibly have been needed, that supreme selfishness is not the best characteristic of a people, and while each may have been going on his way for years, and taking his share of the general prosperity that seemed to have been given to this country in abundance, we may have forgotten what to us may seem to have been the smaller things and, amongst them, the well-being of those around us. After all, the ideal of a man ought to be to so conduct himself and to so treat those with whom he comes in contact, that when he is called hence the world will at least be a better place for his having lived in it.

The men who have been asked to go to the front should not only have our best wishes and heartiest support but, what to them is more important: they ought to know that their families shall not want for any necessity while they are at the war. This is the first and supreme business of this Parliament after providing for the men who go to the front. We must begin by assuring the men at the front, or the men who are asked to go to the front, that while they are fighting our battles and doing the work that we ourselves might be called upon to do, those who are near and dear to them must have, not as a matter of charity or generosity, but of actual right, everything they require while the bread-winners are at the front, and who are engaged in a work far more important than anything ever before conceived by the people of Canada. It must be remembered that our armies are composed not only of men from the ordinary walks of life: mechanics, artisans, and workmen, but that professional and business men are locking their doors, giving up their business, putting aside their ordinary avocations, forsaking not only what to them means a livelihood but considerable profit, and going to the front in order that we who are left behind may continue to enjoy those liberties for which our forefathers fought and died.

When our brave fellow-citizens come back, should they be allowed to be objects of charity? Sir, no Canadian who goes to the front must ever be allowed to stand at the street corner and pass the hat for charity. He is entitled to be
3 p.m. taken care of by the state so long as he lives. It does not tend to strengthen the fibre of manhood that a man who fought and bled for his country should live on charity, and no man who has courage to go to the front would want that. The duty of the Government, and of Parliament, is plain; we should put ourselves on record as being prepared to give the first opportunity to the men who have made this sacrifice. Heretofore we have passed Civil Service Acts, and we have appointed men largely on account of their being political warriors, but now we have an opportunity of giving our returned soldiers positions which they have earned because of duty courageously, ably, and nobly performed. As a nation we ought to rise to the situation without any question or quibble about it.

My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) has referred to the provisions made in France, Great Britain, and the United States, and although we are not going to take an

example from Germany, still it may be noted that Germany has made provision for her retired soldiers. If you take a trip through that country, as you possibly will in a few years, after it is defeated, you will find that all along the lines of government-owned railways old soldiers are given positions at a comparatively fair salary, and the statutes of the different portions of the German Empire which own and control the railways, provide that these men shall be entitled to the first claim on these positions.

We are all one in wishing to do this, and to do it properly. If we are going to do anything let us do it right; let us make the men who have gone to the front, and whom we are now asking to go to the front, feel that the State is with them, not only now when the State wants their services, but through the years to come.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, while supporting the resolution and everything that has been said by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I would like to suggest an amplification of the idea. There are men taken from all walks of life who may suffer accident, wounds, or partial disablement, which will unfit them for the occupations they were formerly engaged in. It is quite possible that in many cases a man who has been engaged in some active, outdoor calling, and who has been disqualified for the pursuit of that calling, may be given a training or education that would fit him for some other calling for which he would be mentally, but not as injured physically fitted, and for which he had not been before educationally equipped. It appears to me that this is the time and the occasion when, if ever, the question of technical education should be taken up in a practical way for this specific purpose. I do not wish to debate now the general question of technical education, but there is no doubt that in existing circumstances many men who have become unfitted for their ordinary callings might well be given an opportunity to acquire technical knowledge which would enable them to become useful and self-supporting citizens.

I am induced to bring this matter to the attention of the House because of a condition which exists in the city in which I reside. That city has established a technical school. It is ,of course, a very expensive establishment both to inaugurate and to carry on successfully, and in the present financial stress, when it has become necessary to reduce expenditure along many lines, many of the citizens feel that the expenditures necessary to this technical school should, under the circumstances, be postponed until a better day. In all probability this school will have to be closed, or its usefulness will be very much curtailed, for lack of financial support at the moment. I do not wish to make any particular suggestion to the Government in reference to this school, and I merely mention it to say that here is an institution well fitted to do the work which I have suggested. The disabled soldier who might be a suitable person to attend that school and get the benefit of its training will not, as things exist now, be able to do so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does that school provide free technical education?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, that is its purpose.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is it supported as a municipal institution?

Mr. OLIVER: It is practically a municipal institution; but it is not under the control of the city council, it is under the control of the school board. I am only citing this case as an instance of what could be done; and I believe that what is possible in that case is possible elsewhere throughout the country. Altogether aside from the advantage this education would be to the soldiers themselves, it strikes me that it would be of immense advantage to the country to enable these men to recover their usefulness and productive power. Otherwise, a valuable part of the population would not be useful, productive, creative, or indeed, would not enjoy life with satisfaction to themselves. I thought it might be a good idea to bring this to the attention of the Government.

Might I also suggest that an opportunity be given to the disabled soldier to enter, not exactly the higher professions, but the school teaching profession, for example. If the disabled soldier, who in his previous career did not have the opportunity of acquiring that degree of education that would fit him for school teaching or some kindred occupation, were given the opportunity of acquiring that broadening of knowledge that would enable him to become useful in this line, not only would his condition be better, not only would the country be discharging those obligations that my two hon. friends have already spoken of, but the country at large would be benefited by

the useful endeavours of a number of its valuable citizens, who, left to themselves, and without outside assistance of some kind, would certainly pass the remainder of their lives with a minimum of usefulness to the community, and with very much less satisfaction to themselves.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): I should like to remark that I have had some experience in this matter. In my humble judgment, the suggestions of this kind that are being made from time to time, fall far short of the requirements. From the discussion to-day, it appears that only those who have gone to the front and have returned, are to be dealt with. What are you going to do with those who have offered and have not been accepted? Their effort, so far as it goes, is of immense value to the country, for by their example they are nourishing the spirit of self sacrifice and of defence—something which is most material. Furthermore, apart from the pension, what provision is to be made for the permanently disabled, and the dependents of those who have been killed? To my mind the various schemes that have been suggested partake largely of the spirit of tutelage or guardianship, and have in them something which is not conducive to the best interests of the soldiers, their wives, and their families. I am well aware that there is a variety of schemes in other countries, where the old soldier in many cases is treated pretty much as a sort of poor relation—somebody who has to be provided for. To my mind this matter should be dealt with differently, and I would venture to suggest a satisfactory method. The soldier is a man who offers his services in an enterprise of a peculiarly hazardous kind, requiring in him not only physical but moral qualities. You are paying that man accordingly, in the first instance. In the second place, I say you should insure his life. Then, if he dies, the insurance money will enure to the benefit of his family, and can be taken care of by trustees. If he is wounded, he can be taken care of on the principle of the Workmen's Compensation Act, which provides for every degree of disablement. Under this plan, the old soldier would not be a pensioner upon public bounty, but a man whose business affairs would be on a proper business basis. This would be recognizing soldiering as a calling of the nation at large. It is just the same as any other calling, except that it differs in its greater danger, and in other qualities of a like kind.

A soldier should be sent forth to war on the understanding that he will be allowed sufficient to properly provide for his family while he is away; and if he dies in the service of his country he should be assured —not by the promises of the people, which are often written in water, but by a guarantee at the time of his enlistment—that when he enlists his life is insured, and that his future, and the future of his family is also assured. There are some cases arising out of this discussion which are not provided for. For instance, if a man is not fit he cannot be taken into the Civil Service, and that man might have become unfit purely through the extraordinary character of his services to his country. I know a young man from Peterborough who holds the Cross of St. George from the Czar, the Legion of Honour from the French Republic, and the D.C.M. from England. He was shattered by shrapnel, by bullet and by high explosive shell; he was stabbed three times through the groin by a German bayonet; he was left out on the field to die. Even in that extremity, he gave up his stretcher to another man, in that way exemplifying the highest quality that the human race is capable of. He is now gradually degenerating; his mother was sent over to the Old Country to see him, but the young fellow's mind is gradually weakening. Am I, Sir, to understand that such a case is to be provided for in the way proposed in this resolution? This man is incapable of holding a position in the Civil Service, and yet nothing, apparently, can be done for him, unless through the spirit of benevolence of some charitable association, organization, or private individual.

I think, Sir, that this matter ought to be reduced to a thorough business basis, and, outside of that, there is ample room for those nobler qualities, shown in the volunteer and in the people at large, which it is so wholesome for the people to exemplify.

Mr. D. O. ALGUIRE (Stormont): It occurs to me that one little thing might be done by us which would indicate our attitude towards this question. In this country there are those who have a certain say as to who shall be appointed to some of the smaller positions that do not come under the Civil Service Act, and I think it would be proper for us to make it clearly understood that those positions should be filled by returned soldiers who were capable of

filling them, and, if there are no returned soldiers available, we should take into consideration those whose boys had volunteered to take their places in the firing line.

One of the most pleasant duties I had in the way of nominating a man and having him appointed to a position in my county, occurred in this way. The case was a rather pathetic one: a woman was mourning the loss of her second boy, word having just been received from France that he had been killed. It so happened that there was a vacancy in the Civil Service, and it was given to one son living at home who was partly crippled, but who was able to do the work required. I refer to this matter only to show the effect it had on every one who heard about it. People said that a very good effect was produced in Stormont by the fact that the position was given to the surviving son of this poor widow, whose other two sons had been killed. In any event, we should take into consideration the families of those who are fighting, and as far as possible appointments to positions in the Civil Service should be made from the relatives of those who are serving us at the front.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to the present resolution, that soldiers returning from the front, especially those who have been wounded, be given appointments in the Civil Service. But I would request the Government to see to it that the appointments go to deserving individuals, who not only will have the credit of having taken part in the war, but who, at the same time, will be trustworthy, and not to men of the stamp of those who have pillaged the House of Commons during the tragic conflagration of a few days past.

On that occasion certain individuals were about, who, far from deserving of their country, were unworthy of the military uniform they wore. They were more intent on barring the way to those who wanted to give aid and might have helped to save some lives than on fulfilling their duty.

An inspection of the ruins will disclose signs of plundering worthy of bandits.

I fully concur in the motion of the hon. member, provided a judicious selection is made; I mean that only those secure appointments who can be in every way recommended. Whoever offers his life on the battlefield—especially if he be wounded, deserves, on his return, the best consideration of the Government.

With those few remarks I take pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. member.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am sure we all agree that every possible consideration must be given to those men, who, during the past eighteen months, have gone out to fight the battle of Canada and of the Empire, and who have thus shown their willingness to make the supreme sacrifice in the cause of liberty and civilization. I appreciate the information which has been afforded to the House by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) in presenting this motion for our consideration. The subject engaged the attention of the Government some months ago, and on the 27th of November last an Order in Council was passed, and immediately after the opening of the House it was laid on the Table. I asked for it a moment ago, but I fear that the documents thus brought down have been destroyed in the recent fire. Although I did not know that this resolution was to be presented today, I have had an opportunity of sending for a copy of the Order in Council, which I will read for the information of the House. It may be that its terms should be enlarged or expanded, but it contained the views of the members of the Government as the subject presented itself to us at that time. The Order in Council is as follows:

> The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the right hon. the Prime Minister, advise that in making appointments to the Government Civil Service, preference be given to the returned members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, especially those who through disability occasioned by active military service are unable to fill their previous occupations; such appointments to be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Acts and to be made with due regard to the capacity of any applicant to discharge the duties of the position to which it is proposed to appoint him.

On reading this Order in Council it seems to me that it fulfils pretty fairly the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro), although I entirely agree that its scope does not extend to all that he has urged upon the House. The considerations which he has advanced will, of course, necessarily receive the very careful and close attention of the Government, because the subject is one, not only of very great importance, but, I am sure, of intense interest to all hon. members. What has been mentioned by several honourable gentlemen—by my hon. friend from

Edmonton particularly—appeals very much to me. I refer to his remarks urging the Government to assist in every way the training of those who, by reason of physical disability occasioned by their military service, are unable to follow the occupations they were engaged in before the war. The work which is being done in Great Britain attracted my attention during the past summer, and I took occasion, while in England, to visit the St. Dunstan's Hostel for the blind, which receives and cares for soldiers who have lost their sight in the war. I had heard something of what was being carried on there by Mr. Pearson, who is the chief inspiration of that great work, and I mention this as an illustration of what might be done along similar lines alluded to by the honourable member for Edmonton. Take the case of a man who has lost his sight and is therefore unable to follow his former occupation. In this hostel it is sought to train such men to earn their livelihood in some other way. We must give earnest consideration to everything that is reasonably possible to be done for the men who have been in any way disabled by reason of their military service. I am sure that every hon. member will agree with me that the best service we can render to those men is to enable them to earn their own livelihood as far as possible. These men do not want charity; they want the means of being independent as far as possible of all outside assistance. By helping them in that way we are not only doing something which preserves their independence and self-respect, but we are enabling every one of them to contribute to the wealth of the country. When I went to St. Dunstan's Hostel, I found a beautiful old historic house, with grounds extending back of one of the great London parks, and equipped with means of teaching the men who had lost their sight how to earn their livelihood; a choice of perhaps a dozen different occupations being afforded. I was so much interested in the splendid work carried on there, that I asked Mr. Pearson to give me a written statement of the efforts that had been made, the methods pursued, and the results accomplished. He told me that either the French or the Italian Government—or perhaps both—had become interested in his work and had asked him for a report upon it, and he very kindly offered to send me a copy of that report. I brought it with me and sent a copy at once to the Economic and Development Commission who have under consideration certain matters relating to this subject, and I also sent a copy to the chairman of the Military Hospitals and Convalescent Homes Commission; and to both these commissions I commended the work that is being carried on in St. Dunstan's Hostel as an example of what might be done. It goes without saying that we all thoroughly agree that men who have offered up their lives for the service of the State, and through that service have been deprived of the means of earning their livelihood, ought not to be left to beg on the street corner. We know that provision has been made by the Government, through a pension system, which, I hope, will be under consideration by the House at a later date in the present session. The pension scheme which we had in mind last year was placed on the table of the House in the session of 1915, and we invited the suggestions of hon. members thereon. We were not fortunate enough to secure many suggestions at that time, but the subject has, perhaps, awakened a deeper interest since, and I have no doubt we shall be able to procure a larger number of opinions and suggestions from hon. members than at the last session.

One hon. member referred to the appointment of employment commissions in different parts of the country, and reference has been made to possible arrangements by which positions under the control of municipalities throughout Canada should be made available for men returning from the front. There was a conference during the past autumn, called by myself at the request of the Chairman of the Military Hospitals and Convalescent Home Commission, at which all the different Provincial Governments of Canada were represented, with the exception of British Columbia, and the Government of that province gave me authority to say to those present that they would readily concur in anything that might be determined by the representatives of the other provinces. We found the gentlemen representing the Governments of the different provinces not only willing but eager to co-operate with the Government in every way. Commissions have been formed, I understand, in every province in Canada, which commissions have under their attention the purposes of the chief commission so far as it concerns hospitals and convalescent homes. They are also dealing with the problem of finding suitable occupations for those who have been disabled in one way or another

in military service. I believe—I am not sure of this, but I state it as my belief, and I will verify it later—that every province in Canada to-day is prepared to give preference in its Civil Service to the men who have been disabled at the front, provided, of course, that they are capable of performing the duties of the offices to which it is proposed to appoint them. It is with a great deal of appreciation that I speak of the spirit displayed by every Provincial Government in this regard, and of the co-operation they have given. If I am not mistaken, the co-operation of the Provincial Governments extends, in some provinces at least, to an endeavour to have the like policy carried on in the municipalities of the province. If that is not the case in all, I hope it soon will be.

I am very glad indeed that this discussion has taken place. In order that I may consider the terms of my hon. friend's motion, as compared with the Order in Council which we have brought down, and in order also that the Government may take into consideration the wider scope which the hon. gentleman has given to the subject, I move that the debate be adjourned, to be resumed at some future day.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM ASSEMBLY OF BARBADOS.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that I have received the following cablegram:

Barbados, February 9, 1916.

Speaker, House of Commons,
Dominion of Canada, Ottawa.

The Speaker and other members of House of Assembly, Barbados, desire to express the sorrow they have felt concerning the terrible disaster that occurred on night of third instant involving the loss of human lives and destruction of Parliament Buildings at Ottawa, and to offer their deepest sympathy to the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada on the sad occasion. If this disaster shall eventually be proved to have been the work of one or more of the King's enemies, then the House wishes further to express the horror and indignation which will properly be felt by all loyal subjects of the Empire.

Speaker, House of Assembly,
Barbados.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister and the House to the fact that the answers given to some of the questions are inaccurate and, I think, untruthful—apparently intentionally so. I refer particularly to a question which I put on the Order Paper some time ago and which was answered on Thursday last. One question was:

Were the horses purchased in Prince Edward Island found to be suitable and satisfactory?

That is, for army purposes. The answer to that question was, "Yes." I expected that answer, because it is correct. I have not seen the report of the Davidson Commission; I do not think it has yet been issued; but I remember reading in the newspapers the statement that the Davidson Commission found that the horses purchased in Prince Edward Island were suitable for army purposes. They commended the man who purchased them, saying that he had done his work honestly and well.

Another question was:

Were the horses purchased in the other provinces of Canada found to be suitable and satisfactory?

The answer was the same: "Yes." Now, I am quite satisfied that that answer is not correct; every member of this House knows that it is not correct. I have only to say this: if that answer is correct, the hon. gentleman who formerly represented the county of Kings, N.S., in this House, Mr. De Witt Foster, ought still to be here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I regret to have to call the hon. gentleman to order. It is open to him not to accept the answer given by the Government to a question, but it is not open to him to discuss that answer, and I would ask him not to do so.

Mr. HUGHES: In what way, then, can I bring the matter to the attention of the Government? The question is a very important one.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member can discuss it upon the motion for Committee of Supply, or when the Estimates come up.

Mr. HUGHES: That will be a long time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I hope not. In the meantime I can only say that I will direct the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to my hon. friend's observation and let him know that he intends to discuss it later. Finally, I express my satisfaction that the hon. gentleman was so well supplied with the information he sought that he really need not have asked the question at all.

Mr. HUGHES: I want to call the attention of the Government to another part of the question to which I have referred. May I just remark, in reply to the Prime Minister, that one reason why I asked a question in respect of which I did know what the answer should be was that I desired to know what confidence I could place in answers given to questions with regard to which I was not so well informed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask that the hon. gentleman desist; he is clearly out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: I want to discuss another part of the question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will send me a memorandum of the other matter to which he refers, I will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence.

EMBARGO UPON OATS AND OATMEAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: It has been reported in the papers that an embargo has been placed upon the exportation of oatmeal from Alberta to the United States. I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if there is any foundation for the report; and also whether any embargo has been placed upon oats.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think I can tell my hon. friend that no embargo has been placed upon the exportation of oats. If any embargo has been placed on oatmeal, it is a general embargo, not particularly applicable to any one province. I am not certain about that, however; I will give my hon. friend the information at the next sitting. I may add that there is no embargo upon the exportation of oatmeal to the United States; there is a general embargo in respect of its exportation to certain countries.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for Committee of Supply:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia and of the Government the matter to which I referred a few moments ago. I was saying that if it be true that the horses purchased in the other provinces of Canada were suitable and satisfactory, Mr. DeWitt Foster should still be in this House. I say that the answer "Yes" to the question which I asked in that respect is not correct. More than that, the newspaper reports of the evidence heard before the Davidson Commission, if they may be relied upon, prove that that answer is incorrect.

I asked what commission was paid to the men who purchased the horses in Prince Edward Island, and the answer was that no commission was paid to them. I am pretty sure that is not correct. If I may rely upon the newspaper reports of the evidence before the Davidson Commission, some remuneration or commission was paid, and very properly so. The amount was a reasonable one, and the work was well done; the horses were suitable, and everything was proper. Therefore it seems clear that the formal answer given by the minister was not correct. There is a principle behind this. Members of this House have a right to ask questions in regard to public matters; the people of Canada have a right to information of that kind obtained through their representatives, and the duty of the Government to give correct answers to such questions cannot be disputed. Pains should be taken to see that every answer given in this House is correct. In this respect we have some complaint against the Militia Department. It may be that the department, being a military department, think they should not take so much notice of civil matters; or it may be that the minister considers that everything he does ought to go without question; but in any case we have some ground for complaint, and I am sure the Prime Minister will see that this grievance is remedied. I would ask him to tell me whether I should ask this question again or whether he will see that a correct answer is given without my again placing it on the Order Paper.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Really I think I should not care to tender any advice to my hon. friend as to the course he had better take; he is fully capable of coming to his own conclusion in regard to that. All I can promise is to direct the attention of his namesake, the Minister of Militia, to the subject, and I presume the minister will have some explanation or some observations to make in reply to my hon. friend.

SUPPLY.

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

Charges of management—offices of assistant receivers general and country savings banks—salaries, $66,850; contingencies, $6,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is not present, perhaps it would be better not to go on with my estimates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We might allow an item to stand.

Commission for payment of interest on public debt, purchase of sinking funds, $80,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the explanation of the increase of $20,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is on account of the growing public debt, owing to the war borrowings. The department thought it wise to insert this estimate of $20,000 additional on the assumption that that amount would cover all possible contingencies.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister object to allowing that to stand until Mr. Maclean is here?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That was my suggestion, to allow these items to stand.

Item stands.

Removal of foreign and uncurrent coin from circulation, $15,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I presume that this is for the removal of American coin from circulation in Canada. Has the minister ever approached the United States Government with a view to having them grant similar accommodation to our coin in the United States? In Boston, for instance, Dominion notes or Dominion silver coins do not pass as current coin. Would it not be reasonable to ask them to give to our money the same accommodation as we give to theirs? That would be to their advantage, as we are their best customers, and I feel sure there is a disposition in the United States to promote intercourse with Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The matter has not been taken up with the Government of the United States, nor do I think it desirable that it should be. The coin of neither country has any legal status in the other. The coin of the United States is not legal tender in Canada, nor is the coin of Canada legal tender in the United States. Along the border, and I think generally in Canada, American coins are taken at their face value. Under the arrangement referred to in this item, American coinage is taken up by the banks, to whom the Government pay a commission, and sent out of the country. It is to the advantage of Canada to have its own coinage in circulation in Canada, as there is an increase of Government currency to that extent. If the silver currency of Canada were replaced in whole or in substantial part by silver currency of the United States, to that extent Dominion currency would not be in circulation, and there would be a loss to the Government. Therefore, under the late Government, an arrangement was made by my predecessor, Hon. Mr. Fielding, whereby, in consideration of the payment of a small commission, the banks undertook to transport to the United States American silver and other coins, with the idea of getting rid of this foreign circulation. It is a fact that our coins do not circulate generally in the United States. I believe that in the American border cities our coins are accepted. I do not think it would be a proper subject on which to approach the Government of the United States. It would be for them to deal with the matter, if they see fit, as the Canadian Government has seen fit to deal with it. I should doubt very much whether they would meet any wish we might express to them in the matter. I think it better to leave the question to be dealt with according to the discretion of the Canadian Government on the one hand and of the American Government on the other, without any request on the part of either Government. To put forward a request and have it refused might be somewhat invidious. My own view is that, as trade increases between the two countries, probably our coins will be more and more acceptable across the line; and the Americans may in time adopt a similar plan to ours to get our coins out of their country. As we take the attitude that it is not in the interest of Canada to have American coins circulate in our country, I do not think the United States Government would take the attitude that the amount of Canadian coinage current in the United States should be increased. They would probably take the same view as was taken by my predecessor, namely, that it is advisable that Canadian coinage should find its way out of the United States, in order that the United States Government might have the advantage of the circulation of American coinage there.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this $15,000 a fair payment for the services rendered?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is the amount paid out, according to this statement, on the commission basis, and, of course, no more is paid out than is required under that arrangement.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it confined to American silver, nickel and copper coinage?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think so.

Governor General's Secretary's office; salaries, $25,600.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is an increase there.

Mr. REID: Only the statutory increases, which come automatically.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery—salaries, including Mr. Fred. Cook, assistant King's Printer and Controller of Stationery, at $4,000, $70,662.50

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does that include the printing of the electoral lists of the past year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is simply for officers under the head of Civil Government; printing is a separate item.

Department of the Interior—salaries, $1,171,655; contingencies, $120,000.

Mr. ROCHE: The number of officials is the same.

Mr. OLIVER: While the vote and the number of officials are the same as last year, merely with the statutory increases, I think that the minister will admit that in view of the falling off of the business of the department that has occurred, there might have been occasion found of permitting the staff at any rate to decrease, as it must necessarily decrease, from natural causes. I would not suggest dismissal, but it seems to me that the circumstances of the past year or two have been such that the head office staff might have been allowed to decrease rather than to keep up to the former standard.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not see how we could very well do that. A great many of the officials of the inside service in the Department of the Interior have enlisted and gone to the front. Some of these positions we have not filled but at the same time the salaries of these officials go on. I do not see how it would be possible to reduce the staff.

Mr. OLIVER: The explanation of the minister is that the number of officials actually rendering service in the department has been decreased by enlistment.

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that common to all the other departments? Do the officials who have gone on active service retain their salaries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, that is the rule.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that to continue?

Mr. REID: That applies to all those who enlisted up to the 1st November.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the minister sure that is the rule?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have been told that in the case of some individuals who have offered to enlist the information given to them is that they will have to relinquish their salaries while they are serving.

Mr. HAZEN: That was the rule up to the 1st November.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the rule now?

Mr. HAZEN: An individual can only enlist with the permission of the head of the department, who decides whether his services can be dispensed with. If his services can be dispensed with and he enlists he will be paid an amount equal to the difference between his military pay and the pay he was receiving in the department, so that he will get the full amount of the pay he was receiving in the department.

Mr. GRAHAM: Suppose his military pay is greater?

Mr. HAZEN: Then the department does not pay him anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How is it in regard to many thousands of young men who are engaged in the outside service, and who, to all intents and purposes, are permanent employees? Are they to be treated in the same way?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same rule prevails.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is my hon. friend sure of that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It does in my department.

Mr. REID: It does in the Department of Customs.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I know a young man who has been informed that if he enlists his salary will absolutely stop.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, this will take place, as it has taken place in one case in my own department. There must be some authority in the department itself who will judge as to whether it is possible

to dispense with the services of a civil servant or not, and if the civil servant is an indispensable one, as in many cases he is, he does not then get the consent of the minister. In that case, not having the consent, if he enlists he does not get the same treatment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then am I right in saying that instead of their pay being allowed to go on they receive a portion of their pay sufficient to make what they get equal to their former salary, and that the same rule now prevails in regard to the outside and the inside service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I understood the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that the new arrangement was made on the 1st November. Was it the first of last November?

Mr. HAZEN: The first of last November.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the Minister of the Interior be good enough at some later date to lay on the table a list of the employees of the Department of the Interior, inside service, who have transferred to the overseas force, with the ranks they hold, the different units they belong to, and the positions they hold in the department?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to say a word about the enlistment of civil servants. I know of a few cases, not very many, where the head of the department has not seen his way clear to grant certain officials permission to enlist. Like others who have applied to enlist, and who, for various reasons, have been rejected, these men are labouring under a little disability among their fellows, who think that they have not shown any intention of enlisting. I know some who have not made application for enlistment because they have been informed by the head of the department that they were believed to be indispensable. If some method could be adopted, either through their association or otherwise, of letting it be known that these gentlemen had offered their services and that they had not been allowed to enlist, it would relieve them from the effects of the feeling on the part of some of their fellows that they had not offered to enlist.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In my own department there are two cases of that kind. My private secretary was very anxious to enlist and go to the front. To me he was indispensable, and I thought I was doing some service to the country in carrying on the business that fell to my department. I therefore tried to persuade him that he was doing just as good service in remaining and assisting me as he would be doing if he went to the front. I offered to give him a letter to that effect, and I have made it public as far as it was necessary to do so. Another case of the same kind took place, and I offered to give this young man a letter which he could show to his friends. There has been some talk of having an armlet or some kind of distinctive badge to show that a man had offered his services, even if they had not been accepted. But I do not think any general application has been made for that idea to be put in practice in Canada. It is done in Britain, however.

Mr. GRAHAM: A young man who has offered to enlist and been rejected on account of being physically unfit would hesitate to wear a badge of that kind.

I suppose we shall have an opportunity of discussing the question of immigration. In regard to passengers crossing from the United States into Canada, the department has adopted a plan which is very convenient to the passenger, but which strikes me as not being quite efficient under the present conditions. For instance, a passenger from New York to Montreal or Ottawa is given a blank to fill in before he retires, so that the immigration officer will not have to rouse him out for inspection. That is a convenience to the passenger, and under ordinary circumstances, it would be sufficient protection; but at the present time, when it is very important that a great deal of care should be exercised with regard to those who are crossing the border, it seems to me that the present system is hardly adequate. I have often heard passengers on the train say, "I do not know how to fill this out," and get somebody else to fill it out for them, and then they would sign it. That might be all right in some cases, but in another case it might allow an undesirable to get across the border. He could get some other person to fill out the blank, and could go to his berth, and would not be aroused during the night. Does it not strike my hon. friend that at this particular time, when it is so important that undesirables should not be allowed to cross the border, even passengers might be inconvenienced for the sake of a stricter inspection. I think the present system allows an undesirable to get across the line if he has sufficient ingenuity.

Mr. ROCHE: I did not expect a question of this kind would come up on Civil Government Estimates. I may say that complaints have been made to me that the travelling public are put to a great deal of inconvenience by the officers requiring them to answer these questions. Some hon. members of this House have objected strenuously to filling in these blanks, and have urged that the regulations be relaxed, as they were a source of great annoyance. I am convinced that our boundary inspection is much more rigid than it was prior to the outbreak of war. However, I will bring before the Superintendent of Immigration the point raised by my hon. friend, and see whether we can in any way meet his wishes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know the present system is a great convenience to the passenger. Sometimes, however, I myself have wondered why I should fill in the blanks, as no doubt have other hon. members. But there is no difficulty in filling them out so far as I am concerned, except that I invariably omit my age, which I suppose I should not do. In one or two cases I have had my own suspicions of people crossing the border so easily on the train. They simply filled in the blanks and retired, either to the drawing room or a lower berth, and were not disturbed at all. I think the present system leaves an opening for an undesirable to get in.

Mr. ROCHE: Most of the undesirables do not travel in that style.

Mr. GRAHAM: The dangerous kind travels in style.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have had my attention directed on more than one occasion to the matter referred to by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). Usually it has been in terms of most outspoken complaint of the inconvenience occasioned to people of Canadian birth and residence by having to fill in these slips supplied by the Immigration Department. It seems to me that it is more or less a formal matter, and serves no useful purpose. I have heard complaints of this system by numerous people. Furthermore, most men fill in these blanks in the most casual fashion, very often omitting to answer some of the questions, and treating the whole thing lightly, if not as a joke. If any undesirable wished to gain access to Canada I do not think these slips would interpose any formidable obstacle, because the undesirable would fill in the blanks just as a great number of Canadians fill them in to-day, namely, in any such fashion as occurs to them. I do not look on these slips, therefore, as a safeguard against undesirable immigration. As far as I myself am concerned, they are an unmitigated nuisance, and I know I am expressing the opinion of the great majority of the travelling public in Canada when I say that. It may be that these slips serve some useful statistical purpose, and that compilations are made from these returns. But they do, undoubtedly, cause the people of this country a very great deal of trouble, and are looked upon as more or less of a farce by the railway companies who give them to the travelling public for the purpose of having them filled in. I do not desire to object to the system, because when a system is in force I suppose it serves some useful purpose, but I do not think it is in the public interest that any greater trouble should be given to the travelling public.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It would seem that stricter regulations are required at the present time. No doubt it is important to keep track of the people who come across the border. I notice by this morning's papers that some fifty writs have been issued in the case of San Francisco people who had plotted to come across the Canadian border and blow up bridges and tunnels, and commit other depredations. If the present system is not efficient I think the Minister of the Interior should take some steps to improve it.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police: salaries and contingencies, $22,350.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The increase is due to statutory increases only; the number of employees is the same.

Mr. OLIVER: Who is the Comptroller now?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Fortescue.

Office of the Auditor General: salaries and contingencies, $150,650.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a decrease here.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have often thought that in regard to the Auditor General we are perhaps not sufficiently generous. In saying this I am speaking entirely on my own responsibility, as I have never in my life had a word about the matter with this gentleman. The position of the Auditor

General is somewhat different from that of any other official in the employment of the Government; he is subject to Parliament, and, as I understand, he receives the salary provided by statute for a deputy minister. I am not saying that his work is more arduous than that of a deputy minister, but his responsibility is perhaps greater than that of any other official of the country. At present he does not get as large a salary as some of the deputy ministers, who receive additions to their salaries through some other employment or in some other way. If we are to get the best man for this responsible position, we ought to make the salary a little higher than that which appertains to a deputy minister, or a least as high as the salary received at present by any deputy minister. I have thought of this matter a great many times, but this is the first opportunity I have had of presenting it when this estimate has come up. If any man ought to be well paid for the able and conscientious manner in which he performs his duties, that man is the Auditor General, and Parliament ought to give him a higher salary than the salary which he has received heretofore and which, I believe, is $5,000, the salary given to a deputy minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I agree with my hon. friend as to the qualities which should be possessed by an Auditor General and as to the responsibility which he assumes in discharging his duties; but I should not like to say that his duties are more arduous or his responsibilities greater than those of deputy heads of some of the departments. He, of course, has the responsibility of checking all expenditures; his audit is what is called a post-audit; that is to say, the business of the country is carried on, the necessary entries made, and then the Auditor General checks up and inquires into transactions, if he sees fit, with a view to making to Parliament his report, which, of course, is of supreme importance in our constitutional system. I am quite sure that there are some departmental heads whose duties are or ought to be quite as arduous and as responsible as those of the Auditor General, but I will agree with my hon. friend to this extent —and I am now expressing my own opinion —that practically all the high-class officials that we have occupying positions of responsibility as deputies and as assistant deputies in the several departments are not paid as they should be; I would not like to say that all of them are underpaid because that would be rather a sweeping assertion. Take for instance, my own department. I doubt very much if there is a financial institution in this country in which there is greater responsibility devolving upon officials than devolves upon the officials of the Department of Finance. During the past year my deputy minister and my assistant deputy minister—and I am quite sure this is not confined to my department but common to many departments,—have had very heavy responsibilities placed upon their shoulders and have had an immense amount of detail work which could not be handed over to others. I make the general statement that the public officials of my department, since this war has broken out, have been engaged almost day and night, and frequently Sunday and Saturday, in the discharge of their duties. The people are not aware of these things and I think they should be aware of them. My sympathies are usually with the civil servants, because it chanced that once I was in municipal employment and I know that very frequently the Civil Service is a target for a good deal of criticism, in some cases, no doubt, just criticism, but in others not well founded. One thing with which I have been impressed since I have come to Ottawa—and I think it is my duty to state it publicly—is the willingness with which the members of the Civil Service respond to the demands made upon them. I am speaking only of my own department, but I believe the same is true of all the other departments. In my department the employees have been ready, literally day and night, to carry on their duties; they have never shrunk from any task set before them.

A year ago last fall I was requested as Minister of Finance to take charge of a very large amount of gold consigned to Ottawa for the credit of the Bank of England. Hon. members and the public generally are not aware, but I am aware, of the enormous amount of work that devolved upon certain of my officials at the periods when that gold was being received and at other periods when it was being sent out. It was work of the most responsible kind, and it was done with the greatest degree of accuracy. I was able not very long ago, to send a report to London dealing with the handling of considerably over a hundred million dollars worth of gold which had to be weighed down to

fractions of an ounce, and I was able to say that in the handling of that gold there was a variation of the most fractional character. In other words, it was done with as great skill as could have been exercised in connection with such work.

Let me mention another thing. In addition to the routine work, which has been heavy, and the responsibility which has devolved especially since the outbreak of the war in connection with matters of finance, we have floated, as the House knows, a loan of $50,000,000 which was afterwards increased to $100,000,000.

The securities were in denominations of $100, $500 and $1,000. There were some 25,000 individual subscribers. And, notwithstanding that we made use of the services of some 3,000 branch banks of Canada, an account had to be kept in my department with each subscriber and of the bonds by number. I had some experience in connection with flotations when I was in business life, and I had then as good a staff, I think, as any man in Canada—I always stand by my staff. Yet I do not believe that any financial institution in the Dominion, no matter how great, could have handled that loan any better, in fact I do not think they could have handled it as well, as it was handled by the staff of the Finance Department. I am not paying any compliment to myself because I, as minister, simply supervised the issue in a general way; the compliment I am paying is to the staff, and I speak in appreciation of their work in connection with that loan as well as of the energy and the high sense of duty they displayed in the heavy work and responsibility which devolved upon them. I think it only due to the staff and to those in charge of the several branches that I should make this statement. And I have no doubt that ministers in charge of other departments could say the same thing. It is well known that the officials engaged in the Militia Department—to take that as an example—have worked literally night and day, Sunday and Saturday, since the outbreak of this war. Very heavy duties have been thrown upon these men, and very heavy responsibilities as well. If we were dealing with this matter on a business basis, or even on a basis of common fairness, I think the Government might well consider later on whether it would not be proper, just, and fair, that some remuneration should be made to these men who have put forth such efforts, and who have so untiringly devoted themselves to their duties since the outbreak of the war. The same thing, I am sure, can be said of other departments. It is not necessary to enlarge upon this further, the point is, that men in charge of many departments of Government have heavy duties and responsibilities. And, in my opinion, they are not overpaid—many of them, I am satisfied, are underpaid. But we are at war. Men are giving up their civil occupations and are going to the front, making great sacrifices for the common cause. Therefore, notwithstanding the undoubted fact that men in many departments of the public service are underpaid for the services which they have performed since the outbreak of the war, it is not regarded as expedient that salaries should be raised at this particular time. I agree with my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) that the man placed in the high and responsible position of Auditor General should be paid a proper salary. All our salaries in the higher grades of the service are on the basis of a situation that existed many years ago. Some day the situation will have to be revised. I certainly do not depreciate in any way the work of the Auditor General or the responsibilities of his position, but I think it only fair to the heads of some branches that I should put in a word with a view to informing the House of the work they are doing, and of the fact that, in my opinion at least, they are not overpaid.

Mr. TURRIFF: On what ground is the Deputy Minister of Justice paid $10,000 a year, when many other deputy ministers are paid only $5,000?

Mr. HAZEN: When the salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice was increased, it was provided that, in consideration of that increase, he should argue cases on behalf of the Crown before the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Canada, for which service counsel had been retained up to that time. The result is that, although there is an increase in the salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice, there is a saving to the country of thousands of dollars formerly paid to counsel whose services are now performed by the deputy minister.

Mr. TURRIFF: But while the Deputy Minister of Justice is in the Old Country, attending the Privy Council, or at the Supreme Court here, the work of the department goes on, and it must be done by somebody else. I understand that the Deputy Minister of Justice has the

privilege of taking outside cases—or had, up to a year or two ago.

Mr. HAZEN: Up to the time of this increase.

Mr. TURRIFF: He does not do that now?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: Such instances as this have been the cause of dissatisfaction in the Civil Service for years past. It is an invidious treatment of some deputy ministers as compared with others, for some deputy ministers, for some little reason or other, are paid more than the ordinary salary of a deputy minister. I am not complaining of this Government more than of their predecessors in this matter, for the same practice has been followed for years. But it seems to me to be wrong. There should be a fixed salary for deputy ministers, and all should be paid the same amount. If the excuse be made that some are not as able men as others, the answer is that such men should not be in such positions. The present state of affairs is not satisfactory, and as long as it continues it will be a cause of irritation in the service.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Reference has been made to the war loan floated by the Minister of Finance. If I am in order I should like to ask whether the minister has considered providing means whereby duplicates can be given to people who lose their bonds by fire or accident. I have heard of two cases, and I have no doubt there will be many others, for these bonds are scattered all over Canada, and many of them are held by people who do not have safes in which to keep them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is probably aware that in this issue, as in many others, there are two kinds of securities. There is, first, the bearer bond with coupons. This is what is called a negotiable security. It passes from hand to hand and the party who holds it, in ordinary course, has a good title though some of his predecessors in title may have found the bond or even stolen it. It is payable to bearer, both as to principal and as to interest. It is usual to provide that bearer bonds may be registered as to principal. That is, the name of the owner may be written upon the back of the bond, and in such case no one can deal with the principal of the bond except the person whose name is so written. But the coupons in such a case are not less negotiable than before. So, in the case of the ordinary registered bonds, the principal can be dealt with only by the registered owner, while the coupons pass from hand to hand as if the bonds had not been registered. A record is kept in the department of registered bonds, showing the owner of each bond. When the owner desires to transfer his title to another, he does it by power of attorney, in which case either the name of the new owner is entered upon the back of the bond, or the bond is made payable to bearer. In the latter case its complete negotiability is restored.

There is another kind of bond, which forms a considerable part of the recent domestic war loan. These bonds are registered both as to principal and to interest; they are registered bonds without coupons. In other words, the name of the owner appears upon the bond and in the books of the Finance Department. If the owner of a registered bond loses his bond, he can readily get a new one from the Finance Department. Nobody else could make use of lost bonds of this kind if he found them or stole them, because, as I have said, they are registered both as to principal and to interest. In the case of the former bond, if it were lost and a diligent search failed to disclose its whereabouts, the owner would be required to file a bond by a reliable indemnity or guarantee company guaranteeing the Government against any loss through the issue of a new bond. Upon a satisfactory bond of indemnity or guarantee being filed with the department, setting forth the facts with respect to the loss of the bond and guaranteeing the Government against its turning up in the hands of some innocent person who would acquire a good title, this new bond issues.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does my hon. friend say it is a matter of law that a stolen bond gives title to the thief?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not to the thief. I say that a bearer bond has the quality of negotiability, under decisions. I can refer my hon. friend to some decisions; he will find them in Palmer's Company Law. In that work two or three leading cases are cited, in which it was decided that the character of negotiability attached to a bond payable to bearer.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I refer to stolen bonds.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that in a moment. The quality of negotia-

bility means this: That a man who has a bearer bond, which he has acquired in good faith—even from a party who has acquired it not in good faith—takes title. Suppose the holder of a bearer bond has it stolen from him; there is no question that the thief has not good title to that bond. But if the thief goes on the open market and sells that bond, which may be a listed bond, to A, B or C, who take it without knowledge of the fact that it has been stolen, then A, B or C take good title to that bond, because it has the character of negotiability to which I have referred.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has a member of Parliament the right to purchase any of these bonds?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Has he the money?

Mr. GRAHAM: Speaking for some of us, no; but has a member of Parliament, under the Independence of Parliament Act, the right to buy these bonds?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Just the same, I think, as he has the right to buy a ticket on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was my view that there was nothing to prevent his purchasing them, though I was talking the other day to a gentleman who entertained quite the opposite view. I think it is well that the Prime Minister is assured on that point.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is my impression.

Civil Government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board, salaries, $138,125.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the minister explain the large increase?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is an increase of five assistants in subdivision B of the second division. I have mentioned the loan, and the additional duties which have devolved upon the department; the appointments which have been made during the past year have been absolutely necessary in order to carry on the work of the department.

Department of Customs—salaries, $328,307.50.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the Department of Customs stopped dismissing officials? Is there any record of dismissals during the last year?

Hon. J. D. REID: We stopped that long ago.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. REID: The increases are the ordinary statutory increases required by law.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $163,450.

Mr. MARCIL: This is a very large increase here.

Hon. E. L. PATENAUDE: There is no increase except the statutory increases and the addition of a few clerks on account of the increase in the regular work of the department. We brought one very valuable officer from Montreal to Ottawa in order to avoid travelling expenses, and we have had to add three clerks owing to the increase of the work. Then we find that we require seventeen analysts instead of nine. That is also on account of the increase in work.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is the revenue of the department as compared with the last few years?

Mr. PATENAUDE: I cannot give the exact figures, but I understand it has increased during the last year or the present fiscal year.

Mr. TURRIFF: The revenue is not as great as it was some years ago. Here we have an increase of $20,000. That seems to call for very definite explanation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That could be given on the ordinary estimates. My hon. friend has perhaps overlooked the fact that the administration of the war taxes in respect of stamps, etc., devolves upon the Department of Inland Revenue and some additions to the staff were necessary on that account.

Mr. MARCIL: Were all of these appointments made according to the Civil Service Act, or was that Act ignored?

Mr. PATENAUDE: These appointments were made under the Civil Service Act. There are very few temporary employees in the inside service.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the minister lay on the Table the names and salaries of the new employees?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Yes.

Department of Agriculture—salaries, $467,612.50; contingencies, $100,000.

Mr. HAZEN: In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, who we all regret is unable to be in the House and will

be unable for some little time, I have been asked to make this statement with regard to the Civil Government Estimates of that department:

So far as Deputy Minister, 1st division, subdivision A, 1st division, subdivision B, and 2nd division, subdivision A, are concerned, the items remain as in last years's estimates, with the addition of the usual statutory increases.

Second division, subdivision B.—An increase of five clerkships to provide for probable appointments made necessary by the constant expansion of the purely agricultural work of the department. Such appointments are, as a rule, made in this subdivision. It may also become necessary to appoint additional patent examiners who are now temporarily employed under the War Measures Act in the place of those who have gone overseas.

Third division, subdivision A.—Same as last year's estimates.

Third division, subdivision B.—An increase of twelve clerkships to provide for permanent clerks, mostly stenographers and typists, in lieu of temporary clerks now employed.

Messengers and packers.—Four vacancies to provide for permanent appointments in lieu of temporary lower grade men now employed.

Allowance for private secretary.—Same as last year's estimates.

Contingencies.—Same as last year's estimates.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries (including Captain L. A. Demers at $3,300), $217,000; contingencies, $49,000.

Mr. HAZEN: There are only two alterations in the Civil Government estimates for the Marine Department. There is one extra official in the first division of subdivision A, Captain L. A. Demers, Wreck Commissioner, transferred from the outside to the inside service at the same salary he is receiving in the outside service, $3,300. This year there are eight messengers instead of nine, as provided for last year. An error seems to have been made in the printing of the Civil Government contingencies estimate. It was my intention to have that reduced by $3,000. I would therefore move that the item of stationery and printing be placed at $13,000 instead of $16,000.

5 p.m.

Mr. SINCLAIR: $25,000 seems a very large item for sundries.

Mr. HAZEN: I have not the figures here, but will give them on the Main Estimates. It is the amount that has been voted each year for sundries in the department.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Department of Naval Service—salaries, $176,050; contingencies, $50,000.

Mr. HAZEN: The total number of clerks provided for in the fiscal year 1916-17 is 126, an increase of one over the fiscal year 1915-16. The total amount is $176,050, an increase of $5,450. These estimates do not provide for any new appointments or promotions. They show an increase of one clerk in subdivision A of the third division, which is to provide for the salary of a translator who was transferred from the Marine Department, and who should have been included in last year's estimates. The estimate provides for the usual annual increases authorized by statute, and there are no new appointments or promotions. The item for contingencies is the same as last year, and covers all office expenses, travelling expenses, stationery, telegrams, and the services of any temporary clerks required.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is there any suggestion that this department should be abolished?

Mr. HAZEN: Not at the present time.

Department of Railways and Canals—salaries (including chief engineer at $5,000), $175,712.50; contingencies, $28,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the chief engineer?

Hon. J. D. REID: Mr. W. A. Bowden.

Mr. GRAHAM: All through these estimates of Civil Government we find a certain amount including a stated name. I can understand the estimates being worded in this way if the idea is to get over the Civil Service Act and name some person in these estimates, which, when passed, become a statute; but why Mr. Bowden, who is an old official of the department, should thus be singled out and named I do not understand.

Mr. REID: At page 23 my hon. friend will see it simply says chief engineer.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Marine brought in the wreck commissioner from the outside service to the inside service, so I can understand it being done in that case.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think it is only a matter of wording; I do not see why it should be there at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Bowden has been chief engineer of the Railway Department for years. He is a prominent official and has been for a good many years, and is a very able man. Unless there is some special reason for doing it I think it is quite out of place to insert the words "chief engineer" in this estimate.

Mr. REID: I agree with the hon. gentleman that, unless there is some good reason, it should not be mentioned, but I take it for granted that this is the same wording that has been followed for a number of years. As the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) is busy in his office this afternoon, I will later let the hon. member know when his estimates will come up. I remember that for some years there was an item in the estimates with the wording "Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer."

Mr. GRAHAM: That was different.

Mr. REID: I admit that, but the deputy minister's salary was in the inside service. Whether the chief engineer comes within the inside service or not I do not know, but perhaps it is because of some statutory provision that he is mentioned in the item.

Mr. GRAHAM: You do not say, in the vote of the Public Works Department, "including the chief architect," or "including the chief engineer." The reason for the wording of this item, no doubt, is that some few years ago Mr. Butler occupied the dual position of deputy minister and chief engineer, and, in order to make it plain that he was occupying that dual position for which he got more than a deputy's salary, it was mentioned in the vote.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is probably a survival.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may be, but it ought to be corrected, because the chief engineer is a permanent employee of the department.

Department of Public Works—salaries, $579,510; contingencies, $85,000.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) asked me to say to the committee that the increase of $9,675 is caused by statutory increases only.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like a statement of the promotions which have been made in the department in the various classes during the year.

Mr. REID: It will be brought down.

Mr. MARCIL: I have been informed that good officials have been overlooked and that newcomers have been promoted very rapidly. I think that information should be given to the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may not be out of place to say a word in commendation of what the staff of the Public Works Department have done during the past few days. This is a very busy department anyway, and the activity and ability which they have displayed in establishing us in this new home with conveniences such as we have at the present time is very creditable to the officers of the department. We cannot do less than show that we appreciate the work they have done in such a few hours.

Mr. MARCIL: I have no doubt that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) read last night the interview given by Senator Edwards to one of the papers as to the present condition of the old Parliament Buildings. He has expressed the opinion, and this has been confirmed by those who have visited the ruins, that the Government will find that the damage done is less than was expected. I hope that further consideration will be given to the subject, and that inquiry will be made as to whether it will be possible to utilize the old building.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, after consultation with his colleagues, has appointed two capable architects to make an examination of the walls and to report as to the possibility of their being utilized. Even if they should be utilized, I think there is a great deal of question as to whether the new building should be made to conform in several respects to the plan of the old building. It seemed to me that it could be greatly improved. At all events, when the report of the architects has been received, the Minister of Public Works will make a statement to the House in order that the discussion suggested by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition may take place, and that the Government may have the advantage of the views of hon. members in regard to the course that should be adopted.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the Prime Minister have any objection to saying who the two architects are?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Pearson of Toronto and Mr. Marchand of Montreal, together with the staff of the Public Works Department.

Post Office Department—salaries, $819,375; contingencies, $125,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: There is no increase in

the number of employees. The increase of $11,660 is to provide for statutory increases.

Mr. GRAHAM: This vote is for the inside service only?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have heard that the outside service has been greatly increased in spots.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Department of Trade and Commerce—salaries, $122,312.50; contingencies, $15,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have made an arrangement with reference to the two branches of this department, and the result is that we provide more help at a little decrease in the total amount. In the Department of Trade and Commerce proper there is a decrease of one officer, and in the Census and Statistics Branch there is an increase of three. The total increase in the number of employees is two, but the amount required for payment is a little less than it was last year. The increase in the Census and Statistics Branch is due to the making permanent of a number of officials who have been employed on the tabulation work of the last census. We have made them permanent so that we might avail ourselves of their experience and previous work in carying out the quinquennial census for the Western Provinces, which work is now under way.

High Commissioner's Office, London—salaries, $18,450; contingencies, $32,588.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not wish to be too inquisitive, but could the Government give us any information as to the permanent appointee to this position? Is the gentleman who is performing the duties of that office at the present time permanently appointed, or only temporarily? Rumours have been afloat for a long time as to the probability of us losing an hon. member of the Government. In fact, at one time there was quite a discussion as to which one it would be; but I think the finger of choice now points to but one member. As it seems that the term of Parliament is to be extended, and that we shall not be having an election for the present, it strikes me that an appointment might be made to this office, which has been in the public mind more or less for some months. Could the Government give us any information without divulging any Cabinet secrets?

[Mr. Casgrain.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As there are no secrets to divulge, it is very easy indeed to answer my hon. friend. At the present time the duties of the High Commissioner are being discharged by a member of the Canadian Government, who has been resident in London since about June, 1914. Those duties have been adequately and efficiently discharged by Sir George Perley, and we have found his presence in London as a member of the Government to be of very great advantage in the necessary co-operation between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada —co-operation more necessary than ever during the war. The arrangement, which would have terminated in the autumn of 1914, had it not been for the outbreak of war, has been continued with that marked advantage ever since, and so long as the war continues I see no reason for suggesting any change in that respect.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This item does not include the High Commissioner's salary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The salary is not paid, as there is no occupant of the position. Sir George Perley is in London as a member of the Canadian Government. While there he is discharging the duties of the office of High Commissioner, but he is there primarily as a member of the Canadian Government.

General Consulting Engineer to Dominion Government—salaries, $7,600; contingencies, $150.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What department is that engineer in?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He is not in any particular department, but reports to the Minister of Railways and to the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, is it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. I think the arrangements under which he carries on his duties were initiated under the late Administration.

Civil Service Commission—Salaries, $32,587.50; contingencies, $15,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: On previous occasions there has been a good deal of discussion about the Civil Service Commission. Has the personnel of the commission been changed at all during the year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: The personnel not having been changed, I presume that the Government has confidence in the commission. I wonder whether the Minister of Customs has apologized to the Chairman of the Board for the attack of last year.

Mr. REID: Not at all. I do not take back one word of what I said. I should like to add some more to it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not see, then, how the Government can collectively have confidence in the commission, and either they should change the commission, or the Minister of Customs should apologise to the chairman, or resign from the Government. I do not see how he can belong to a Government which has confidence in a commission in whose chairman the minister has not confidence. Personally, I think the commision has had a pretty hard row to hoe in many ways. I have differed with the chairman of the commission myself, but never in the language and tones of the Minister of Customs. I think the work of the commission is satisfactory on the whole. I have heard that they have been overridden a good many times during the past year in their attempts to keep within the four corners of the Civil Service Act. I hope that is not true. I know the Minister of Customs would override the commission if he could; but I hope that the Government, instead of overriding the commission or endeavouring to get around the statute, will comply with it. It would be far better to improve the weak points of the Act than continually to appoint members to the Civil Service in violation of it. If I remember correctly, it is section 21 that proves most convenient to ministers who wish to evade the spirit of the Act. But there is a danger that they may go too far in applying that clause, which has reference to special or technical knowledge. I am glad the Government did not pay any attention to the Minister of Customs, and kept the commission intact.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Speaking in the House last year upon the subject to which my hon. friend has directed attention, I ventured the opinion that probably the observations which were made by the member of the commission alluded to had been based upon the newspaper report of a certain return, and not upon the return itself. The gentleman in question came to me afterwards, and told me frankly that my conjecture in that regard was entirely correct, namely, that he had based his observations upon the newspaper reports, and he admitted in a very frank and manly way that he should have looked at the return itself before he made his observations. Doubtless any Civil Service Commission is liable to have more or less difficulties with any Administration. I do not imagine that the Civil Service Commission has, within the same period, had many more difficulties with the present Government than it had with our predecessors. If some advantage has been taken of the section to which my hon. friend has alluded, I am very much afraid that my colleagues in the Government have learned a lesson in that regard from the example of their predecessors. I agree entirely, however, that while we have a Civil Service Act, it is most desirable that we should conform with its terms, and make no attempt to stretch its provisions, or to use it for purposes which were not within the contemplation of Parliament at the time the Act was passed.

Mr. MARCIL: To my knowledge, Section 21 has been interpreted in several ways. When I was Speaker, translation was declared to be non-technical. It has since been declared to be technical, and a large number of appointments have been made in that way; not only to the House of Commons staff, but to the staff generally. As to the personnel of the commission, if I remember rightly, a statute was passed about two years ago authorizing the appointment of a third member of the commission. That statute, however, seems to be a dead letter. In answer to a question put by me last year, the Government replied that there was no chairman of the commission; that both commissioners were on an equal footing. I think both members of the commission are hard working men, and that they have had a more strenuous time than they expected when they were appointed. Does the Prime Minister intend to complete this commission, or is the statute to remain a dead letter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think I was asked that same question both last session and the session before, and I give the same answer now that I gave then, namely, that we thought it was desirable to make some amendments to the Civil Service Act, that other matters in regard to it were under consideration, and that, pending those amendments, we thought it unnecessary to make the additional appointment. My hon. friend is quite correct in his

appreciation of the status of the two commissioners.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): I should like to say a few words touching the Civil Service as regards the qualifying tests. I always laboured under the idea that a list was made of the names of candidates who came within the required number of marks, and that they had not to qualify further subsequently.

Only lately have I found out my mistake. It seems that all who come up for examination are put aside after there is found a sufficient number to fill the vacancies. To me this method of preference is altogether unfair. How does it work? Here are young men who have obtained more than the bare percentage of marks required. Yet if there be no position for them they are cast aside. They forfeit the fees they paid, and no more attention is given them than if they had never come up for examination.

In my opinion the system is unfair and should be changed. I should suggest, as a possible remedy, that a list be kept of all the successful candidates, and that they be not required, two or three years later, to pass further examinations.

It may be that some plausible justification of such a course can be found, but I fail to see any. Many complaints have come to me from young men in such a situation. I inquired the reason of their having been refused positions in the service. Their invariable reply was that they did not know. How could they know, when I myself, after five years in this House, and after ceaseless attempts to get information, am still in the dark. One of the Civil Service Commissioners informed me that of the successful candidates only the number required to fill the vacancies received consideration.

I hold that a change ought to be made. Among those who are rejected in this way some may be found who are as competent as those who secure employment. Yet they have to qualify once more, and undergo tests which are often very difficult, particularly for the first division of the Service, as well as for the second and third. It is most unfair to require of these young men to qualify anew on matters concerning which two or three years previously, when fresh from their schooling, they had successfully undergone the test.

I wish to discuss another question. My remarks, I feel certain, will not agree with a certain section of the people. I refer to the employment of girls in the Civil Service. In my opinion there are far too many in the departments. For a number of years some young women in the Service have been earning salaries reaching to a thousand, twelve hundred, fifteen hundred and even up to two thousand four hundred dollars. Those positions could be filled with advantage by young men who would willingly accept work at such salaries, come to Ottawa and become heads of families. To my mind the system is ridiculous to the utmost.

Those girls, if debarred from Government positions, would be none the worse for it; they would become mothers of families, and thus the best interests of the country would be served. My four years' experience as member has brought home to me that those young ladies who receive large salaries are not anxious to marry. They prefer their salaries to household duties. Yet in motherhood they would be of much greater utility to their country. The Civil Service Commission might possibly do something to improve the situation. The matter, however, rests with the Government, and I appeal to the ministers who are now in office to bring about a change.

As I have only just stated, objection will be taken to my remarks in certain quarters, but I am speaking in the general interest.

There is another point on which I would insist particularly. In my opinion the number of French-Canadians appointed every year in the public service falls short of its due proportion, when the French-Canadian population is taken into account. Is it not beyond belief that in certain departments there is not a competent staff of translators?

My object is not to cast any blame on the present Government. Similar conditions have long prevailed in the Service. It existed during the previous Administration, and it goes on to-day, because we have not sufficiently nursed the sore; we have failed to insist on having in the departments a fair proportion of French-Canadians.

Last year I called the attention of the House to the fact that in the one department, on a total of ninety employees, only two were French-Canadian. I think it is unfair.

When we have dealings with the public officials we can hardly find any to understand us in French. In a room where are

to be found ten or twelve clerks, if information is sought in the French language, those clerks look askance at one another and appear to be at sea. It would seem, indeed, that our enquiries were made in Austrian or German.

If the Civil Service Commission cannot cope with the situation I call upon the Government to deal with the matter. Not the messengers only should be competent to speak French, but the higher officials as well. If such were the case there would be no renewal of the incident that happened a few days ago at the Department of Public Works, where a certain gentleman by the name of Narroway dismissed a French-Canadian because the latter spoke in French. It is sad for a French-Canadian to be told: No French spoken here, get out!

Again I say that the Cabinet is not to be blamed for those conditions. The incident I referred to may be accounted for by the narrow-mindedness of the individual whose name is Narroway, but who would more properly bear the name of Narrow-minded. I have about done with the remarks I intended to make on the Civil Service Commission.

Before resuming my seat I shall again insist on the fact that too large a number of women are employed in the Civil Service. I want the matter to be understood in its proper light. There are too many of these young ladies in the public service, who earn large salaries, and who, instead of putting their money to a proper use, such as depositing it in the bank, or spending it to help their families, squander it in dress, so that it is of no benefit to any person, or to the country.

Departments Generally—Contingencies—care and cleaning of Departmental Buildings, including amount of $50 each to E. Snowden and W. H. Jeffery for firing noon gun, $220,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is an increase here of $45,000. I had not expected to go on this afternoon, and so I have not the details of this increase before me; but my deputy explains that it is made in view of the occupation of the new Customs building in Ottawa, and possibly some other buildings as well. Of course, the House will understand, we are not bound to spend this $45,000. We will only spend as much as is necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine it is a matter which we need not discuss at this stage, but it has been proposed that the new customs building should be prepared for the occupation of Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That would make a difference, of course.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would mean that the expenditure would come under another head altogether.

Referring to salaries authorized by statute, especially the item of salaries of ministers, after the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), I am more convinced than ever that the British system of giving different salaries to heads of different departments is not a bad system. I am not sure that it can be worked out in Canada, for it seems difficult to work it out even in the case of deputy ministers, although there is considerable difference in the work of different deputy heads. At the present time, perhaps, we could not make a distinction between the work carried on by the different ministers, although to a person who has studied the situation, there can be no doubt that some heads of departments carry greater burdens and have to work much harder than others. I think that the country is growing so large that the Government will begin to think about the advisability or possibility of a distinction being made. But that is not what I specially wished to refer to. I call attention to the salary of the Solicitor General, $5,000. I understand that the Solicitor General is now a member of the Privy Council, a new departure having been made in that direction last year. Would the Prime Minister give the House an explanation as to how that came about?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Solicitor General is a member of the Privy Council; I think Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, when he was appointed Solicitor General, became a member of the Privy Council. It was thought desirable, in view of his position, and of his being occasionally required to discharge the duties of Minister of Justice, that the Solicitor General should be made a member of the Privy Council. Since becoming a member of the Privy Council he has performed important duties connected with the administration of the Department of Justice, which otherwise he could not very well have performed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Prime Minister has said that the HighCommissioner for Canada in London is a member of the Canadian Government. I note that his salary is covered by this item of $10,000, though it

was not included in the estimate for the High Commissioner's office. I should like to have an explanation as to how this salary is made up, and how it differs from the salary given to members of the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Sir George Perley has been discharging his duties as member of the Canadian Government without portfolio. He is not in receipt of any salary.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But he gets this salary of $10,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. He gets an allowance for expenses, but no salary.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why, then, are we voting him a salary?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The amount was not expended last year, and it will not be expended this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Unless an appointment is made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The amount is voted in view of the possibility that a permanent appointment may be made; but it is not paid to Sir George Perley. Being a member of Parliament, he could not receive the salary unless a change were made in the law.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understand it, Sir George Perley is a member of the Government without portfolio, and consequently he does not get a salary as a member of the Government. His expenses are paid, but his services are gratuitous.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He receives only an allowance for expenses, and even about these he has been more or less sensitive. I have urged him to include certain items of additional expense to which he is subjected, and it was only with the greatest reluctance that he was induced to accept even part of those expenses which I thought were quite reasonable, and which I am sure Parliament would ratify.

Administration of Justice—living allowance for judge of Atlin district, B.C., $1,200.

Mr. MARCIL: Great inconvenience is occasioned by the non-appointment of judges to fill vacancies in the districts of Montreal and Three Rivers. Does the Prime Minister know whether it is the intention to fill these vacancies in the near future?

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is upon the recommendation of the Minister of Justice that such appointments are made, but his unfortunate illness, which has lasted longer than he anticipated, has prevented the bringing of these matters to a head. I anticipate that he will be here to-morrow or Friday at the latest, when, no doubt, he will take up the matters to which my hon. friend has referred.

Legislation—Library of Parliament, $62,200.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it would be wise for us to have some authoritative statement as to the condition of the Library. We have a good report in the press, of course, but I think it would be well to have the statement of the Government as to the condition of the Library since the fire.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite sure whether the librarians have been able up to the present time to make such an examination as would give information of certainty. However, I shall ask the joint librarians to prepare at the earliest possible moment a statement embodying the information which my hon. friend asks for.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it the intention of the Government to have in this building a temporary library for the use of members during the session?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have really not had an opportunity of considering that; I shall bear my hon. friend's suggestion in mind and ascertain whether or not it is practicable. The reading room, I understand, is provided for. I have not heard from the Minister of Public Works as to the practicability of bringing any part of the library into this building. I am afraid that if we did bring part of it here it would probably turn out that the particular books wanted on any occasion were not the books that were here.

Mr. MARCIL: We might have the Hansard and the Statutes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand from the Clerk of the House that arrangements have been made to provide a complete set of Hansard at once, and of the Statutes, as soon as practicable.

Legislation—contingent expenses in connection with the voters' lists, $10,600.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it the intention of the Government to print the voters' lists which are now being compiled for the current year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it would take a great deal more than this amount to print the lists. I cannot remember at the moment that the subject was under consideration, but I shall make inquiry and give the information to my hon. friend.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I notice from an answer given the other day that a number of voters' lists were printed, not in Ottawa, but at various places in the Maritime Provinces. I think that was a departure from the usual way of printing the lists, and I should like to know what proportion were thus printed; the reason for resorting to that method, and if that printing was done by public tender.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will make inquiry and give the information to my hon. friend. The Printing Department has had a great deal of extra work in connection with the war.

Progress reported.

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

Thursday, February 10, 1916.

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

THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE.

MESSAGES OF SYMPATHY.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that I have received the following messages of sympathy:

Paris, 7 février, 1916.

Monsieur le Président de la Chambre des communes du Canada, Ottawa.

J'ai l'honneur de vous exprimer la profonde émotion de la Chambre Française en présence du sinistre qui a détruit le Palais du Parlement canadien. Mes collègues et moi nous nous inclinons avec respect devant les tombes des victimes, et nous adressons à leurs familles nos plus vives sympathies.

Le Président de la Chambre des Députés,
Paul Deschanel.

Translated, the above reads:

Paris, February 7, 1916.

The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada, Ottawa.

I have the honour to express to you the deep emotion of the French House of Deputies in the face of the disaster which has destroyed the Canadian Parliament Buildings. My colleagues and I bow with sorrow before the tombs of the victims, and we beg to address to their families our utmost sympathy.

The President of the Chamber of Deputies,
Paul Deschanel.

The Speaker, House of Commons.

Heartiest sympathy and congratulations escape Mde. Sévigny.

Grey.

London, February 5, 1916.

Speaker, Canadian Parliament, Ottawa.

Deeply regret disaster to Parliament House, and your personal loss. Sincere sympathy.

Speaker Lowther.

Québec, 4 février.

Hon. A. Sévigny, Ottawa, Ont.

Profondes sympathies dans cette terrible et cruelle épreuve pour notre pays. Veuillez faire part de mes sentiments aux ministres, députés et familles des victimes.

Cyrille F. Delage,
Orateur de l'Assemblée Législative,
de la province de Québec.

Translated, the above reads:

Quebec, February 4,

Hon. A. Sévigny.

Sincere sympathy in this terrible and cruel affliction for our country. Please transmit my feelings to the ministers, members and families of the victims.

Cyrille F. Delage.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With the permission of the House, I will read some telegrams which have been received since yesterday:

London, February 8, 1916.

Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Empire Parliamentary Association offer sincere sympathy in appalling disaster and loss of valuable life. Congratulations on your fortunate escape.

Balfour, Chairman.

Montreal, Que., February 8, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

I have the honour to inform you that I have just received a cablegram charging me to present in the name of the Government of the King of Italy the condolences for the loss and destruction of the Dominion House of Commons.

Zunini,
Consul General for Italy.

Capetown, February 9, 1916.

Prime Minister, Ottawa.

The Government and people of the Union of South Africa send you their heartfelt sympathy in your great loss.

Botha.

Rajkot, February 8, 1916.

Premier, Dominion Government,
Ottawa.

Bombay Presidency deeply sympathizes with Canada in her irreparable loss.

Lord Willingdon, Governor.

REPORT OF CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF DOMINION POLICE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was asked yesterday with regard to a report from Col. Sherwood, Chief Commissioner of Do-

minion Police, on the fire which occurred on Thursday last. On the 4th instant Col. Sherwood handed me a report which I did not get in time to bring down on that day, and I have since asked him if he desired to supplement it in any way. He says that it contains all the information with regard to the fire that is available up to the present time. The memorandum is:

Chief Commissioner of Police, Canada,

Ottawa, February 4, 1916.

Memorandum for the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada.

Sergeant Carroll who was in charge of the police on duty at the House of Commons last night, reports that at about 8.45 p.m., fire was discovered in the reading room among papers lying on the shelf of the second reading desk from the House of Commons entrance. Constable Moore was the nearest officer on duty at that point and his attention was called to it by a gentleman whom he recognized as a member, but whose name he cannot recall. The fire at the time he saw it had apparently just started and had not reached serious proportions. He immediately got a fire extinguisher from the Senate side, thereby passing the flame and upon operating it found that it had no retarding effect, because it had gained great headway in that brief space of time. The sergeant and one or two other men had arrived then and got ready the hose that was stationed at the Speaker's door, but the blaze was already coming out from the reading room so that they were compelled to abandon it, and got the hose in operation from the west corridor, while other constables with the caretaker of the Senate reading room had also a line of hose operating from the Senate side, but even then found the smoke so dense that they were unable to get any results and were forced away from that part of the building, by which time the fire brigade had arrived, the police then bent their energies to warning those in rooms and in getting them out of the building, as it was evident that the conflagration was going to be serious.

I regret to say that in addition to the two ladies who died by suffocation in Mr. Speaker's quarters five others are reported missing, and I fear have perished,—

Mr. Law, member of Parliament for Yarmouth, N.S.

Mr. J. B. R. Laplante, assistant clerk, House of Commons.

Mr. Robert Fanning, Post Office Department.

Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, plumber, Public Works Department.

Constable Alphonse Desjardins, Dominion Police Force.

I have no reason to believe the fire was the result of a malicious act, but would suggest that a board of inquiry be constituted to fully investigate all the facts, and if possible to ascertain the true cause.

(Sgd.) A. P. Sherwood,
Chief Commissioner of Police.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Reports of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1915, Vol. 2.—Sir Thomas White.

Orders in Council Nos. P. C. 731, dated April 19, 1915, and P. C. 1168, dated May 21, 1915, setting forth the arrangement between the Federal Government and the Governments of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan respectively in regard to the Royal North-West Mounted Police.—Sir Robert Borden.

MAJOR-GENERAL LESSARD.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is a press despatch this morning to this effect:

Lieut.-Col. Maynard Rogers, of Ottawa, has been appointed temporary staff officer to Major General Lessard.

May I ask what is the mission of Major-General Lessard in England? What position does he occupy and what are his duties?

Sir SAM HUGHES: He has been given leave of absence for three months to visit the troops in England and at the front, in order to perfect his knowledge of military work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He is not on active service then?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why was Col. Maynard Rogers appointed to an official position?

Sir SAM HUGHES: We have no official information of Col. Rogers being appointed to any staff position. I have no hesitation in saying that it was an act of courtesy on the part of our Canadian officers to permit a staff officer to accompany him.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then the appointment of Col. Rogers was made by the Imperial authorities and not by the Canadian authorities?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Imperial authorities have not made the appointment. If any appointment has been made, it has been made by Col. MacDougall, who commands the Canadian troops in England.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Corporation of the City of Brantford.—Mr. Cockshutt.

Bill No. 27, respecting The Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 28, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company and Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 29, respecting certain patents of The Pedlar People Limited.—Mr. William Smith.

Bill No. 30, to incorporate Seaport Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 31, to incorporate The Eastern Canadian Union Conference Corporation of Seventh-day Adventists. — Mr. William Smith.

Bill No. 32, respecting The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EXPORT OF ELECTRICITY.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has an application been made within the last twelve months by or on behalf of the Federal Light and Power Company, or any other company, for permission to export electricity generated in Canada to Detroit?

2. If so, what are the terms of the application?

3. Has permission been granted in any case? If so, on what conditions?

Mr. PATENAUDE: 1, 2 and 3. No.

INSPECTION OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Who did the work of inspection of weights and measures in Rimouski, Gaspé and Bonaventure counties in 1915, and what was the total cost of the work?

2. How many officials were employed as compared with the number employed for this work in 1911?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

Counties.	Officer's Name.	Date of Inspection.	Expenses.
1. Bonaventure	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Gaspé	G. Myles	Sept. 1914	$125.36.
Gaspé	G. Myles	Oct. 1914	$115.66.
Rimouski	A Bernatchez	Sept. 1914	Special railway inspector.

Counties.	Officer's Name.	Date of Inspection.	Expenses.
2. Bonaventure	Nil.	Nil.	
Gaspé	A B. Caldwell	June 1910	
Gaspé	A. B. Caldwell	July 1910	
Rimouski	L. J. Bourget	July 1910	Special railway inspector.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. McCOIG:

1. How many horses from the United States have passed through Canada since August 4 1914?

2. How many horses coming from the United States for military purposes abroad have been detained since the above date?

3. Why were they detained?

4. What was done with them?

5. If sold in Canada, what amount of duty was collected on horses entering Canada since August 4, 1914?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not considered advisable in the public interest that the information asked for in this question should be given at the present time.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many horses have been sold in Toronto by the British Remount Commission?

2. Was the duty paid on these horses in every case? If so, by whom?

3. What is the total sum received in duties?

4. Were all the horses examined by an official veterinary before being offered for sale? If so, were any found unfit for sale in Canada?

5. If any horses were found unfit for sale in Canada, were they either destroyed or deported after examination? If so, how many in each case?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not in the public interest that this question should be answered at this time.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many horses have been sold in Montreal by the British Remount Commission?

2. Was the duty paid on these horses in every case? If so, by whom?

3. What is the total sum received in duties?

4. Were all the horses examined by an official veterinary before being offered for sale? If so, were any found unfit for sale in Canada?

5. If any horses were found unfit for sale in Canada, were they either destroyed or deported

after examination? If so, how many in each case?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not in the public interest that this question should be answered at this time.

Mr. SMITH:

How many horses purchased for Great Britain in the United States have been admitted into Canada during each of the months of November and December, 1915, and January, 1916, and how many of this number have been shipped from Canadian ports?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not in the public interest that this question should be answered at this time.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Did the parties who bought horses for the Government in Prince Edward Island receive any remuneration for their services?

2. If so, what was the nature of the remuneration, and what did it amount to?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1 and 2. W. S. McKie, who purchased 99 horses, $10 per diem, total, $650; Major Thurston, who purchased 2 horses, no remuneration; Lieut. Barry, who purchased 14 horses, no remuneration.

CABLE AND WIRELESS RATES.

*Mr. FRIPP:

1. Is the Government aware that the cable companies operating the lines between Canada and the Mother Country, as also the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company operating between Canada and Ireland, have cancelled or suspended their deferred rates and week-end letters, thereby imposing an extra burden upon Canadian citizens who have sons at the front or in England, and who may desire to communicate with them by telegraph?

2. Has the Board of Railway Commissioners authority over Atlantic or wireless rates?

3. If so, will the Government move the Board of Railway Commissioners to compel the cable companies to restore deferred and week-end letter rates?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The following answer has been received from the Board of Railway Commissioners:

The Board is advised that owing to cable trouble the Canadian Pacific Telegraph are unable to accept week-end and deferred cablegrams. This resulted in the business being turned over to the Great North Western Telegraph Company and the Marconi Wireless Company, which companies were unable to handle. For this reason the Great North Western and the Marconi companies temporarily suspended accepting such messages, but since 1st February, we understand, the Great North Western have been accepting them. The Marconi Wireless Company still unable to accept such messages.

The following correspondence by cable with Sir George Perley is submitted for the information of the House:

Ottawa, Ont., Feb. 1, 1916.

Perley, Dominion, London.

Following question on Order Paper: 'Is the Government aware that the cable companies operating the lines between Canada and the Mother Country, as also the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company operating between Canada and Ireland, have cancelled or suspended their deferred rates and week-end letters, thereby imposing an extra burden upon Canadian citizens who have sons at the front or in England, and who may desire to communicate with them by telegraph?' Please procure all available information and cable.

Borden.

London, February 8, 1916.

Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Your cable yesterday. Inquiries elicit following. Western Union Company state special rates for soldiers cabling from this side not interfered with. Suspension deferred rates and week-end letters applies only ordinary traffic, but as regards deferred rates these were reinstated so far as messages from Canada to this country are concerned fortnight ago. Commercial Cable Company at present time accept no deferred rate or week-end letters for transmission to or from Canada, but have not interfered with special rates for soldiers. Marconi Company suspended all deferred rates and week-end letters, but their special rate for soldiers still in operation. Operation Anglo-American Company not accepting traffic at deferred rates or week-end letters for despatch westward but state cables at deferred rate and week-end letters reaching them from points in Canada. They have not suspended special rates for soldiers.

Dominion.

2. The Board of Railway Commissioners has given the following answer: "No."

3. Answered by No. 2.

QUEBEC POST OFFICE.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many employees have been appointed at the Quebec post office since November 1, 1911?

2. How many were employed up to that date in the inspector's branch and the sorter's branch respectively, and how many have been appointed since, and at what salaries?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Since 1st November, 1911, there have been two hundred and fifty-two appointments made in the Quebec post office. This number includes all appointments to fill permanent vacancies caused by resignation or death, and all temporary appointments for the summer holiday and Christmas seasons for each year since that date.

2. There were twenty employees in the office of the post office inspector at Quebec on 1st November, 1911. There is no sorters' branch. There have been twenty-five appointments in the office of the post office inspector at Quebec since 1st November, 1911. This number includes appointments to fill permanent vacancies

caused by resignation and death, as well as temporary appointments during the summer holidays and absence of any members of the staff, as follows:

2 at $1,800 a year, 2 at $1,200, 1 at $1,000, 2 at $800, 6 at $600, 7 at $500, 1 at $2.50 a day, 3 at $2 a day, 1 at $1.75 a day.

WAR SUPPLIES—CANVAS SHOES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What was the average price per pair of the canvas shoes ordered for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. How many pairs have been issued to the units of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in Canada and overseas, respectively?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Prices paid were from $1.50 to $2. or an average price of $1.70.

2. All units sent overseas were supplied with one pair per man; 116,000 sent overseas; 50,000 issued in Canada.

WAR SUPPLIES—OVERSHOES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. How many pairs of overshoes have been purchased for the use of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. What is the average price per pair?
3. How many pairs of overshoes have been issued to the several units of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces on overseas service?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. 124,600 pairs purchased.

2. The prices paid were from $1.67½ to $1.96, or an average price of $1.86½.

3. About 118,000.

SMELT FISHING REGULATIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the reason for the adoption of the Order in Council passed February 9, 1915, prohibiting fishing for smelts in the spans of bridges or within one hundred yards of such spans?
2. On whose recommendation was this regulation adopted?
3. Was it first submitted to the Fisheries Board?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. To prevent the blocking of the passage of smelts through bridges and undue advantage to certain nets that would be set too close to such spans.

2. On that of the Minister of the Naval Service, acting on the advice of his technical officers.

3. No.

PURCHASE OF SHIPS FOR WAR PURPOSES.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. How many ships have been purchased by the Government for war purposes since the 1st August, 1914, to date?
2. What are the names of the ships, what is the tonnage of each, and what special purpose are they adapted for, or what service are they intended to perform?
3. Where, and from whom were they purchased, what was the date of purchase, and what amount was paid for each ship?
4. What amount has been expended on each ship for repairs or changes since she was purchased?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not in the public interest to answer this question at the present time.

SHELL INSPECTORS—STELLARTON.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were appointed inspectors of shells at the Albion Manufacturing Company, at Stellarton, N.S.
2. On whose recommendation were they appointed?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No inspectors have been appointed by the Militia Department.

Mr. MACDONALD: By whom, then, were they appointed?

Sir SAM HUGHES: They were not appointed by us.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who did appoint them?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nobody.

Mr. MACDONALD: There were no inspectors?

Sir SAM HUGHES: None whatever.

Mr. MACDONALD: Oh, yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No inspectors appointed; we had no more to do with it than the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had.

Mr. MACDONALD: My question is a simple question—who were appointed?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been answered.

BALLOTS FOR OVERSEAS FORCES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were ballots for the voting of Canadian overseas forces sent from Canada in 1915 to England?
2. If so, on what date, in what quantities, and in whose custody are they at present?
3. Was application made to the Officer Commanding the British Forces in Europe for leave to conduct the polling of votes among the Canadian Overseas Forces, in the event of an election in Canada? If so, was the application granted, and by whom and when?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. In compliance with the provisions of section 2 of chapter 11, Statutes of Canada, 1915, 70,000 ballots were sent by the Clerk

of the Crown in Chancery to the Secretary of the High Commissioner for Canada in London on the 20th April, 1915, and they are still in his custody.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. By section 4 of the statute, sections 2 and 3 were not to come into force until His Majesty in Council proclaimed them to be in force and such proclamation was published in the Canada Gazette. This proclamation was made on the 6th of May, 1915, and was published in the Canada Gazette of May 15, 1915.

PURCHASE OF HORSES—MR. FALLIS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Finance been called to the following extract from a news item in the Ottawa Citizen of February 3, 1916:

"Mr. Fallis stated that desiring to conform to public opinion, he had decided to devote his profits of the horse sales, amounting to $1,880, to patriotic purposes and had forwarded a cheque for that amount to the commander of the Peel county Overseas Battalion to be used as he saw fit."

2. If so, is it the intention of the minister to request payment of the above amount to the Dominion Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government is not aware that it has any claim upon the sum of money referred to.

SHELL INSPECTORS—NEW GLASGOW.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any inspectors of shells been dismissed from their work as inspectors of the shells produced by Cummings & Sons, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, since January 1, 1916?

2. If so, what are their names and for what cause?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Government has no information of inspectors of shells having been dismissed.

THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE—ALLEGED WARNING.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the Government aware that the following despatch was published in the press of the United States and Canada on the 4th February last:

"Warning given three weeks ago of plot to blow up Government Buildings in Canada.

Special to the New York Times.

"Providence, R. I., February 3.—The Providence Journal will preface its story of the Ottawa Parliament Buildings fire to-morrow morning with the following statement:

"The Providence Journal three weeks ago notified the Department of Justice that it had received information directly through employees of the German Embassy that the Parliament Houses of Ottawa, Rideau Hall, the home of the Governor General in Ottawa, and large munitions plants in Ontario were to be the next objects of German attack on this continent, in the order named.

"The Journal, furthermore, notified the Department of Justice at the same time that the German Embassy had given instructions that the work of destruction in American munitions plants should be temporarily suspended, and that the next move to be made would 'give the people of Canada a few things to think about.'

"The statement was also made by embassy officials that the arrest of Paul Koenig and the prevention of the destruction of the Welland Canal, would only stimulate these activities in Canada.

"This information, given by the Journal to the Government, was conveyed to the Journal through a channel which Government officers at once declared, when notified of the source, had to their knowledge been in constant touch with members of the German Embassy for many months past."

2. If so, did the Department of Justice receive any such information as above referred to?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. This despatch has been brought to the notice of the Government since its publication on February 4, 1916.

2. No.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

For a return showing the number of field kitchens supplied by the Militia Department to each infantry battalion of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces serving overseas, the number of field kitchens purchased by the Militia Department for the use of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, the average cost of each of the field kitchens supplied, and what manufacturing firms have supplied field kitchens to the order of the Militia Department.—Mr. Oliver.

BANK LOANS TO FARMERS.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) the House went into committee, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair, to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Bank Act by repealing the provision limiting the time within which chartered banks may lend money for the purchase of seed grain upon the security of the grain purchased, the crops to be grown therefrom and the seed thrashed from the crop; and also by permitting the chartered banks to lend money to farmers and those engaged in raising stock upon the security of their live stock, that is to say, upon horses and their progeny, bulls and cows and their progeny, sheep and swine.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The resolution is sufficiently plain as to the nature of the legislation which we propose to introduce, but if, at this stage, any further explanation is desired, I shall be glad to give it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I wish my hon. friend would give the information now.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The House will recall that last year we amended the Bank Act by providing that banks might make loans upon the security of "grain purchased, the crops to be grown therefrom, and the seed threshed from the crop." By the terms of that legislation the time was limited practically to last year. It was stated in the House that it was desirable that production should be encouraged in every way and it was thought we might for that year, on account of its being war time, enact this legislation. The legislation has given some satisfaction. I have no doubt that good results have followed its enactment, and it is now proposed to take away the time limit which was imposed by the legislation of last year so that this year the banks may continue to make advances to farmers to enable them to purchase seed grain, and take the security which the legislation of last year enabled them to take.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do you propose to make it permanent?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The legislation is permanent as drafted, but if, while the Bill is before the House or the committee, it is thought desirable that a further limit should be placed upon it, I shall raise no objection.

The other provision of this Bill involves a considerable departure. At successive revisions of the Bank Act the question has been raised as to whether a bank shall be permitted to take security upon live stock, under what is now section 88 of the Act. There has been a considerable divergence of view on this point, in the past. In drafting the Bill previous to the last revision of the Bank Act, I provided that a bank should be authorized to loan to ranchers on the security of their cattle, and if my memory serves me, also upon the security of their horses. When the matter was under consideration by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and by the House of Commons, it was thought advisable not to enact that provision and it was accordingly withdrawn. The difficulty that has arisen on every occasion when this matter has been under discussion in the House, respecting this provision, which has been asked for by many, enabling the banks to loan upon the security of the live stock of the farmer, has been the question of notice to creditors. The House is aware that, under section 88, the bank is permitted to take security upon raw material and manufactures in their various stages of production without registration. The matter has been fully discussed in the House and I think it is not necessary for me to advert further to that aspect of it. I pointed out last year, when the matter was under consideration, that there were thousands of transactions taking place daily throughout Canada whereby liens were given to banks upon raw material, or upon manufactures in process of completion, or upon goods, under section 88 of the Bank Act. No notice is required to be given to the public by registration or otherwise as to these liens. As far as giving liens upon live stock is concerned, it has been felt every time that this matter has been before the House in the past, that it was advisable, not only in the interests of the public and of creditors, but also in the interest of the farmers themselves, that such notice should be given. But, there were difficulties in the way of giving notice by registration or otherwise. Most of the provinces of Canada have what is known as chattel mortgage, or bill of sale, legislation under which mortgages and bills of sale upon personal property which remains in the visible possession of its owners shall not be valid as against creditors, unless registered in accordance with the laws of the provinces. Most of the provinces of Canada have legislation of that character. On the other hand, there is at least one province, Quebec, in which chattel mortgages or bills of sale are not recognized, and where there is consequently no provision for their registration. The legislation that I now propose has in the past failed to become law because of the difficulties of giving notice by registration. The Dominion itself has no organized machinery for the purpose of receiving and filing chattel mortgages, liens on live stock, or bills of sale, which might be taken by banks as security. The only organization at hand is the provincial organization, and in order to draft a Bill that would meet the requirements of the situation it would be necessary to name officials in the several provinces and under the jurisdiction of the several provincial governments, who would receive, file, and keep records of these liens, chattel mortgages or bills of sale. Therefore, this legislation has not so far been enacted.

Strong representations have been made to me that this legislation is very desirable. It has been pointed out, particularly from the West, that the enactment of this legislation would facilitate the making of further advances, affording a greater degree of credit to those engaged in the live stock

industry; and also that the banks would be more willing to loan substantial sums, and for longer periods, if they were permitted to take the securities referred to in this Act. It is further pointed out with regard to cattle, that it is very desirable that they should be reared to maturity in Canada rather than sold when young and finished on the other side of the line. For all these and other considerations which I need not mention too minutely, there appears to be a very considerable public demand for this legislation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the demand for this legislation come from the banks or from the farmers?

Sir THOMAS WHITE. It comes from the farmers. I received only recently a resolution from the United Farmers of Alberta in favour of this legislation, and it has been brought to my attention that the farmers of Manitoba were also in favour of it. Hon. gentlemen will be able to tell me whether that is also the case in Saskatchewan. The demand has not come from the banks, as I shall show my hon. friend in a few moments. I have been aware that this demand existed, and that it was the view of those engaged in stock rearing that this would afford very considerable assistance to the communities engaged in that industry. Consequently, some time ago I took the subject up and gave it my best attention and consideration. It was brought to my attention that in the United States a very large business is done by banks loaning upon chattel mortgage security covering live stock, and that the facilities afforded under the system which they have in vogue in the western states has greatly promoted that industry. I communicated with the several banks of Canada and asked their views as to whether the enactment of legislation of this character would result in increased accommodation being afforded the farmers and those engaged in the live stock industry. I asked them further, whether in their opinion there would be ample credits afforded during the coming year for the needs of the agricultural community and those engaged in the live stock industry. I received answers from all the banks, and I think they were about equally divided in opinion. About one-half were of the opinion that while not objecting to this legislation they would lend as freely if the legislation were not enacted as if it were enacted, and that they would necessarily continue to look to the personal credit and standing of the borrower. Some of them added that they were not particularly favourable to the legislation but thought it might be of some assistance. On the other hand, a number of the banks held the view very strongly that this legislation would result in the extension of substantial further credits to the farming community and would be of great advantage to the live stock industry. They said that with legislation of this character they would feel justified in making more substantial advances and for longer terms. My answer to the hon. gentleman, in a word, is, that the demand for this legislation has come from the farming community, and particularly those engaged in the live stock industry, and that as to the banks, while there is a division of opinion among them as to the benefits likely to result from this legislation in the way of extension of credit, they are generally of the opinion that it will be of benefit.

I had to consider then the question which in the past has been the obstacle to the enactment of this legislation, namely the question of the rights of creditors, and of giving notice of these liens. I gave the matter the best consideration of which I was capable and, after canvassing the several ways which occurred to me, the Bill has been drafted so as to enable banks to take chattel mortgages or bill of sale upon live stock according to the laws of the several provinces. That is to say, a bank is put in precisely the same position as an individual or an institution that has the power to loan upon chattel mortgage or bill of sale security. I thought that was a wise conclusion, for this reason: the provinces have deemed it expedient, and in the public interest, to enact legislation protecting the rights of creditors. Unless there is some strong objection, it has seemed to me we ought to respect, so far as we can, the legislation in that regard of the several provinces. We have respected that legislation. In the Bill which I shall introduce, in the case of the provinces in which no provision for registration exists, we provide a simple method whereby notice may be given in the official gazette. I have, in a general way, covered the ground, but I desire to say further that the Bill will be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee. I need not say how much confidence I have in that committee. There are some first-class lawyers amongst its members, and if any better method can be suggested for giving notice of this legisla-

tion, I shall be only too glad to give it my best consideration, and if possible, to adopt it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When this matter was before the House on a previous occasion, I took very strong ground against legislation of this kind being effected. I still think it would be very objectionable to pass such an Act, because it would enable the banks to strengthen their security, as they would naturally do. While they might lend money to the farmer, they would take very good care to have him sign the printed form which they would always have available, and by means of which he would pledge to the bank all his horses, swine and cattle. Whether the debt was a large one or a small one, the words used would be of a general character, and it seems to me that the result would be that the credit of the farmer with the storekeeper, from whom he must continually purchase his supplies, would be very much impaired, and in the end this would result to the disadvantage of the farmer rather than to his benefit. The minister, I see, has to a certain extent met that objection by providing that the notice of these securities shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the Gazette of the provinces. In the provinces in which chattel mortgages and bills of sale are recognized, and in which provision is made for their registration, a chattel mortgage or bill of sale must be registered in accordance with the provincial law. But in the province of Quebec, and in other provinces in which there is no provision under the provincial law for the registration of a chattel mortgage or bill of sale, within a certain number of days after the taking of the chattel mortgage or bill of sale by the bank notice must be given to the officials of the provincial Gazette.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that the Bill will provide that in the provinces where there is provincial registration, the provincial law must prevail, but in the case of a province not having provision for registration, there must be publication in the Royal Gazette of the province. Now, I would like to point out to the minister, that the bill as now proposed to be framed, in accordance with the terms of the resolution, goes very far. It is not limited to large ranches, in reference to which it might very well be argued that such legislation would be desirable, just as in the case of the manufacturers of lumber or of the lumbermen who carry on operations in the woods, who get out their logs, and take them to the mill where they are sawn into lumber. In respect of these, the Bank Act preserves the lien for the advances from the time the operations in the woods begin until the lumber is actually sawn and ready for the market. But in this case, if I understand it, the farmer, no matter how small his operations may be, may give a bill of sale to the bank, not only upon his cows, but upon their progeny, upon the unborn offspring, so that the lien would cover not only what is in existence to-day, but what might come into existence six months or two years, or even three or four years from to-day. I submit that it is going a long way to enact legislation of this character. I submit to the hon. minister that legislation of this character ought to be limited to those who carry on large operations, to large ranchers whom it is desirable to encourage in the extensive operations which they carry on. It seems to me that if you allow the bank, when it lends money, say $200 or $300, to the small farmer, to take from him this security, which covers not only the stock which he has to-day, but the stock which may come into existence two or three years from the date of the execution of the bill of sale, you are passing legislation which is likely to prove somewhat dangerous in the future, and which is calculated, I think, to destroy to a very considerable extent the credit which the farmer finds it necessary to get from the local storekeeper. That credit is just as important to the farmer as any provision for security which the banks might give. I doubt very much whether, in respect to the ordinary farmer, it is going to increase the accommodation which he will get. The banks will probably lend him the money only for a short term of three or four months, but they will be careful to take this security which, as I say, will tie up to the bank, not only the stock which he has, but the offspring which may come years afterwards. The result will be that the storekeeper will feel that if anything happens to that farmer the bank will swoop down upon him, take everything he has, and leave nothing for the storekeeper. I am told that in the West to-day, by reason of the existing legislation, storekeepers have passed a pretty hard winter, and that many of them feel that they have to be extremely careful to protect their own rights because of the legislation which

4 p.m.

affects the recovery of their claims. I am told that the law in the western provinces provides considerable exemptions in respect to property which cannot be taken in execution, and now, if you are going to pass legislation which will sweep away the only security which the merchant may have, it seems to me that you are doing something which in the long run will result to the farmer's disadvantage.

Mr. TURRIFF: Can the minister give us any information as to the extent to which advantage has been taken by the banks in regard to the legislation which was passed last year giving them wider powers than they had had previously in the way of taking securities on grain. Is the minister aware of the extent to which advantage was taken of the advances?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no definite information on the matter, but I understand that the legislation was an advantage.

Mr. McCRANEY: I live in a portion of Saskatchewan in which advances would probably be made by the banks to farmers for seed grain, if such a practice was to be carried into effect, and the answer of the minister is in accord with the information I have. I am a practising solicitor, and I never heard of any instance in which a seed grain lien was taken by a bank. I would point out further to the minister that under the legislation of last year, in the case of a lien which the bank could take or of a lien which was not registered, the document could be put in the banker's desk. Notwithstanding that, we have provision in our provincial statute providing for the registration of mortgages taken in respect of seed grain. Is it intended that the provincial law shall govern the registration of documents taken for advances on seed grain, cattle, and other things?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We propose merely to take away the time limitation which was imposed last year. Under this legislation it will not be necessary for a seed grain lien to be registered.

Mr. McCRANEY: If advances on live stock and cattle are to be put under the provincial law, why not advances for seed grain? I must say that I do not think the officials whose duty it is to register seed grain liens will be troubled with many of them. You may lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink; the minister is leading the banks up to the trough, but I doubt very much whether, by this legislation, he will be able to induce them to give any further credit to the farmers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why will not the banks give any more credit to the farmers?

Mr. McCRANEY: The reason is that the advances they make at the present time are on the personal credit of the farmer. I am satisfied, or at least I will take the minister's word for it, that the legislation will be useful in big operations in the ranching country, but, like my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), I fear for the small farmer. The tendency in our country is to limit the extent to which security can be given, and in that connection I would point to the amendment of the Saskatchewan Chattel Mortgage Act, which provides that ordinary exemptions will apply to chattel mortgages as well as to executions. There is a good deal of talk, particularly amongst bankers, about our farmers going in for mixed farming. We have had wise essays and long lectures as to our farmers changing their methods of agriculture. To the ordinary young banker out on the prairies, mixed farming expresses itself in hogs. The young banker out there frequently gets instructions from his head office to do all he can to induce his farmer customers to go into mixed farming, and his instructions usually specify that half of any advance he makes to a farmer shall be invested in mixed farming. As I have said, mixed farming to the young banker usually means hogs, so that if he makes an advance of $200 to a farmer he insists that $100 shall be invested in hogs. A friend of mine in Saskatchewan, near the border of Alberta, told me some time ago that he saw ten or a dozen young dead pigs close to a barn. The banker had loaned $200 to the farmer, and had insisted that $100 be invested in hogs. The farmer bought the hogs, but he had no means of sustaining them, and they died of starvation. That is mixed farming according to the banker, and if we don't look out we are going to have trouble on account of bankers interfering with our methods of agriculture. I do not want to come to a final conclusion at the moment, but my own view is that the minister is not doing a good thing for the small farmer in this legislation. I think in some way he should distinguish between loans which are made to cattle men and loans which are made to farmers who have only a small amount

of stock. He might distinguish between the two classes by saying, for instance, that loans of $2,000 should come under this legislation, but nothing under that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my hon. friend, I would say that I have never been in any way censorious as to the class of farming that is done in any particular province. I always assume that those engaged in a business know the best way of carrying that business on. My hon. friend says quite truly that men write essays and give lectures as to what class of farming should be carried on, but after all the farmer knows best what kind of farming he should engage in. I have always said that. So far as this legislation is concerned, the remarks of my hon. friend are most interesting to me. What my hon. friend from St. John has said, has been said upon many previous occasions when this legislation has been before the House. The one desire that I have in this legislation is to facilitate, as far as I can, the granting of credits to the rural communities in order to enable them to carry on their industry to better advantage. If the Banking and Commerce Committee is of the opinion that the small farmer should be exempt from this legislation, I shall be inclined to attach great weight to their view, because I know that this question will be very thoroughly discussed by the committee. We have only one object in introducing this legislation, and if any part of this Bill is likely to be controversial, I shall be only too willing to drop it. I may say, however, that the legislation has been brought forward for no other purpose than to meet the needs of a growing industry in the West, as presented to me by the parties engaged in that industry. If it is thought desirable by the Banking and Commerce Committee, or by the House, that this legislation should be limited to dealers in live stock only, I shall be glad to give their opinion my most earnest and best consideration. But I know that in the past there has been, and I believe there is to-day, a very substantial body of opinion, both in this House and outside, in favour of granting legislation such as this, which the farmer need not avail himself of, but which he may avail himself of in order to facilitate the rearing of live stock to maturity. I know that in certain sections of the West, and other parts of the rural community, this legislation is considered of very great importance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think it is an undoubted fact that bankers as a rule do not favour lending to farmers. Banks are rather created for the purpose of active trade, and I believe that some time or other we shall have banks in Canada intended especially for farmers. This resolution deals with two classes of goods belonging to farmers: grain, and live stock. I understand that the purpose of the resolution is to give banks the power to take a lien upon live stock, and to have the lien published or registered. I do not quite understand the reason for the first part of this proposition:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Bank Act by repealing the provision limiting the time within which chartered banks may lend money for the purchase of seed grain upon the security of the grain purchased, the crops to be grown therefrom and the seed thrashed from the crop.

Under the circumstances, I am sorry to say, I am not able to get a copy of the Statutes, and consequently I do not know exactly what is meant. If I understand my hon. friend correctly, the law as it is to-day provides that banks can advance money upon grain, and it is now proposed to withdraw that power from the banks.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. I can quite understand why my hon. friend misunderstands the situation. Last year we gave this power to the banks for one year only. We are now proposing to take away that limitation of time, so that the banks may continue to lend to the farmers upon the security in question.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): This idea originated in my section of the country. It really developed out of the practice adopted by the Lethbridge Board of Trade, which, finding that the farmers in that district could not get credit at the banks, formed what is known as the Lethbridge live stock guarantors, a body composed of some fifty of the business men of the city of Lethbridge. This body guarantees the payment to the bank of money advanced to farmers in the immediate district for the purchase of live stock. The scheme worked splendidly, and assisted materially in the development of mixed farming. The farmers thought that they should be able to get this credit direct from the bank. The matter came before the United Farmers Association, at its recent meeting in the city of Calgary, and they endorsed the idea contained in this resolution of the Minister of Finance.

In my section of the country there are a great many people who have come from the United States. They dislike our banking system; in fact the banking system of Canada is extremely unpopular amongst the farmers of Western Canada, not because they want to get something from the banks for which they do not give an equivalent, but because they cannot get anything in many cases from the banks, and the American farmers argue in favour of the state or local bank which exists in the United States. One argument in favour of that is the fact that they can secure small loans by giving small chattel mortgages. I agree with the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), that a great many essays and lectures are delivered by the heads of the Canadian banks to the farmers as to how they should farm their land, and telling them they should go in for mixed farming and abandon mining the land. Those very bankers, however, are the men who refuse to permit the farmers to go into mixed farming. In 1914, during the drought which existed in Southern Alberta, the farmers had a great many hogs, but on account of the failure of the crop they had no feed on their own farms, and so they went to the banks and asked for an advance on the strength of this live-stock, so that they could get feed for them. What happened? The banks would not give them a cent, and the farmers were forced to sell their hogs at a price away below the market price because they had no feed for them, and because the banks would not provide an advance so that they could buy feed. In many cases the farmers were responsible men, but the banks seem to have had an attack of cold feet in Southern Alberta that summer; they were afraid of the country; they did not think it would amount to anything; but I think I am safe in saying that last year Southern Alberta, which was drought-stricken the year before, had as good a crop as three average crops. In that area of country the average crop has been greater than the average yield in any country during any one season. If the farmers are to go into mixed farming, they must have assistance from the banks. I do not want to attack the banks for their attitude during the past year, but their attitude has been the same during all years. They are not giving assistance in many cases to the farmers of Western Canada, and I presume the same is the case throughout the rest of the country. A bank sends out a young man to manage a branch in a small community surrounded by farmers, and he can hardly advance a cent to farmers without receiving sanction from the head office. He has to communicate with Toronto or Montreal, and a farmer having an opportunity of investing a small amount in a horse or a cow may have passed away before the manager receives the sanction of the head office. There will have to be some change in the method of management of the banks before the western farmer is satisfied.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I suppose this is hardly the time to discuss this question generally, but I want to ask the minister one question. Before I do so, I would like to refer to some points which have come up. It is rather early to say very much on this question, but at present I do not see much cause to be quite as afraid of the effect of this legislation as my hon. friends from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) apparently are, although when we discuss the question further, we may change our minds.

With regard to the increased loans, I have not heard of any in my own own locality, but we have better authority than my experience, and I am always prepared to submit to better authority when I find it. The Grain Growers' Guide of Winnipeg has taken the trouble to make inquiries among the farmers throughout the country, and I find in a recent issue of that journal—it was unfortunately destroyed, and I therefore cannot quote from it—that a number of the answers received showed that the recent legislation had caused a very considerable increase in the loans to farmers, and that it also had made it possible for farmers, who otherwise would not have received loans, to get them. Now, I am inclined to think that some good has been done.

With regard to the difficulty raised by my hon. friend from Saskatoon as to a banker insisting on a farmer buying hogs or something of that kind with a portion of the money advanced, I do not see that the situation will be any worse than it is at present, if the legislation proposed by the minister is passed. There is nothing to prevent a banker from insisting on that sort of thing if he is giving a loan of any kind. The question I want to ask is this: My hon. friend from Saskatoon referred to recent legislation in Saskatchewan regarding chattel mortgages providing that a chattel mortgage shall not affect property which is exempt from seizure under execution.

My hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) proposes to recognize the existing legislation of the provinces at least so far as registration is concerned. Is he proposing to recognize that existing legislation now? Supposing a bank takes a mortgage on a farmer's exemptions, will they be affected? Without expressing a definite opinion on the question just now, I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of recognizing recent legislation in Saskatchewan or in any other province that shall pass such legislation. I am not asking my hon. friend to decide positively whether the legislation is going to be recognized now, but I would like to hear his opinion, because the subject is worthy of his consideration. The difficulty has been raised about loans to small farmers who have a very small amount of stock but if mortgages on exemptions are ineffective that difficulty will be largely removed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have followed the principle of recognizing provincial legislation with respect to bills of sale and chattel mortgages, and in the Bill which I intend to introduce founded on this resolution, it is provided that:

13. The security agreement may be made in the form of a bill of sale or chattel mortgage, or, in any province where no provision exists in the laws of the province for the filing or other registration of bills of sale or chattel mortgages, then in the form H in the schedule to this Act or in a form to like effect.

14. Such security agreement shall be filed or otherwise registered in accordance with, and shall be subject to the laws relating to bills of sale or chattel mortgages, as the case may be, that are in force in the province in which the live stock included in such security agreement are situate.

I am not sure that that touches the point the hon. gentleman has in view. He has in mind the fact that in Alberta there are certain exceptions which cannot be made the subject of a chattel mortgage. I think that this clause will cover them, but, if not, I shall be glad if he will give me the benefit of his information after the Bill is introduced, and I will have the matter discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: I have a word to say on behalf of the mixed-farming country and of the small farmer. When the Bank Act was up for consideration some years ago, this matter was threshed out very thoroughly. On that occasion, certain members of the House, both on our side and on the Government side, took a strong position as to the propriety of including such a provision as is made here. I am sorry that at that time the minister did not agree with us, and am correspondingly glad to see that he has come around to what seems to me to be a very much better view. I hope that when the Bill gets into the Banking and Commerce Committee he will not be swerved from his present intention of including all classes of stock farming, whether on a large scale or on a small scale. I do not anticipate the difficulties that have been suggested by some hon. members. The purpose of this legislation, as I understand it, is to enable the banks, as the reservoir of the money of the people, to loan part of the funds in a manner they are not now permitted to do by the Bank Act. I cannot understand that this enabling provision as regards the use by the banks of money in their care is likely to result, or can result, in any detriment to those who may be looking for the advantage of the use of that money.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 33, to amend the Bank Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GUSTAV HEIDMANN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of privilege, I desire to refer to a subject that, I think, is of sufficient importance to justify me in asking the indulgence of the House for a few minutes. My attention has been called to an article appearing in the Ottawa Evening Journal of February 9, headed: " Germans Have Access to Confidential Papers in Ottawa," and reprinting an article contained in the Toronto Star of the same date which, among other things, says this:

Probably the most conspicuous case on record is that of Gustav Heidmann, secretary of the Minister of Marine, and Naval Service, Hon. J. D. Hazen. Mr. Heidmann was born in Germany, and no doubt has relatives fighting there. He has been a long time in Canada, and is reputed as an able and efficient secretary. His name appears on the most recent list issued from the Secretary of State's Department as having received full naturalization. But Mr. Heidmann has access to all correspondence connected with Canadian coast defence, wireless, harbour patrols, and marine matters which come to the office of the Minister of Marine and naval defence. It is not conceivable that Admiral Von Tirpitz would be so trustful, in connection with the administration of his department.

I think it desirable that I should state the facts to the House. My secretary, Mr. Heidmann, who has been my secretary since November, 1911, was born in Germany, and, when an infant in arms only a few weeks old, came to Canada with his parents who were dissatisfied with conditions in Germany and sought Canada with a view to making their home here and becoming citizens of this country. The father settled in Toronto, and, soon after taking up his residence there, applied to an alderman of that city for naturalization as a British subject, and received a certificate which he believed conferred upon him the rights of a British subject, but about which there may be some question as the preliminary steps were not entirely complied with. However, for over thirty-two years Mr. Heidmann's father has engaged in manufacturing business in Toronto, has voted at elections from time to time, and has taken such part in the affairs of the city as a good citizen ought to take. Mr. Heidmann, my secretary, was brought up in Toronto, educated in the common schools there, and, after having received his education, was appointed as private secretary to Mr. H. S. Strathy, General Manager of the Traders Bank of Canada, which bank, I believe, has since been amalgamated with the Royal Bank of Canada. In 1904 Mr. Heidmann came to Ottawa as a member of the Civil Service of Canada, and he continued in the Service until 1911, being at that time assistant to the secretary of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission. In 1911, I selected Mr. Heidmann as my secretary out of a number of applicants, because I thought him eminently fit for the position. Before making that selection, I made inquiries regarding Mr. Heidmann's character and standing, from persons in the city of Toronto, who knew him and his family well; in whom I had every confidence, and in whom the members of this House would have every confidence if I were to mention their names, as they are among the leading citizens of that city. The reports I received from them were of the most favourable character, with regard to Mr. Heidmann's character and abilities, and also with regard to the standing and reputation of his family who had been living in Toronto, as I have said, for thirty-two years. Since then Mr. Heidmann has acted as my secretary and has done so with great acceptability to myself, because of the industry and ability with which he has discharged his duties. I may say for the information of the House that one of his brothers, soon after the outbreak of the war, enlisted and is now a trooper in the third troop, "C" squadron, Second Brigade, Fourth Canadian Mounted Rifles, which has since been reorganized into an infantry brigade under the command of General Victor Williams and has been in the trenches in Flanders for some considerable time fighting for the defence of Canada and the Empire, and for the perpetuation of those democratic principles that are so dear to the heart of every Canadian. In a letter which was received only a short time ago from Colonel F. B. Black, a member of the legislature of the province of New Brunswick, and who is also serving his country at the front, he spoke in the highest possible terms of the services which were being rendered by Mr. Heidmann's brother in the trenches and referred to the fact that he had been offered promotion on several occasions but had declined it because he preferred to remain, as he stated, with his "pals" in the ranks, and to continue side by side with those with whom he had been serving since the outbreak of the war.

My secretary, until a short time ago, believed that he was a British subject. Believing that his father had been naturalized, and he himself having lived in Toronto since he was an infant, he considered that he was a British subject. But there being some legal question about it, he applied for, and obtained full naturalization at the time of the outbreak of the war. I think it is only right and fair that I should make this statement to the House in view of the article I have read from the Toronto Star, and which was copied last evening into the Ottawa Evening Journal. I would like to say further, that after the war broke out, when rumours became current in Ottawa in regard to Mr. Heidmann, and on different occasions since, he has come to me and told me that if, in the slightest degree, I felt embarrassed in consequence of his connection with me as private secretary, he would at once, and without any feeling, tender his resignation and seek to make a living in some other way.

Mr. Heidmann is married to an Ottawa lady connected with some of the most prominent and oldest families in the capital. He is the father of five children who are being brought up as good Canadians and good British subjects. I declined to allow

him to resign because I felt that if I did so, or if I accepted his resignation, or gave him some position in the service that was not as important as the position he held, I would be doing a very great injustice to a young man who, I believe, is in every way an upright, conscientious, and competent public official, and who, I further believe, is as loyal a Canadian and as loyal a Britisher as can be found within the four corners of the Dominion of Canada.

This matter, previously to its being taken up by the press, was the subject of comment, and I had hoped that the result of the investigation which was carried on then by the Ottawa Free Press would have put an end to the rumours that were then in circulation. I might quote this from the Ottawa Free Press published in November, 1914:

> Another Rumour Run to Earth.
>
> For several days past the Free Press has been in receipt of communications calling attention to the fact that a gentleman holding a confidential position in one of the Government Departments in Ottawa is a native of Germany. Upon this fact has been built a formidable structure of suspicion. The Free Press has just completed a very thorough inquiry. It started out with a strong doubt as to the propriety of the retention of such a one in a capacity giving him access to important and possibly secret governmental information. These doubts have been dispelled. The loyalty and sincerity of the young man have been vouched for, not only by his minister and his deputy minister, but by a large number of responsible Ottawa people. An interview with him has given the Fress Press the same impression; and further, even in the position he holds, he has access to no information that would be of value to the enemy.

That last statement is absolutely correct. Any secret information in connection with the department over which I have the honour to preside is known only to the deputy minister and myself and, on some rare occasions, to the Chief of Staff and the Director of the Naval Service. The article in the Free Press concluded:

> Don't let us get into a silly war panic. Don't let us permit anybody's reputation to be blasted by irrational rumours. The warning seems necessary because this is not the first time since the war began that the Free Press has felt called upon to defend an Ottawa citizen from cruel injustice.

I feel that a very cruel injustice is being done to my secretary by the publication of such articles as appeared last night in the Ottawa Journal, and an injustice which must bring sorrow and tribulation not only to himself, but to his wife and the members of his family. Therefore, I deem it my duty as his chief, and as one whom he has served with the very greatest possible loyalty and fidelity during the time I have been Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to say these few words to the House, not only as a matter of justice to my private secretary, but in order that there may be to some extent removed from the public mind the unfortunate conclusions that have been drawn from evidence and facts that are entirely insufficient to justify even the slightest suspicion being attached to Mr. Heidmann's loyalty and fidelity.

THE SHELL COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a statement made by him in the House on the 24th January last, when we were discussing certain matters in regard to shells, and when there had been a number of questions asked by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and myself. I asked the minister when he was making a statement to the House if he would bring down a list of the contractors to whom contracts had been given. He said:

> I shall be very glad to go to the Shell Committee and ask them to give me a statement containing the names of those to whom contracts for shell boxes were awarded.
>
> Mr. Carvell: Will you give the dates, quantities and prices? As the hon. gentleman is in a good mood, it may be good time to get this information.

On the next day, 25th January, I asked the minister if he would lay the statement on the table of the House, and he said that he would get it ready. Has the minister now the information and can he lay it on the table of the House?

Mr. HAZEN: No, I have not the information for my hon. friend yet, but I am getting it.

GERMAN CANADIANS IN THE MILITARY SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) an interview which appears in the Ottawa Journal of the 9th of this month. I do this not for the purpose of making comment on it or finding any fault, at present at all events; but I think it very much better that in cases like that to which I am going to call attention, as well as the case to which the Minister of Marine has called attention, the matter should be

brought up in Parliament and a fair and frank statement made. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) should not be too censorious on either the newspapers or the people throughout the country who have written and spoken with reference to the subject of his complaint. I know there has been a good deal of talk, and I think it much better that the minister should bring the matter before Parliament and make a statement as he has done, because it tends to remove erroneous impressions, and to allay suspicion and anxiety. The press and people of this country are naturally exceedingly anxious and sensitive at the present time. I have called the minister's attention to this interview in the Journal and he has given me permission to bring the matter up. The interview is as follows:

"There is an erroneous impression in the country," said General Hughes to-day, "that there is some German officer around Ottawa doing intelligence work. That German officer is at the front in the trenches. He is one of hundreds of Germans loyally fighting with Canada under the British flag." The Minister of Militia was referring to newspaper comment on statements made some time ago by the Minister of Militia that Capt. Kahn, his chief intelligence officer, was a German with two brothers fighting in the German army, that he was the son of a German officer and that his mother was the daughter of an Austrian General.

"It is remarkably strange," continued General Hughes, "that they do not state that thirty-eight Germans have fallen in the service fighting the battles of the Empire with the Canadian forces. It would be better if those who are endeavouring to make a race war out of it would follow their example. This is not a race war, but a war of liberty.

"There is an agitation all over the country regarding military protection for civic works, such as water works. This is a purely municipal matter in which the Militia Department has no concern. If the people would throw fewer cigarette or cigar butts around there would be fewer fires. Twice in three weeks there have been fires in the reading room of Parliament.

"In the South African war," he said, "I had the honour of enlisting the first Boer in the British service. There never were truer men or better fighters once they realized the difference between Boer and British liberty."

Would the Minister of Militia kindly state whether that interview is correct, and if it is not, in what particulars it is incorrect?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not state that Captain Hahn—not Kahn, as in the newspaper—had any relatives fighting against the British in the Austrian or German forces. His father is a very estimable resident of the city of Stratford. In his younger days he was in the German army, but, like many another splendid resident of Canada and the United States to-day, he left Germany on account of the tyrannous government in that country, and the spread of militarism. He came to Canada as a citizen and has been a most estimable citizen ever since. His son, I am proud to say, is following in the footsteps of his father, and is now fighting splendidly at the front for the cause of liberty. He has already won the Distinguished Service Order at the front in the British service.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The paper states that the minister said that Captain Hahn was chief intelligence officer at the front.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Chief intelligence officer of the British Canadians at the front, and a finer fellow never lived. The statement in the paper is correct, that 38 Canadians of German descent had fallen in action, while many more were wounded. I am proud to bear testimony to the fact that in the South African war, once the Boer realized that the British cause was the cause of liberty, he fought with us against the cause of Krugerism, which is akin to Kaiserism in Europe. If the people of the world would take a little trouble to understand that the cause we are fighting against is not the cause of the German people but the cause of Kaiserism and tyranny, I have that faith in humanity that I believe thousands more people of German descent would be fighting with us to-day in the great cause of human liberty.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend has not referred to the statement that this man had two brothers fighting in the German army.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think I have already denied any such statement. I said that I made no reference directly or indirectly to his having any relatives in the Austrian or German forces. He has none whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then there is the statement alleged to have been made by the minister that twice in three weeks there have been fires in the reading-room of Parliament.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That matter is now under investigation; but my information is exactly as stated there. I know that on one occasion an incipient fire was caused by a cigarette butt, and on another occasion by a match.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Last year we were furnished with a printed statement giving details of the expenditures on war account,

and we were promised a similar statement this year. Will such a statement be presented?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have asked the various departments of the Government which have made any payments out of the war appropriation to give all necessary information as to their expenditures. This information has not yet been received from all the departments. When it is received I shall consider what my hon. friend has said and shall be glad to bring down the information.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES (Minister of Milita): In my absence yesterday a question was raised regarding the purchase of horses, into the details of which I shall not enter. Some observations were made concerning horses purchased in the Kings county region in Nova Scotia in comparison with those purchased in Prince Edward Island and other parts. The horses purchased by Major Anderson in New Brunswick for his battery cost upwards of $225 each. The horses purchased in Prince Edward Island cost, I think, an average of $175.50. The horses purchased in Sydney, C.B., I understand, cost $185 and upwards. These, taken all in all, were good horses. The horses purchased in the Kings county region cost on an average $171.09. Soon after the camp started, when these horses commenced coming in, I remember one morning, when I was out bright and early, seeing a number of horses coming into camp. I admired most of them as they passed, for they were in splendid condition. I asked whence they came, and was assured that they came from the vicinity of Kings county, in Nova Scotia. They were without exception the finest looking lot I had seen come into camp. Towards the tail of the procession there were about twenty-two horses that were rather dried up looking, and four horses that certainly never should have been allowed inside the camp; I am free to admit that, but it is an old game, I understand, among some of these smart-alec horse dealers to change horses in the cars when they are loading and things like that. Any one who set eyes on these four would have realized that they were swapped horses, and that the other twenty-two were not up to the standard. I immediately held them up, and made inquiries, and I was informed that they had been for forty-eight hours without food or water in a car standing in a yard somewhere along the line. Four of them were disposed of as no good, but the other twenty-two—I am not exactly sure whether the number was twenty-two or twenty-one—were placed in suitable quarters and given lots of food and water, and at the end of two weeks they were a lot of very fine looking animals. I say this without prejudice to anybody. I do not wish to raise any controversial issue to-day, but I am prepared to enter into the details of this transaction on any occasion if any one chooses to bring it up. I do not want to make it a political issue, but if any one cares to make it such I am prepared to discuss it as a political issue. If any one wants to treat it as a business issue, I am prepared to treat it as a business issue. So far as the horses purchased in Kings county are concerned, I say that they were about the cheapest horses purchased in the Maritime Provinces. They were better than the horses purchased in the Westmorland region, and better by 30 or 35 per cent than the horses purchased at Sydney.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is rather hard upon the Sydney horses.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not at all; the Sydney horses were good, and the Westmorland horses were good, but not any better than the Kings county horses, and the price of the other horses was on an average $55 per head higher than the Kings county horses.

NEW NOVA SCOTIA JUDGE.

On Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if the statement which I see in the press that Mr. Joseph A. Chisholm, K.C., has been appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia is correct?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, it is true.

INSURANCE COMPANIES' CHARTERS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), the House went into committee, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair, to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that any insurance company whose power to apply for a license under the provisions of the Insurance Act, 1910, will expire before the end of the next session of Parliament, may obtain an extension of such power until the end of the next session of Parliament by filing a notice in prescribed form with the superintendent of insurance, and paying a fee of one hundred dollars.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The object of the legislation we have in view is to extend for one year, until the end of next session of Parliament, the charters of insurance companies which, while incorporated under existing legislation, have not been able to organize on account of the war. The Bill which I propose to introduce is in precisely similar form to that introduced last year, and its object is the same.

5 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand that the object of the Bill is to give certain companies who have been incorporated a certain length of time to take out their license. Not having been able to organize, these companies have not taken out the license. The minister must have a list of such companies. Are they fire or life insurance companies, or both?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It applies to any insurance company whose power to apply for a license under the provisions of the Insurance Act, 1910, will expire before the end of the next session of Parliament. My hon. friend desires a list of the outstanding companies, and I will endeavour to get it for him before we reach the second reading.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 34 to authorize certain extensions of time to insurance companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

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

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—Northwest territories, Yukon territory, provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan—pay of force, $630,216.75.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I might make some explanation of this vote. The members will observe that there is a reduction of $280,356. That is due to the fact that the force has been reduced. On the outbreak of war the force was increased to 1,200 non-commissioned officers and constables, and a number of men were engaged specially for one year's service . Of these about 300 took their discharge in August and September last, the large majority joining overseas forces, and owing to the peaceable demeanour of persons of enemy nationality and the presence of large bodies of troops in training in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, it was not considered necessary to keep the force up to its strength of 1,200—900 non-commissioned officers and constables being considered sufficient. When the commissioner's recommendation of this decrease, concurred in by the comptroller, was brought to my attention, I sent a copy of the report to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition before taking any action on it. I thought the matter was a proper one upon which to consult him, especially as for more than fifteen years he had been the political head of the force. He agreed with me that it would be safe to act upon the report of the commissioner and the comptroller, and the force was consequently reduced from 1,200 to 950, and the contemplated reduction is to 900. The present strength of the force is 950 officers and men, and 987 horses, distributed as follows:

	Officers and men.	Horses.
Alberta..	393	406
Saskatchewan	445	559
Northwest Territories...	22	2
Yukon Territory	60	20
Hudson Bay..	30	...
	950	987

There are 10 divisional posts and 253 detachments.

With regard to the present arrangements between the Federal Government and the provinces, information has already been given to the House in the Orders in Council which I had the honour of laying on the table this afternoon. Briefly speaking, those arangements are as follows: the existing agreements will expire on the 31st of March, and arangements for their renewal have been entered into, the only difference being that they can be cancelled by either the Dominion or the Provincial Government on one year's notice being given. Each province pays $75,000 annually for the services of the force, and also pays for the maintenance of all prisoners and lunatics confined in Mounted Police guard rooms, and their transport expenses.

In connection with the work of the force for the past year, the attention of hon. members might be directed to the report of the comptroller of the force, which has already been laid on the table of the House. I think a portion of the report is of sufficient importance to read to the House, as it relates to a very important subject. I am reading from page 8:

When the war broke out, some natural apprehension was felt for the peace and good order of the Western provinces, owing to a

large percentage of the population being of enemy nationality, and it was therefore decided that the strength of the Mounted Police should be increased. No disturbance of the public peace has taken place and the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta during the past twelve months have been singularly quiet and orderly This fortunate condition is due to a variety of causes, wise precautions, fair and impartial treatment by the authorities, and an admirable attitude of self-restraint on the part of the loyal population towards the enemy aliens, and the recognition by these nationalities that as long as they pursued their ordinary avocations, and refrained from inimical acts, they would not be molested nor interfered with.

Distributing reports have been received, and alarming rumours have been current, from time to time, all of which, no matter how trivial or improbable, have been investigated and found to be baseless. However, there have been instances of individuals whose acts and words were treasonable and seditious. In a few cases, they were prosecuted and convicted.

The enemy nationalities are principally engaged in tilling the soil. They own their farms, have large interests, and have no intention of imperilling their property and their own security and safety.

I might say, in passing, that there was an intense desire all through the force to be permitted to enlist en masse. They would gladly have done so, but there were of course considerations which prevented that. The force had to be maintained at a suitable strength in the West in view of occurrences which might arise. The report continues:

The decrease in the strength is due to the fact that shortly after the outbreak of the war, authority was granted to increase the force by five hundred men for one year, and that nearly all the men so engaged took their discharges for the purpose of joining the army for service at the front. Many of them had joined because they thought that a contingent would be selected for active service. As this was not the case, they took the earliest opportunity of accomplishing their highly laudable and patriotic purpose.

The Comptroller, with whom I have discussed this subject, has made the significant statement that the influence of the women among the alien enemy portion of our population has been very beneficent. They are attached to the homes which they have established in the West, and appreciate, perhaps even more than the men, the liberties and privileges which they enjoy under the system of Government that is established and maintained in this country, and so their influence has been an important factor in bringing about the results to which I have alluded. The report continues:

They are scattered over the vast areas of these provinces, and it is quite apparent that no concerted action could take place without preparation and organization, lacking which, any outbreak would be sporadic and fruitless.

The conditions for suppressing any such outbreak have greatly improved. Large bodies of troops are now under training at every centre.

For the foregoing reasons, I recently reported to you that I did not consider it was necessary to maintain the strength at more than 900 and which recommendation you approved.

I have already spoken of the profound desire upon the part of the officers and men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police to enlist for active service, but for the reasons I have indicated it was held impossible to grant their request. On the 25th day of August, 1914, this general order was made:

No leave of absence can be granted to officers, non-commissioned officers or constables of the force for the purpose of serving in any expeditionary force leaving Canada for the European war.

On the 3rd day of February, 1915, another general order was passed in the following terms:

Any non-commissioned officer or constable, who has less than three months to serve to complete his present engagement, may be permitted to purchase his discharge for the purpose of joining any contingent being raised for war services, provided he produces certificate that he will be enrolled in a contingent as above stated, if he is permitted to purchase his discharge from the police.

This privilege is not to be extended to men who engaged for one year's service on account of the war.

I should also state that these orders did not apply to Imperial reservists, about sixty in number, serving in the force, who were granted their discharge at the outbreak of the war to enable them to re-join the colours. The reason for that was that these men came to this country under a certain obligation as Imperial reservists. They joined the force under that obligation, and we thought it proper that they should not be prevented from filling an obligation that was binding on them at that time.

I am very glad, indeed, to be able to present to the House the report with regard to the demeanour and behaviour of persons of enemy nationality in the western provinces. The spirit that has animated them throughout the war under somewhat trying conditions has been admirable, and the country is to be congratulated upon the comprehension and understanding of conditions as they exist, not only by persons of enemy nationality who have come to Canada for the purpose of making their home here, but by those of British or Canadian birth,

who are in large numbers in the western provinces, and who have shown a reasonable consideration for those settlers in the western part of our country who are of enemy nationality. Hon. gentlemen will remember that very early in the war, on the 8th day of August, 1914, an Order in Council was passed, which, after reciting:

> That there are many immigrants of German nationality quietly pursuing their usual avocations in various parts of Canada; that it is desirable that such persons should continue in such avocations without interruption—

went on to declare:

> That such persons, so long as they quietly pursue their ordinary avocations, shall not be arrested, detained, or interfered with unless there is reasonable ground to believe that they are engaged in espionage, or attempting to engage in actions of a hostile nature, or to give information to the enemy, or unless they otherwise controvert any law, order in council, or proclamation.

That Order in Council, in the spirit in which it was promulgated, has commended itself to all elements of our population in Western Canada, with the results which, as they are embodied in the report of the Comptroller of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, I have been very happy to announce to the House this afternoon. I desire also to pay a tribute to the Comptroller, Mr. Fortescue, and to the Commissioner, Mr. Perry, for the good judgment and discretion with which they have dealt with the few matters in regard to which it has been necessary for the police to take action on the lines indicated in the report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Everybody knew what everybody will be glad to hear from my right hon. friend, namely, that the character of the force has been and is being maintained to the very high level that it has always maintained. That will be the case so long as it is commanded by such able officers as have been at its head for some years past. Commissioner Perry is the one man who is exceptionally well qualified for the position he holds, and Mr. Fortescue has also had very long experience. I have been informed that Mr. Fortescue intends to take his pension at no distant date. Is my information correct?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is probable that he will do so at no distant date; however, he is still in control.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Fortescue is advanced in years and his health is perhaps not as good as it was at one time, so that I am not surprised to hear that he is contemplating taking his leave from the force. Every one will be sorry for this and I, who knew him well, will also be sorry to hear it. He is a most efficient man, most faithful in his duties, and my right hon. friend will be very lucky if he is able to secure as good a man to replace him. The work of the force at the present time in the older provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta is decreasing. In those provinces it has no other duties than those of preventing and looking after offences against the common law which are found in every society. The offences prevalent at one time, such as tampering with cattle, are becoming fewer and fewer. I suppose for some years, or perhaps for many years, we shall have to keep a cordon along the boundary line between Canada and the United States. I suppose also that my right hon. friend is increasing his patrol and his stations in the northern part of the country. As the force becomes less and less required in the older settlements that are included in the three provinces, settlement is spreading in the North, and I would like to know if my right hon. friend can tell me how many stations of the force he has outside of the boundaries of the provinces; in the Athabaska district, on the Peace river, on the Mackenzie river, and on Hudson bay.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that there are six or seven.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How many men in all?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Forty-five, including Hudson bay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This will be a very important duty of the force in the future. Settlement is going on and the older habitations of the traders and trappers are making way for permament settlements. Has my hon. friend received any information about the expedition which was sent to the North to investigate the murders reported to have taken place there?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The policy is to withdraw the police from the towns, as far as possible, in order to utilize their services in the rural districts. When a town is incorporated, it is generally understood that it should be able to take care of its own affairs so far as police regulation is concerned. As to the expedition, nothing has been heard since August. At that time the report was not very important. It mentioned the discovery of a large stone cairn where a camp had been made.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the murder referred to that of Street and Radford, or that of the two priests?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The murder of Street and Radford.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any information with regard to the murder of the two priests?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that no definite information has been received up to this time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are efforts being made by the police to find the murderers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Every effort of which the police are capable is being made.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister state that the conditions with regard to men of foreign birth are satisfactory, so far as the West is concerned, and that loyal citizens of Canada can feel that there is no disloyalty among the men who have come there to live. He spoke of the Order in Council of August 1914, as being, in effect, a message from the Canadian people as a whole to that section of our population and attributed to the provisions of that Order in Council some portion of the good results of which he spoke. But there is a growing feeling that the provisions of that Order in Council ought to be amended in relation to persons of foreign birth residing in Eastern Canada. Every hon. member must feel, having regard to information which, I am sure, each of us is receiving from his people, that there has grown up in the mind of the average Canadian of to-day a great feeling of uncertainty and suspicion concerning people of German birth in their midst. In the West, you have communities made up of what may be called the plain people of central European countries, who have fled to Canada from the militaristic conditions under which they were living. But that does not describe the condition of affairs in the East. The people of Canada believe that there are in different localities a large number of people who are disloyal and who are in touch with the enemy. They note what has taken place in the United States, where munition factories have been burned down and plots against life and property have been made, as is shown beyond the shadow of a doubt by the publication of the correspondence of attachés of both the Austrian and German embassies in New York and Washington. There can be no doubt that these men have been in correspondence with spies throughout Canada. It is easy for us to publish to the world in a wholesale way concerning persons of German or Austrian birth residing in Canada that nothing will be said to him so long as he does not openly declare hostilities. But that is not sufficient, in my judgment. The time has come when something more must be done. If you have spies in the country, you may be sure that they are not shouting from the housetops the nature of their business. It is no answer to say that these men have gone to the front. The boys at the front write that the German troops seem to know all about what is going on among the Canadian sections there. A spy would probably be quite willing to go to the front in order to be able to gain information for the benefit of his country. At any rate, there can be no doubt that there is a feeling among the people of Eastern Canada that there are people among them who are in touch with the enemy. That is shown by letters which I received from Nova Scotia, and I am sure that my experience is not different from that of any other hon. members. The provisions of the Order in Council of August, 1914, ought to be made wider, and greater power should be given the Administration in order to deal with the cases—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that the item under consideration is the vote for the Royal North West Mounted Police, and I hope he will bring his remarks within the limits of the subject before the Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD: You will remember, Sir, that the Prime Minister dealt with this very question. He spoke of the order of August, 1914, and dwelt upon the fact that its provisions, wide and generous as they were, had had good results among the foreign-born population in the West. Surely, I am in order in discussing the effect of that Order in Council, not only in regard to the West but in regard to the East as well. I do not want to go into the matter at too great length, but the same question was dealt with in another connection—if I am in order in referring to that—and I feel sure that the Prime Minister must attach importance to the representations in favour of a change in the provisions of that Order in Council. The utter disregard by the Germans and Austrians of the conditions that should ob-

tain between warring countries, is a sufficient reason why there should be, under the Defence of the Realm Act, the strongest kind of restraint upon all persons about whose loyalty there is any doubt. I have already said that I draw a distinction between the case in the West and that of the East. The men who, coming from the common people of Central Europe, have fled from militarism and taken up pastoral pursuits in our West, are quite different from those who have come to the industrial centres of the East and who live under conditions that arouse the suspicions of the people among whom they dwell. There should be the widest possible scope given to the local authorities to deal with persons of that kind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as the principle set forth in the Order in Council is concerned, I think there cannot be much difference of opinion. The principle laid down is with respect to persons who have been invited to come to this country, and who have come here as settlers to make their home, to become Canadian citizens and to assist in cultivating, building up and developing this country. The Order in Council provides that such persons who quietly pursue their ordinary avocations, shall not be interfered with unless there is reasonable ground to believe that they are giving information to the enemy or performing other acts of an illegal or hostile nature, or otherwise contravene the law. I do not know what action we should take other than that with regard to persons who have come to this country practically on the invitation of the people of Canada, and who are engaged in the ordinary pursuit of their every day affairs, and are quiet, peaceable citizens. But the Government was not unmindful of the fact that there might be many persons of enemy nationality who might make some attempt at disorder, and so an Order in Council was passed on September 3, 1914, which was laid on the table last session, prohibiting the use or possession of firearms, ammunition, or dangerous explosives, in Canada by alien enemies. I need not read the Order in Council, which contained quite elaborate provisions. Then, on October 28, 1914, an Order in Council was passed providing for registration of alien enemies, for appointment of registrars of alien enemies, prescribing regulations, providing for internment, and providing that no alien enemy, required to register, shall be naturalized unless he files the certificate of a registrar that he is registered and that his application for naturalization is approved by the registrar. This Order in Council also provides that no alien enemy shall be permitted to leave Canada without an exeat from a registrar to be issued only when the registrar is satisfied that such person will not assist the enemy. The Chief Commissioner of Dominion Police may also, in any case, grant or cancel an exeat.

Then, on November 20, 1914, provision was made for periodical reports to registrars by persons of enemy nationality, and so on. These provisions are all that seemed necessary, as far as the Government has been able to study the situation, and I think that the good effect of the orders which have been passed in that portion of Canada where the greatest number of alien enemies is to be found is the best possible proof that the regulations are in accordance with sound judgment and good sense.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am obliged to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for telling us about these official Orders in Council, but I think we might as well clear up the subject now. Matters are in an unsettled state in Eastern Canada in regard to this question, because everybody recognizes the difference between the position of a farmer settled on the plains and a man who drifts into an industrial community in the East. Is there any provision in any Order in Council under which municipal or police authorities in any of our cities or towns can, upon ascertaining that a person is of alien or enemy birth or nationality, compel him to submit to surveillance, or to report at all times, or have they to depend upon the central authorities in Ottawa? I have in my mind the fact that in a community which adjoins my county there were two Germans living at the outbreak of the war. Shortly after the war broke out one of them went away. I reported to Ottawa at the request of the neighbours of the man who remained the fact that the other man was of alien birth, that he had only been in that place for a shirt time and that he was living on a farm. I suppose he was a man who came within this Order in Council and who had been invited to come to Canada. I was told in reply that persons would be sent down to investigate. They did investigate, and I was told afterwards that this man was perfectly harmless. However, it developed that he was not a perfectly harmless man, and

at the instance of the local authorities he was arrested and was, by various processes, eventually imprisoned at Halifax and then taken to the internment camp at Amherst. He escaped last summer from the internment camp by means which showed that he had at all times been an enemy and that he should have been interned. Doubt exists in a great many eastern communities in regard to matters of this kind. I had a letter to-day from my own constituency asking whether wider powers should not be given to the police authorities to deal with these men of foreign birth, at least in the four eastern provinces. These men who have come to this country and who, unfortunately, are Germans or Austrians, must pay the penalty. I wonder what our Canadian people would think if they were in Germany to-day. I think there should be the widest possible authority given to the police authorities to deal with persons of enemy nationality.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to ask the Prime Minister what the aliens who have been interned in the Abitibi region, in the province of Quebec, are doing. Are they cultivating the land, or simply lumbering?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend will have to wait for definite information on that point until the Estimates of the Department of Justice are reached, because the internment camps are all under the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not panicky, but we must face the facts as they are. To emphasize what has been said by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I might give my personal experience. Last summer at Murray Bay, when the submarines which had been built by Vickers-Maxim at Montreal were undergoing their trials, there were for several days two spies in the district apparently surveying on the river Malbaie. The people at Murray Bay noticed them and immediately informed the police at Quebec. They did not get an answer as quickly as they expected, and, upon coming to me, I told them that they should wire to Col. Sherwood and he would direct the proper parties to have these persons looked after. I do not know what became of the two spies; they disappeared as soon as they saw the brass buttons. But in the city of Quebec itself—and my hon. friend from l'Islet (Mr. Paquette) can verify this statement—for one year before the war there was a German named Mundschein—they called him Moonshine down there—who had bought for a German syndicate, but apparently with the concurrence of some Canadian gentlemen, the extreme portion of the island of Orleans, just facing the Beaumont battery, which guards the city of Quebec and protects all that section of the river St. Lawrence. He had formed a company which, I believe, came before this Parliament four sessions ago asking for a Bill authorizing them to erect some works there. It was found that Mundschein was a German spy who had been operating in Quebec. He was arrested and interned. This shows the audacity and the treachery of those people. My hon. friend, without being panicky, states what is the simple truth, that it is part of the highest German patriotism to act as a spy. Certainly these people will come into our cities with smiles and with graceful manners; but at the same time I say we should be on the look out at all times. What has been discovered in the United States as disclosed in the Von Papen papers and the revelations in San Francisco should open the eyes of the Canadian public. I am not panicky, but I say we must be very careful in guarding against the presence of these strangers in our midst.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I think it is only fair that while we are on this item of the Northwest Mounted Police, I should say a word in respect to that body, coming as I do from the city in which they have their headquarters and have had for many years. The mounted police in Western Canada, as I have known them, have been a body of men beyond reproach, perhaps the best body of men for the preservation of law and order that we have had in Western Canada or in the whole Dominion. I read not long ago the book of Colonel Steele, now General Steele, formerly an officer of the Northwest Mounted police, called "Forty Years in Western Canada." That book gives one a very good idea of the pioneer work, of the hardships endured by that body of men in the earlier days of settlement all through the West. It was necessary in those days for the mounted police to go ahead of settlement and of civilization. They were the pioneers of civilization throughout the whole of Western Canada. A very interesting part of the book is the description of the work of the police in British Columbia when the Canadian Pacific Railway was building its road into that province. They

also, of course, did work in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the time that road first entered the Western country.

The mounted police, as a body of men, are to-day just as good a military organization as they were many years ago. We often hear in the West to-day and in the East from men who have been in the West, that the mounted police are not as good an organization as they were, say twenty-five years ago, in the matter of the preservation of law and order. My experience with the mounted police has been that they are to-day just as good a body of men as they were twenty-five years ago. All of us, especially men who are growing older, are inclined to look upon things that took place in the past as being greater than those which are taking place to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is as regard Governments.

Mr. MARTIN: As regards Governments it may be true. I also believe that we are inclined to look upon men living to-day as not being as great men as those who lived say twenty-five years ago. That may apply to statesmen as well as to ordinary individuals. However, in so far as the mounted police are concerned, I believe they are very well keeping up the traditions of the past.

During the past year and a half, since the outbreak of the war, the mounted police as a body have rendered magnificent service in the preservation of law and order in Saskatchewan, and, I believe, in the West as a whole. Reference has been made to aliens, or rather to men who are perhaps not aliens but who are naturalized British subjects, although formerly subjects of enemy countries. We have in the West a large number of people who came from Germany, and particularly from Austria. We have had very little trouble with those people in the part of the country from which I come. A number of men have been interned, and a number have been placed on parole by the Northwest Mounted Police. I think some 360 or 370 were interned by the police, and a similar number placed on parole. A number of these came under my personal attention. The total number thus dealt with is very small when compared with the number of these people in Western Canada. I believe, of course, in exercising the greatest vigilance in looking after our alien enemies in this country; but I believe that the mounted police, in our province at least, have done more than any other organization towards keeping these people in order—that is, if there had been any possibility of trouble. I am, of course, more or less inclined to look upon these people who are in this country as being entitled to a certain amount of consideration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not believe in dealing out to them what you might term cold justice. I think the mounted police have exercised a reasonable amount of discretion in dealing with them; their justice has been largely tempered with mercy. I have always felt that these people were entitled to a certain amount of consideration largely for this reason, that if I myself were residing in Germany or Austria to-day I might be inclined to have my sympathies with the country from which I came, and we cannot expect these people not to have a certain amount of sympathy with their old fatherlands. But, of course, they must be taught to exercise that sympathy in a proper direction. I rose simply for the purpose of expressing my views in regard to the mounted police. I have nothing to say with regard to them except a word of commendation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Registrars of alien enemies are appointed in any part of Canada where representations are made to the Government, or wherever the Government obtains any information which seems to justify their appointment. When they are so appointed they are in constant touch with the chief of police and the civil authorities generally with respect to alien enemies in their vicinity. I entirely concur in my hon. friend's expression of appreciation of the work of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police.

At six o'clock, the Committee took recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and ice-breakers, $1,180,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That seems a very large item.

Mr. HAZEN: The increase this year is $55,000, and it is due to the insertion of an amount for the maintenance of the steamer Montmagny, which, it is expected, will be raised and put in commission, after having lain in the bottom of the St. Lawrence since

the 18th September, 1914. When raised, she will be an extra steamer in the service. The cost of maintenance will be $67,500, but we are making the increase $55,000, as we will have a small surplus in respect of the other vessels. The expenditure under this vote in 1914-15 was $995,545.95, and up to the 31st December last it was $828,620.28. We are asking for the same amount as last year, plus the $55,000 for the maintenance of the Montmagny.

Mr. MACLEAN: Have we the same number of steamers in the service as last year?

Mr. HAZEN: We will have one more when the Montmagny is raised.

Mr. MACLEAN: Was the steamer which was sold to the Russian Government replaced?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, she was replaced by the Prince Edward Island, which is one of the mail steamers between the island and the mainland.

Mr. MACLEAN: She is a ferry boat?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, we are operating the car ferryboat. The car ferry service comes under the jurisdiction of the Railway Department, but for this winter's service the car ferry was placed at the disposal of the Department of Marine, and the Department of Marine pays the expenses of the operation of that steamer during this winter.

Mr. MACLEAN: Has that car ferry boat been successful?

Mr. HAZEN: We are told that it is giving very good service.

Mr. KYTE: What are the ice-breakers employed by the Government at present?

Mr. HAZEN: The Montcalm, the Lady Grey, the Stanley and the Prince Edward Island.

Mr. KYTE: Where are they placed for the purpose of ice-breaking?

Mr. HAZEN: The Montcalm and the Lady Grey are on the river St. Lawrence; the Stanley and Prince Edward Island are on the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. KYTE: Would any of them be available for Sydney harbour?

Mr. HAZEN: I am afraid not this year, because I do not think we can take either of the boats from the St. Lawrence, and I am also afraid that at the time that Sydney harbour might want attention it would be impossible to take the boats away from the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. MURPHY: Is the increase due to some repairs on the Montmagny?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend will remember that the Montmagny was sunk in a collision on the St. Lawrence nearly two years ago. We have entered into a contract to have her raised for $27,000. The contractors are to place her in the dock of Levis or there will be no payment. It is a case of no cure, no pay. We expect that the boat will be repaired and ready for use by next summer, and it is for the running of the boat that the extra $55,000 has been placed in the Estimates.

Mr. MACLEAN: This item does not include the naval service?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: Will the minister give the number of steamers on the ocean and river service?

Mr. HAZEN: There are twenty-seven: the Aberdeen, Arranmore, Bellechasse, Scout, Brant, Champlain, Dollard, Druid, Estevan, Frontenac, Grenville, Lady Grey, Lady Laurier, Lambton, Prince Edward Island, Lansdowne, Maggie May, Montcalm, the new ice-breaker, Montmagny, Newington, Quadra, Rouville, Shamrock, Simcoe, Stanley and Vercheres.

Mr. MACLEAN: Is there any revenue from these steamers?

Mr. HAZEN: There is from some. The Champlain conducts the ferry service between Murray Bay and River Ouelle and she earns revenue, but most of these are boats from which there is no revenue. The Aberdeen is engaged in the lighthouse and buoy service on the Bay of Fundy; the Arranmore is engaged in the same service in Nova Scotia; the Estevan in the lighthouse and buoy service in British Columbia; the Lady Laurier in the lighthouse and buoy service in Nova Scotia; the Scout is in the Prescott district; the Simcoe is on the Great Lakes; and the Stanley is in the lighthouse and buoy service in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACLEAN: What comes within the definition of maintenance?

Mr. HAZEN: The upkeep of the crew, coal, oil, and everything else that is necessaray to keep the boats running.

Mr. KYTE: How many boats were acquired by the Government during the past year.

Mr. HAZEN: None by this department.

Mr. HUGHES: Is the minister aware that the heating of the Prince Edward's saloon is very poor, and is any attempt being made to remedy it?

Mr. HAZEN: The matter has been attended to, and our latest advice, is that the saloon is comfortably heated.

Mr. HUGHES: Could the minister give me the names of the officials, and the stewards on the Stanley and the Prince Edward?

Mr. HAZEN: I remember that the name of the steward on the Stanley is Hill. I do not remember the name of the steward on the Scout. The Prince Edward belongs to the Department of Railways and Canals, and all officials on that boat are appointed by that department. We simply operate the boat during the winter, and as soon as the winter is over the boat passes under the absolute control of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. HUGHES: Have the trips been regular this year?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: I see another item for repairing the steamer Montmagny. Why have one item under Ocean and River Service, and another item under Lighthouse and Coast Service?

Mr. HAZEN: The item under discussion is for the ordinary maintenance of the steamers. The other item is an extraordinary item, involving the raising of the Montmagny, and for repairs much more expensive than those which might fairly be charged to maintenance.

Mr. KYTE: How many boats have been sold by the department to the Russian Government since the outbreak of war?

Mr. HAZEN: Two, the Earl Grey and the Minto.

Mr. KYTE: Have any boats been purchased to take their places?

Mr. HAZEN: No; the car ferry takes the place of one of the boats.

Ocean and river service—examiners of masters and mates, $16,500.

Mr. HAZEN: This item is required to pay the salaries, travelling expenses, and rent of offices of the examiners. We asked for the same amount in 1914-15, and spent $12,723.17. For the current year the estimate is $16,500. Up to the 31st of December we have spent $10,413. In addition to examining candidates for the positions of masters and mates, the examiners are expected to conduct preliminary investigations into wrecks, and to perform such other duties as the department may from time to time assign to them.

Mr. HUGHES: Who is the examiner at Charlottetown?

Mr. HAZEN: Capt. Alexander Cameron.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister intimated last year that he had in mind some changes in the form of examination for masters and mates which would enable captains holding coasting certificates to take longer voyages than the present law permits them to take. Has the minister worked that idea out?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend has introduced a Bill for the purpose of allowing those who hold coasting certificates to take longer voyages, and when the Bill comes up I shall be prepared to give the views of the department to the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Bill I introduced does not deal with the examinations; it simply seeks to have the line extended from 5 degrees north latitude to 40 degrees south latitude, in order to enable coasting vessels to go further south than they can at present. That is not the proposal the minister made last year. He proposed a new examination, and the issuing of a different kind of certificate. Does the minister contemplate doing anything along that line?

Mr. HAZEN: To do anything of that sort we should have to have legislation. What I suggested last year was that in addition to the deep sea certificate, and the coasting certificate, there might be another certificate which I referred to as a limited foreign certificate, enabling captains to go, not only on coasting voyages, but a much further distance than they can at present. The matter has been given some consideration during the recess, and when my hon. friend's Bill comes up I shall be prepared to state just what our matured opinion on the subject is. As my hon. friend has pointed out to the House on several occasions, owing to the limitation

of a coasting certificate, a good many of our vessels have withdrawn from Canadian register. There is also a tendency to register in the United States and Barbados rather than in Canada. I hope that we shall be able to make an arrangement pretty soon which will be quite satisfactory.

Ocean and river service—investigation into wrecks, $12,300.

Mr. HAZEN: The sum voted to us for the current year was $18,400 and up to the 31st of December, we spent only $8,068. Therefore we think we are justified in reducing this vote by $6,100 as compared with the vote for the current year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Were there many wrecks last year?

Mr. HAZEN: I have a list here of investigations held on wrecks that occurred during the year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It would be interesting to know how many lives were lost.

Mr. HAZEN: The losses in the wrecks that were investigated by the commissioner in most cases were small. The list, which is quite lengthy, is up to February 7, of this year. In June, the A. W. Perry stranded and was lost. The finding was that the stranding was in consequence of the carelessness and negligence of the master and the court suspended his certificate for six months. The cost of holding that investigation was $125.46. On August 30, the Alexandria was beached by the master owing to the fury of the gale and he was not held to be at fault. On August 13, 14, and 16, there was an investigation into the collision between the Batiscan and the Bengore Head. The Batiscan was held to be at fault; the master was suspended for two years, the pilot fined $100, and the pilot of the Bengore Head had his license cancelled. Does my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) wish me to read the whole list?

Mr. SINCLAIR: No.

Ocean and river service—expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. KYTE: Where are these schools located?

Mr. HAZEN: At Halifax, St. John, Quebec, North Sydney, Yarmouth, Collingwood, Kingston and Vancouver. In addition, we pay with this vote $500 a year to Queen's University, and the university provides free instruction and pays all expenses of lecture rooms, rent, etc.

Mr. MURPHY: Who are in charge of these schools?

Mr. HAZEN: At Halifax, Captain John Simmons; at St. John, Captain R. C. Coles; at Quebec, Captain P. L. LaChance; at North Sydney, Captain James Sutherland; at Yarmouth, Captain J. E. Murphy; at Collingwood, Captain Cole; at Kingston, Captain MacMaster; and at Vancouver, Captain Charles Eddie.

Mr. MACLEAN: Do you make any allowance to the Technical School at Halifax?

Mr. HAZEN: We supplied the equipment at the Technical School at Halifax, and I think we also pay the instructor.

Mr. MACLEAN: What number of students were there?

Mr. HAZEN: The school at Halifax is run the whole year around and is well patronized. During the last six months there has been an average daily attendance of eight pupils, and fifty-nine candidates have been examined for certificates during the past ten months.

Mr. MACLEAN: What number at other schools?

Mr. HAZEN: The average attendance at the school at St. John has been three, and fourteen candidates for certificates have been examined during the past ten months. At Quebec the school was not in operation during the summer and autumn months owing to the transfer of the instructor, Captain P. L. LaChance, to the pilot service of the port. The Quebec school was resumed in December, with Captain Napoleon LaChance as instructor, and there has been an average daily attendance of thirteen pupils. The Kingston school was opened on the 14th of December, under the direction of Queens University, with Captain MacMaster as instructor, and very satisfactory reports have been received respecting this school. The captain examined two candidates for certificates at Kingston on the 3rd instant. During December marine lectures were delivered at Vancouver, Collingwood, North Sydney and Yarmouth by Captains Eddie, Cole, Sutherland and Murphy respectively, and there were very fair attendances.

Mr. KYTE: What about North Sydney?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Sutherland reports a fair attendance so far this year.

Mr. KYTE: How much money has been paid by the Government to the instructor at North Sydney?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Sutherland receives $250 a year; Captain Murphy, Yarmouth, the same; Captain Cole, at Collingwood, the same.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like to see the minister establish branch schools at points along the coast, because trained seamen are very scarce on the coasts of the Maritime Provinces. It is difficult to secure men to man the vessels there, and some people do not care to go into the shipping business owing to the great difficulty in securing masters and mates who have certificates. My idea is that this branch should be run with a little more vigour, and that points might be selected along the coast where there are numbers of young men engaged in fishing, and where schools might be established. For instance, the late minister furnished some apparatus at Canso a few years ago, and the master of the high school there undertook to teach the boys navigation. In the winter season, after the month of January, the young fishermen are not very busy, and he had a vigorous class of between forty and fifty doing splendid work, about twice as many as in the city of St. John. I venture to say that there are more sailors at Canso who are prepared to attend a school of this kind and compete for certificates than there are at St. John or Halifax.

Mr. HAZEN: Is the nearest school North Sydney?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The nearest school is North Sydney, about one hundred miles away. That is a long distance for the boys to go, and North Sydney is an expensive place to live in. You cannot expect these young men to leave their homes, pay their own expenses, and go to a school in these distant places. It will be a very important step in the right direction if the minister will establish schools at points like Lunenburg, where there must be a large number of young men would attend, and also at Canso, and perhaps at Louisburg. Certainly, in Lunenburg and Canso, there are a number of young men who would like the advantage of a training of this kind. I suggested this to the minister before. The expense would not be great. I do not think it would cost more than $400 in each place to establish a school, which would educate these young men.

Mr. HAZEN: The expense would not be great if we could get suitable instructors.

Mr. TURGEON: I appreciate very much the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The minister knows that in Caraquet there is a fleet of a couple of hundred fishing vessels in which some seven or eight hundred young men learn navigation, as it were by instinct, and become as able as any others simply by following their fathers. A school of the class referred to, if established in Caraquet, would certainly have a large number of pupils. If established in Caraquet, the school would have to be carried on in French, because nearly all those who are inclined to the sea in that portion of the province are French Acadians.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: What advantage do the students get who attend these schools?

Mr. HAZEN: They get instruction in the art of navigation.

Mr. HUGHES: What monetary advantage?

Mr. HAZEN: None, they pay their own expenses, but the instruction is free. Then, if they want to get certificates as masters or mates, they can pay the examination fees, and if they are successful certificates are issued. These certificates give the holders of them the right to command vessels.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Are these examinations held in other places?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). In the province of Prince Edward Island there is no such school as is proposed. I brought this matter to the attention of the minister last session. There are a great many young men engaged in fishing in our province, as well as those in other marine occupations, and yet, as the hon. member for Guysborough has said, it is becoming more difficult to find certificated men as masters and mates. Anything that the department can do to increase the number of competent certificated men will be a great advantage to shipping. The need of a school in Charlottetown is shown by the fact that it has been taken up as a private enterprise. The students have not only to pay their own board but pay for their tuition as well. Perhaps the school is not very well equipped. Is equipment given by the department to these schools?

Mr. HAZEN: In addition to these Government schools, there are a number of private schools, some of which have been in operation for years. The policy of the department has always been to interfere as little as possible with these private schools. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) speaks of the difficulty of finding certificated men, but if he will refer to page 226 of the last report of the Department of Marine he will find a list of certificates of competency issued to masters, mates and sea-going second mates. This list covers eight pages of rather fine print.

Mr. HUGHES: How many masters?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot give the number offhand, but I think the hon. gentleman will be surpised if he consults the list to see how large the number is.

Mr. HUGHES: The claim made by the minister—which he made last session also—that the policy of the department is not to interefere with private schools, hardly holds good in the case of Prince Edward Island, because the necessity there, as I have pointed out, has long existed.

Mr. HAZEN: Is there any private school on the Island?

Mr. HUGHES: Only the one at Charlottetown, and the very existence of that school proves that many wish to get the benefit of this education. I do not want the department to interfere, by establishing a rival school, but a small grant would enable the teacher or teachers in that school to give tuition free, and this would undoubtedly increase the attendance. Those who wish to attend the school at Charlottetown have to leave their homes in Souris, Tignish, Rustico, or other outlying stations, and come to Charlottetown and pay their board. The minister should take this matter into careful consideration. The province would, I think, be fairly entitled to that much consideration.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall have the greatest pleasure in looking into the matter, and if we find a grievance in Prince Edward Island that should be redressed it will be redressed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It will be a small thing, why not do it now?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know how I might be interfering with private enterprise there.

Mr. HUGHES: I can assure the minister that if he follows the course I suggest he will not interfere with private enterprise.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps we can do something between this and next year. Two years ago the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) pointed out the necessity of having a school somewhere along the Baie des Chaleurs or Gaspe coast in Quebec. He made out such a strong case that I told him I would certainly make arrangements during the year to have instruction given there. I did so, and the school was conducted at Carleton, on the Baie des Chaleurs, during December, 1914, and January, February and March, 1915, ninety-six days in all. The average daily attendance was four, the maximum attendance six, and the minimum two. The school was fairly successful, four of the pupils passing for masters of tug-boats, and two for masters of passenger tug-boats on the minor inland waters. Owing to the absence of Captain Landry no steps can be taken to open the school this year. We understand that the desire there now is to have a school for the instruction of engineers for steam vessels, and we are considering that.

My hon. friend from Inverness asked where examinations had to be passed. If at any time we find two or three students at any place desiring to take examinations, say on the coast of Nova Scotia, we do not compel them to go to Halifax, but cause the examiner to go to the town where they are. This avoids putting the candidates to expense.

Mr. HUGHES: Was the whole amount voted last year used?

Mr. HAZEN: No. Out of a vote of $8,000 we had used, up to December 31, $2,406.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister could certainly take some of that money to implement the school at Charlottetown and make it more efficient and available for those who wish to take advantage of it. He has the money; I think he is favourably disposed; the cause is a good one, and, as he gave a promise to the hon. member for Bonaventure last year and carried it out, I would ask him to place the province of Prince Edward Island in line with the other provinces.

Mr. HAZEN: I have asked the deputy minister to make a special note with regard to Prince Edward Island, and we shall look into the matter. If conditions exist that make it desirable that there should

be a school of navigation on the island, there is no reason why one should not be established there. But I think it will be found that the reason there has not been one on the island is that it might conflict with some other school and perhaps interfere with some legitimate business now being carried on in Charlottetown.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not asking the minister to interfere with the school already established; I only want him to assist that school and make it more efficient and valuable.

Mr. TURGEON: If I make my urgent request for Gloucester, may I have the same assurance as has been given to my hon. friend?

Mr. SINCLAIR: If I understood the minister, he said that officers of ships were more numerous than we supposed they were. I would be glad to know if that is the case, because it is a general complaint on the coast that it is almost impossible to secure masters and mates for ocean-going and coasting vessels. How many qualified during the past year in all these schools? Is the list to which the minister referred a list of qualified men; when was that list revised, and can the minister assure us that these men are in the country and are available? Very often when these young men get certificates they go to Gloucester or some other American port and secure ships there.

Mr. HAZEN: I did not refer to a general list, but to the number who received certificates during the year ended 31st March, 1915. It is a long list and will be found at page 226 of the report of the department. I do not know how many are available, but there must be a list somewhere showing that.

Mr. MACLEAN: Has there been any change in the law requiring vessels to carry mates? What tonnage must a vessel be before she is obliged to carry a licensed or certificated mate?

Mr. HAZEN: There has been no change in the law. It is more difficult to get certificated mates than to get certificated masters. The owners of coasting vessels have made representations urging that they should not have to carry certificated mates. That is a burning question with the owners of vessels.

Mr. MACLEAN: This matter has been discussed annually on this same vote. As the hon. member for Guysborough says, there is a great shortage in the supply of masters and mates in the Maritime Provinces, especially in Nova Scotia. During the last several years it has been a common things to have ships detained in ports for days, and sometimes for weeks, owing to their inability to get certificated mates. There may be fundamental reasons for this which the Government cannot cure. It is a fact that in the Maritime Provinces to-day there is very little shipping owned, beyond the smaller shipping used in the coasting and fishing trades.

Whatever be the cause, it is not possible in the Maritime Provinces to get the same number of qualified masters and mates as one could find a number of years ago. In recent years, in my own province at least, it has become the practice to transfer the registry of ships from Canada to Trinidad, the Barbados, and other British possessions. I think that probably, to-day, with regard to the greater portion of all shipping in Nova Scotia not engaged in the purely coasting or fishing trade, the registration has been transferred to Trinidad and the Barbados, in order, I understand, to escape the necessity of carrying certificated mates. If these vessel owners can do that, and escape the necessity of carrying certificated mates, there is not much encouragement to young men who purpose pursuing a marine career to obtain their certificates. I think it is also difficult to obtain certificated masters and there is also a great shortage in that respect. I do not object to the establishment of these small schools at any point which needs them. So far they have not been successful. I remember that when I represented the county of Lunenburg a school was started there. For a few weeks there was a very considerable attendance, but in a short time the school proved a failure and I do not think it has since been resuscitated. That is true regarding a great many other ports in the province. I have frequently said here before that a better way of interesting young men and providing training for a marine career would be to have one central school, where a great number of young men might congregate together, and from the contact and association they would receive new views and wider ambitions. The great trouble about the small school is that the attendance is limited and the advantages are not very great. I remember a number of years ago men coming from all parts of the province to attend a

private school at Halifax which was in existence when I was at college there. I do not think the expense is any impediment whatever to young men desirous of attending these schools. A likely attendant at a marine school is one who has had some service at sea and he is not the sort of person who is apt to complain about the small cost of attending the school. I do not agree with some of the views presented by my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), because you cannot make a marine school with persons who object to making some sort of expenditure towards acquiring his education. I would hardly approve of that, although I should thoroughly approve of assisting a school in any way one possibly could. It may be that the difficulty in getting, in the Maritime Provinces, a sufficient supply of certificated masters and mates is due to our shipping laws of one kind or another and our statutory requirements in respect to masters and mates. Practically all the vessels from western Nova Scotia are registered in Barbados and Trinidad, but if you could avoid that and secure the registration of these vessels at home ports, you might be able to supply the ambition of our young men. This is a matter that requires looking into.

Mr. KYTE: To what extent are these certificates recognized by the Board of Trade in England?

Mr. HAZEN: They are recognized by the Board of Trade absolutely. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) asked me a question as to the tonnage of a vessel engaged in the coasting trade that had to obtain a certificated master and mate. A ship of 150 tons has to have a certificated master to engage in the coasting trade, while a ship of 400 tons and upwards is required to have a certificated master and also a certificated mate.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In reference to what my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has said, really the main reason why vessels are being transferred to Barbados and other colonies is because they are not allowed to clear for distant ports. Most of these vessels over 400 tons require to have masters and mates. The owners of these vessels do not send them to sea without these officers. But the main reason why they seek registration elsewhere is that the customs officer will not allow them to go to distant places. If a man comes

9 p.m.

to clear for the River Plate the Canadian customs officer will tell him that he cannot allow him to go farther than the fifth degree of north latitude. The River Plate at present happens to be the place where the best business is to be obtained, and, therefore, these owners are driven to Barbados to register their ships. I do not want to enter into this question just now. When my Bill is before the House I will give the minister the reasons I have for asking him to adopt it as a Government measure, which I hope he will do this year.

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot see the force of the reasoning of my hon. friend from Halifax. I think he favours the establishment of a large school at Halifax.

Mr. MACLEAN: Oh, no.

Mr. HUGHES: Or at some point in Nova Scotia, but he would not have one at Charlottetown.

Mr. MACLEAN: Oh, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it was St. John that he had in mind.

Mr. HUGHES: That appears strange to me. I do not see why. The very fact that there is a school at Charlottetown without any assistance shows the advantage and necessity of such an institution. I could not present any stronger argument than that. There must surely be a necessity for it when private enterprise tries to meet the necessity. If the department is encouraging such schools in the other provinces it seems to me that it would be a wise thing to encourage a school where it has already been established and where the facts of its establishment prove the advantage of it. There is another point but I do not know that the time is opportune to discuss it. I, and I presume other hon. members from the Maritime Provinces, get letters from coasting captains and owners complaining of the privileges that are given to Norwegian and foreign vessels engaged in the coasting trade. They say that our men are at a very great disadvantage. If we buy a vessel, for instance, in Norway, or in any part of the world, and bring it here we have to pay a duty of from 25 to 33 per cent. But the Norwegians can come here in their own vessels. I understand that they fit them out in Norway, where provisions are much cheaper than they are in Canada; they are manned by Norwegians, and the

wages are much lower than in Canada. They come here and are admitted to all the coasting privileges of this country. They carry cargoes from one port to another, competing with our sea-faring men, with the result that complaints are loud and long. I presume that the department is cognizant of these complaints, and perhaps we might as well discuss this matter.

Mr. HAZEN: The matter falls within the control of the Customs Department and not the Marine Department. For a good many years, since 1904, there has been passed from year to year a regulation allowing vessels of not less than 2,000 tons, owned by Norwegians, and trading between the Maritime Province ports and the ports of Quebec and Montreal, to engage in that business. I am not very familiar with the subject, but I think the regulation was passed for the purpose of enabling the coal owners of Nova Scotia to get their coal to the Montreal market. I have been told, and I think there is a report to that effect, that, if it were not for that privilege accorded to the Norwegians, the coal could not be brought in sufficient quantities to Montreal every year, and the result would be that American coal would have to be brought in to a greater extent than at present to supply the markets of Montreal and the West. The regulation applies, I think, only to vessels over 2,000 tons.

Mr. HUGHES: Not to smaller vessels?

Mr. HAZEN: Only to vessels of 2,000 tons and upwards.

Mr. MACLEAN: The point raised by the hon. member for Kings has suggested another matter to my mind. Whatever there may be in the objection raised to Norwegian shipping, I feel it would be hardly fair to press that objection at the present time, because Canada is suffering from a shortage of shipping in the province of Nova Scotia. There is really a coal famine in many parts of the province, despite the fact that we live in a province no part of which is far removed from a coal field, and that is due to a lack of shipping.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand it was partly due to a shortage of miners in Cape Breton.

Mr. MACLEAN: It was due to the great demand for coal, and to the fact that it was impossible to obtain sufficient shipping. There is a coal famine in the Island of Newfoundland because it is impossible to get shipping. I have in mind a place west of Halifax where the people were obliged to do absolutely without coal during the present winter. If the coal was available at the collieries, the shipping was not available, and the coal could not be taken there by rail. This condition is very liable to recur next year, because the demand for coal will be greater than the capacity of the mines to supply it. The available shipping will not be greater, but in all likelihood it will be less. Is it not possible that this fleet of steamers, to maintain which we pay $1,250,000, could be available in the fall of the year, after the services of the department have been completed, for the carriage of coal to certain sections of the country. I do not know whether that is practicable. It may be that the department is allowing steamers to lie in the River St. Lawrence all winter that could be made useful, perhaps not for the purpose I have mentioned, but for other purposes. There is a tremendous shortage of shipping in the Maritime Provinces during all seasons of the year. At all events, that was the case last year, and I believe it will be more severe next year. If there are any ships of the Marine Department laid up in the river St. Lawrence during the winter, could they not be transferred to the Maritime Provinces late in the fall, so as to have them available if needed.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think that any of these vessels would be suitable for carrying coal. As my hon. friend knows, they are not large vessels; they have been built for the purpose of putting out and taking up buoys, taking supplies to the different lighthouses, and doing that class of work. I doubt whether any of them are capable of being used as colliers. There are not many of them lying in the St. Lawrence. Take the Arramore, for instance. That boat is in Halifax during the winter months doing work in that neighbourhood, and most of our boats are well employed. They have to be repaired and overhauled annually, and as a rule they are kept pretty busy. For coal carrying purposes large dead weight boats are necessary. Some of the Government vessels carry coal to the lighthouses, but I do not think they could relieve the situation to which my hon. friend refers. If I understand him correctly, his view agrees with the idea that in order to get the coal away from the Nova Scotia ports to the ports of the St. Lawrence it is necessary to allow these Norwegian vessels to carry it. If that ser-

vice were cut off, there would be a shortage of the coal supply in Montreal, and the price would advance.

Mr. MACLEAN: There is a difference of opinion about that. My own view is that this is not the proper time to press the objection raised by the hon. member for Kings, because the coal companies of Nova Scotia have great difficulty in supplying the demands along the St. Lawrence. In fact they cannot do it, and I am afraid they will not be able to do it for several years. Has the Government had under consideration during the past year the idea of supplying some marine tonnage in Canada, or of encouraging it by advancing money for the construction of vessels or otherwise? Canadian trade is liable to suffer immensely in the future by reason of lack of tonnage. The destruction of the world's tonnage during the past 18 months has been enormous, and it will probably be at least ten years before the tonnage destroyed can be restored. In Canada we depend entirely upon the exports of the products of the mines, the forests, the sea and the land. We cannot import anything unless we export, and it is absolutely necessary that we should be secured in the possession of tonnage sufficient to carry these exports. The minister has already stated that he has made arrangements with the Admiralty to secure tonnage, particularly for the carriage of munitions of war.

France has undertaken to advance money to persons who are willing to buy ships, or to have them constructed, and I think the Government of Canada might do well to consider giving assistance of this kind. I do not know what conditions are like on the Pacific, but there is no doubt at all that a certain extra amount of tonnage on the Atlantic might be the salvation of Canadian trade. But this must not be left till too late; it must be done at the proper time. I should like to hear from the minister whether the Government has had this matter under consideration.

Mr. HAZEN: I know my hon. friend would not expect me to tell him in detail just what has been discussed in connection with this matter between the members of the Cabinet. I may say, however, that the subject to which he refers has received the very serious consideration and attention of the Government. There are certain difficulties in the way, however. My hon. friend is no doubt right in saying that we may suffer in the future from lack of tonnage. That is true of all countries in the world. I am told that a very unfortunate state of affairs exists at present in Australia and New Zealand on account of the difficulty they have in getting ships to carry away the wool, and it is not only unfortunate for Australia and New Zealand, but for the other countries that use the wool, and for the countries whose mills manufacture it. I may say that since I spoke on this subject during the debate on the Address the Admiralty have furnished us with more transports. At the present time fifty-three transports are assigned to the Atlantic trade. I get returns every morning, and I find that nearly every morning there are six or seven transports at Halifax, and five, six or seven at St. John—usually from twelve to fourteen boats at the two ports. At the present moment those transports are taking away Canadian goods—munitions of war, hay, oats, etc.—as fast, and I am inclined to think a little faster than the railways are able to get them to the ports of Halifax and St. John. At the present time, therefore, there is little disturbance of Canadian trade on account of lack of tonnage, but I quite agree that disturbance may come in the future. There is, of course, a great deal less tonnage than before the war broke out. Many ships have been either destroyed, interned, or assigned to naval purposes. In regard to my hon. friend's suggestion that people should be encouraged to increase the tonnage of our country, I may say that at the present time people are not disposed to put their money very largely into ships. The expense of building is very great and the cost of the raw material is very high. On the other hand, freights are exceedingly high, but there is great uncertainty how long that may continue. Of course, I am not in a position to give any detailed statement to the House on this question, but I may say that negotiations have been going on, and much correspondence has taken place.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps my hon. friend can tell us how it is that Japan is going ahead with enormous rapidity in the building of a mercantile marine. All the shipyards in Japan, the newspapers inform us, are busy night and day turning out ships. Thousands of men are engaged in the work. But here in Canada, with vast supplies to send across the Atlantic, we are doing absolutely nothing along that line. Our people, I regret to say, are receiving absolutely no encouragement from the Govern-

ment to go on with ship building. France has given encouragement, with a view to increasing her mercantile marine for the purpose of enabling products of other countries to be brought to France more cheaply than would otherwise be the case. To-day the people of Canada, and those who consume Canadian goods, are paying on an average one thousand per cent more than what is reasonable—one thousand per cent more than was paid before the war broke out.

Mr. HAZEN: That is true of other countries besides Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But, other countries are trying to make good the deficiency. They are trying to build up a carrying trade themselves. Japan is doing wonderful work in that direction. Here in Canada it seems to me that our mercantile marine is simply going to destruction; it is gradually growing less and less, and no encouragement at all is being given.

Mr. HAZEN: The main trouble is that our regular liners on the Atlantic and Pacific have been commandeered by the Admiralty.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They are not Canadian ships.

Mr. HAZEN: The Canadian Pacific Railway——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Those are British ships.

Mr. HAZEN: But they are owned in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They are built under circumstances and under laws which give to the British shipbuilder an enormous advantage over the Canadian shipbuilder. Those ships enter our ports without paying any duty. They come into Canada without paying one single cent into the treasury. On the other hand, a shipbuilder in Canada must pay an enormous duty on a vast number of articles which go into the building of ships. If a Canadian shipbuilder wants to build a sailing vessel and operate it by means of auxiliary power, he has to pay an enormous duty on the machinery required to secure that power.

Mr. HAZEN: The Canadian shipbuilder gets a large rebate on most of the material that goes into the construction of a ship. Does my hon. friend suggest that we should place a duty on ships from Great Britain—ships that come here flying the British flag?

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Gentlemen on this side of the House might hesitate to advocate general protection, but surely hon. gentlemen opposite, who impose a very high protective duty against almost every other class of people in Canada, ought not to hesitate to give some encouragement to the building of ships in this country. One would think it would not be straining their conscience too much, or trespassing too much on their good judgment, if they were to move along these lines. As a representative of a Maritime province, I desire to say that there is no interest in Canada which is more deserving of encouragement than ship building. It would probably not be necessary to impose a very heavy duty, but surely it would not be unreasonable for the Government to give some encouragement by way of a bonus to encourage the building of ships. It is not absolutely necessary to go into the building of steel ships. Wooden vessels could be constructed, and would be able to do good work in the carrying trade. My hon. friend says the matter is under consideration. He makes the same objection that the Minister of Trade and Commerce made the other day, namely, that the war may end very suddenly, and that the people are not willing to go into this business. Should an argument like that influence the Government of this country? Surely it is of enormous importance that Canadian products—Canadian wheat, Canadian cattle, Canadian pulp and lumber—should be taken across the Atlantic and to our allies as cheaply as possible, and that this enormously heavy rate, which is a thousand times greater than it ought to be, should be done away with. Yet the Government, although the war has been going on now for about eighteen months, has done absolutely nothing and the minister tells this committee just what the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated the other night, that the matter is under consideration, but that there are serious difficulties in the way. This Government should go ahead in the way of encouraging shipbuilding irrespective of whether this war may last for one year or for ten years. They should look ahead and seek to relieve the situation by fostering a shipbuilding industry in Canada. There are splendid opportunities on both oceans; we have plenty of men who understand everything about shipbuilding; we have some of the finest shipcarpenters in the world, and we know that, in the past, when we were building wooden ships, the ships of Canada were found on every sea and bore the palm away from the

ships of any other country. If there was sufficient encouragement we could build ships in Canada, and now is the time when we may reasonably look forward to this as there will be an enormous demand for shipping for a good many years to come. We ought to take hold of the matter seriously and see if shipbuilding cannot be so encouraged that it may be undertaken in earnest on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. I do not mention this simply with the idea of bringing my views before the House in order to get them on Hansard, but I do it most sincerely and earnestly in the hope that my hon. friend who presides over the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which is peculiarly charged with this matter, who represents a maritime constituency and a city which used to be one of the great shipowning cities in the world; a city where they used to build ships by the score and by the hundred, may take it up and press it upon his colleagues, and see that some action is taken in the immediate future, so that we may not come back next session and be told that the matter is still under consideration and that there are still difficulties in the way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I fear we never can become a great shipbuilding country while we have the present tariff rates, because so long as British shipbuilders can build ships from 35 to 50 per cent below what we can construct them for in Canada, there is very little prospect for the construction of ships in Canada to any great extent. Further, I think the ownership of shipping and engagement in shipping is preliminary to the construction of ships in any country. The important thing, however, for Canada to-day is to own ships and this would be a very opportune time to encourage the early acquisition of shipping and that can be helped by removing the duty, which I understand is 25 per cent, Canadian interests might buy some ships abroad from neutral nations during the next few years and if that is possible, there is no reason in the world why a tariff of 25 or 35 per cent should be imposed. We want some changes in the tariff immediately to encourage the purchase of ships.

Mr. EDWARDS: In the remarks of the two hon. gentlemen who have just preceded me we have an example of that delightful unanimity which prevails so frequently on the other side of the House. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) almost announced himself as a protectionist along shipbuilding lines, while the hon, junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) considers that an impossibility, under existing conditions of shipbuilding in the old land with which we could not expect to compete. However, it was not to criticise the remarks of these two hon. gentlemen that I rose to speak. Speaking entirely for myself, because this is a forum where I presume we have the right to express our own views whether they have any value or not, I cannot see any reason why a country like Canada, which owns railway lines like the Intercolonial, which takes the money of the country to equip and operate those lines, should not also own and operate steamship lines. The difficulty of the transportation of wheat from the West to the markets of the world would be largely overcome if the Government would spend some millions of dollars in building and operating lines of wheat freighters which would guarantee to the farmers of the West that their wheat would be carried to the markets of the world at the lowest possible cost. Not only would we be justified in doing that by reason of the benefit that would accrue to the growers of wheat in the West, but it would necessarily mean that, instead of about 40 per cent of our surplus wheat leaving Canada by Canadian ports and the other 60 per cent by American ports, a very much larger proportion would go over Canadian railways to Canadian ports. I agree with the remarks of the hon. junior member for Halifax. I believe this is the time when we should boldly launch out towards owning our own ships, and spend a large amount of money, if necessary, in building vessels to carry our produce across the ocean. The United States has never been a maritime country; it has never purchased a large merchant marine and it does not look as if it ever would, and after this war is over, it seems to me there is going to be a magnificent opportunity for Canada to launch out into something big along the lines of a merchant marine. As a man from one of the older provinces, I believe that the country would be warranted in taking steps along that line. It seems to me that the result would be wonderfully advantageous to the producers of wheat in the Western provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD: This problem is not one for the Maritime Provinces, it is really a national problem. Every acre of land that is brought under cultivation

in the West, and every additional hundred bushels of wheat produced, makes greater the necessity for action in regard to this matter. Of what use to us as a nation are the three great transcontinental lines now practically in operation from sea to sea if, when we reach the seaboard on the Atlantic or the Pacific, there is no tonnage to carry our products except what is beyond the control of the Canadian people? When our friends in the West, of both political parties, say that grievances exist; that there is discrimination in ocean freights; and that the Western farmers have suffered because of the failure to transport products, there can be no manner of doubt that there is some basis for what they say. But I am not sure that our friends from the West quite grasp the situation as it exists in the Maritime Provinces. Thirty-five years ago, the foreign trade of Canada was almost exclusively carried by ships owned and built in Canada. Before the decay of the industry in wooden vessels, the tonnage of Canada upon the sea was greater per capita than that of any nation in the world—greater than that of England herself. After the disappearance of wooden vessels, there came an interim in which the carrying trade fell largely into the hands of Great Britain and Norway. The Norwegians purchased the old Canadian wooden vessels, and by rigid lowering of expenses were able to operate them at rates below those asked by others. Now the question arises whether our internal development is to be hampered and interfered with by the possibility of lack of tonnage on the sea. That condition arose quite apart from the war. Last year we had an abnormally large crop, but even if the war had not interfered, as it has to a great degree, with the handling of that crop upon the ocean, there would be discontent and trouble probably just the same. Every year, as our production increases, there is great discontent in Canada over this question. Now, we have three propositions in this matter. The proposition of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is that Canada should own and control a mercantile marine. That is very similar to the proposition advanced by President Wilson last year in the message to the United States Senate, in which he proposed that the nation should purchase a very large number of vessels as a means of solving the problem which exists in that country. That proposition did not pass the Congress of the United States. The tremendous extent of our territory, and the fact that the greater number of our people are not familiar with maritime affairs, surrounds the question with a great many difficulties, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see. When the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) speaks of Canada owning a mercantile marine, I take it, he does not speak of it in the same sense as does the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). What he means is that Canadians individually should develop and own a mercantile marine. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) points out that on account of tariff conditions there are difficulties in the way of vessel construction. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), as I understand him, proposes to solve the problem by giving a bonus to those who will engage in the building of ships in Canada. These three honourable gentlemen, like everyone in Canada who has considered this problem, realize its significance and the necessity of some solution being found. We have been going on for twenty-five years considering whether we should subsidize this railway or bonus that one, until we have a great network of railways throughout Canada. But these will be of no value if their freights cannot be taken beyond the shores of Canada. That something must be done is recognized. I hope the Government will not deal with this question by appointing a commission to look into it. These commissions to deal with matters that the Government itself ought to deal with do not facilitate progress. The problem can be solved, and solved in the interests of the Canadian people. I come from a constituency in which steel vessels have been built without a bonus and in spite of tariff difficulties. At this moment you can build vessels in Canada of steel, equal to those which come from the Clyde. We forget that the only reason why we did not begin to build steel vessels to replace the wooden vessels twenty-five years ago is that we had no steel industry in Canada. At that time we had no industry that could roll a steel rail or cast a steel ingot, much less roll steel plates for building vessels. It is only within the last ten or fifteen years that that industry has arisen. Today we have many places where steel plates are rolled. Once you have the steel plates the matter of putting them together is a very small problem. The proposition is one that requires consideration and the in-

auguration of a policy on broad lines. If there are conditions in the tariff which prevent development of the industry, amend the tariff. Let us not bandy words about our old differences with regard to free trade and protection, but come down to practical lines and assist in the establishing of an industry that is absolutely essential. We talk of the prosperity of the steel industry in this country. Why is it prosperous? Simply because the mills are rolling steel ingots to be turned into shells, while another shop takes that ingot and carries on the manufacture to the completion of the article in the form of a shell. But some day this shell production is going to stop, and when it stops the steel industry of this country will have nothing to do so far as one can see under existing conditions. The construction of the transcontinental railway lines provided employment for the men engaged in the steel business for a long period of years. We cannot look forward to further large railway construction. The men engaged in the steel industry in this country will tell you that they are prepared to roll the steel necessary for the construction of vessels. Some plan ought to be devised by this Government—and I am not speaking at all in a spirit of partisanship—that would remove the existing difficulties, the nature of which could easily be ascertained upon inquiry, providing for the disappearance from the tariff of those things that interfere with the industry, and providing, by a bonus if you will, as is done in other countries, for the inauguration of the building of vessels. The question is one which can not be settled haphazard, but the Government, or any minister devoting his time and attention to it, could develop a policy within a very short time which would mean that something could be done to create in Canada a steel shipbuilding industry and bring about the construction of vessels which are absolutely essential to the future of Canada.

This discussion is one which has taken a wide range, but the opportunity has not come hitherto this session, and I think that, the question having been discussed along this line, every hon. gentleman can see that the situation which exists is one that ought to be remedied. Let me reiterate this fact, that the condition is not one which has been precipitated by the war. Those of us who live down by the sea, when we see vessels going out from our ports, know that if this war had never occurred the difficulty would have existed just the same, and that it has been increasing year by year. We know that the revenues of the Minister of Railways and Canals have been diminished in the past because there have been no vessels to take the products carried over the Government road. The situation as put by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is absolutely correct. Millions of tons of Canadian products and freight pass through American seaports, and have been passing for the last ten or fifteen years in increasing quantities, simply because Canada has stood still on the question of marine construction. That condition will continue increasingly to exist, and will become very much more acute unless the Government deal with the question. The Minister of Railways and Canals is interested in this problem quite as much as the Minister of Marine is. We have two great transcontinental railway systems passing through Canadian territory, and we are looking for the time when the other will find an outlet through Canadian territory to the Atlantic, just as it already has to the West, and, as a patriotic people, we are hoping for the time when Canada will send her own products over her own roads down to the seaboard, ship them through our own ports, and carry them in our own bottoms across the sea.

Canada can never reach the point which we are all so ambitious to see her attain; she will never have that forceful place in the Empire, until we show that at our own steel works we can do what the men in the Clyde are doing, until we show to the whole world that we can do that which any other part of the British Empire can do. I have heard hon. gentlemen tell us that you cannot do this because they are doing it in some other country. Everybody in these strenuous times is beginning to realize that we Canadians do not need to take off our hats to the men of any other nation or of any other part of the Empire whether it is in fighting or in industry. Canadians can do anything in an industrial way that is done by any other nation. Who would have thought a year and a half ago that every wheel in every iron shop in this country would be turning, that every lathe would be at work, producing shells for the war? Did anybody think that we could produce shells? Yet all of our industries are busy, all our workmen are engaged day by day at that industry. They told us that we could not make shells in 1914 and some people say that we cannot build ships. The

men who are turning out shells to-day can produce the steel plates that are used in the construction of modern steel ships, and they can rivet these plates together just as well as men who happened to be born on the banks of the Clyde, or at Newcastle-on-Tyne, or anywhere in France or Germany.

Look at the question in the broad way, and what is the problem? You can assist or impede the development of an industry by questions of tariff and by other elements which must be taken into consideration. You must remember also that the inauguration of an industry has to take place. It is insulting to the intelligence and the capacity of our people to say that we cannot do this, because we can. All the rest is a matter of governmental action and governmental assistance along such lines as experience and wisdom may dictate. Let the Government devote their energy, attention and ability to the consideration of this whole question so that they may be in a position to formulate a policy which they can place before the Canadian people entirely apart from anything like narrow or partisan lines. I feel satisfied that the Government that would propound such a policy would receive the support of all patriotic Canadians irrespective of party.

Mr. TURRIFF: I quite agree with some of the remarks made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and with that one in particular to the effect that all the money that we have put into railways during past years, amounting to probably over one thousand million dollars, will be, to a large extent, unproductive, unless some better system of handling the crops that these railways handle shall be adopted in the future than in the past. I would like to point out that the excess freight rates charged on the 1915 crop of wheat grown in western Canada will amount to between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000, and that for carrying the wheat across the water, it will cost between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 this year more than it would have cost previous to the war. Even if it costs something to secure a proper supply of bottoms to take the products of Canada across the water we can afford to pay something to have that done. But the question really resolves itself into what is the best way of handling this problem. Last year when the matter of granting a new charter to the Canadian Pacific Steamship Company—a subsidiary company to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the vessels all being owned by the Canadian Pacific railway—was up, some of us endeavoured to have the Government take power to control the rates on these vessels. The Minister of Railways could not see it in that light; he could not see that he had any power to control the rates on the ocean. It seems very strange to me that if the Canadian Pacific railway can carry wheat from the western provinces to Montreal, St. John, or Halifax at the same rate that they charged two or three years ago, it should be necessary, the moment that wheat strikes tide water this year, for them to charge five, six and seven times as much as they did previously. How are we going to get a remedy? Is it going to be by following the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that the Canadian Government could build and own the ships, or by following the suggestion of my hon. friend from Pictou that subsidies should be granted to secure the building of ships, or by so arranging the tariff that the ships will be built? I do not know which of these proposals would be the best, but I want to say that in the United States, under a heavy protective tariff, they have struggled for the last fifty years to build ships, and, they have not done it, and can not do it. My idea is that if you want to build ships to carry the grain products of Canadian farms from this continent to the European market, you do not have to build Government ships, and you do not have to pay a great big bonus to the Canadian Pacific railway or to the Allan line or to any other company. to build ships. You do not have to give great big subsidies to the steamship lines. What you want to do is to take the duties off the products, to make the building of ships cheap, to follow the example of Great Britain. How does Great Britain manage to have such fleets on every one of the seven seas? Simply because she frames her own laws so that the ships can be built cheaply and run cheaply. We in Canada have followed the opposite course and now we are up against a wall, and a remedy must be found. I do not know how that remedy will be found, but I am absolutely satisfied that the best remedy that could be found would be to take off the duties, to make the material that goes into your ships cheap, and then you would find, as the hon. member for Pictou said, that you have the men in Canada, that there is the money in Canada, that would produce these ships and carry the produce of the country to the markets of the world

at a proper price, so that the farmer would get a reasonable price for growing the products. To my mind that would be a much better way than either to build Government ships or to subsidize privately owned ships. If you build Government ships, and I think we can build them—I do not at all agree with the Prime Minister when he said that we could not build ships in Canada in fifty years. We can build them to-day and to-morrow.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Prime Minister never said anything of the kind.

Mr. TURRIFF: I sat in the House of Commons and heard the Prime Minister say in 1911-12 that you could not build a navy in Canada in 25 or 50 years.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is entirely different from your first position. You were in power for fifteen years and did not make much of a start at them.

Mr. PARDEE: You are a small Canadian.

Mr. TURRIFF: We can build ships in Canada to-day, and we have proven it time and again. We have built ships on the Great Lakes, some of them larger than many that cross the ocean, and we would build them to-day if the tariff was so arranged that they could be built profitably. Why are they not built? Simply because it is not profitable to build them.

10 p.m.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: Where would you get the material?

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand from the hon. member for Pictou that they can roll plates and all sorts of steel that goes into a ship down in Nova Scotia. My hon. friend comes from a province very close to Nova Scotia and he may have heard that there is an iron and steel works in Sydney.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The hon. member said that the United States does not build its ships and never will. They produce everything which goes into a ship. Why then are they not able to build the ships as well as in England?

Mr. TURRIFF: I told the hon. gentleman why they have not been able to do so. It is because they have a high protective tariff and the ships cost so much that they cannot compete with Great Britain with her low tariff.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: But they produce everything that goes into the ship, and there is no tariff on what they put into the ship.

Mr. TURRIFF: They produce everything that goes into the ship, but the tariff on the material going into the ship is so high that it enables the home manufacturer to charge a price which makes the completed ship cost so much that it cannot carry freight at a profit. And that accounts to a large extent for our not having ships. Then the United States coasting laws prohibit foreign ships from coming in and carrying freight from one port to another. That accounts for the United States not having a mercantile marine and it accounts for Canada not having a proper mercantile marine. We built ships when wooden ships were in vogue, and now that steel ships are altogether in use we could make steel ships; but you have to make the conditions such that men with capital will see a fair return for the capital if they put it into ships.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is there a protective tariff on the products of the steel company at Sydney?

Mr. TURRIFF: There is a protective tariff on a large amount—

Mr. EDWARDS: Will you take it off?

Mr. TURRIFF: —of the steel that is manufactured in Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would you take it off? You want things free; now would you take it off?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend is asking for—

Mr. EDWARDS: He wont say he will take it off.

Mr. TURRIFF: If the hon. member will keep quiet a moment he will get his answer. I would take it off and I would take it off everything else. You cannot corner me on taking off duties—

Mr. EDWARDS: It is not necessary; you will corner yourself.

Mr. TURRIFF: —you lose every time you try.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman corners himself.

Mr. TURRIFF: Of course I am quite ready to take off any duties. The Government consult the steel people as to whether duties will be taken off or put on. and go largely by what the steel people

say. But they will not do that with us in the West; when we ask the Government to take the duty off our product the Government will not even take off the duty that the people who produce the goods ask to have removed.

Mr. EDWARDS: They are wise.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would be glad to have all duties taken off. But to return to the question.

Mr. HAZEN: The question is navigation schools.

Mr. TURRIFF: I know, but the hon. gentleman took this opportunity of discussing the general question, and now we are discussing the question of ships, which has something to do with navigation, and navigation schools have something to do with training officers for the ships. We must have the ships. We must have some better methods than we have to-day for carrying the products of the Canadian farm across to the markets of the world. The question is how best to accomplish that. That is not for me to decide, but for hon. gentlemen on the Government benches. The Minister of Railways last year would not agree to control the freight rates on the ocean vessels. Now, since he would not agree to do that, and this year the prices are up five hundred fold and more, I think it is up to my hon. friends the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine, if they will not agree to control the rates on the ocean, to devise some other method by which the products of the Canadian farm can be put on the markets of the world without having to pay two, or three, or four, or five, or six times an ordinary freight rate. Until we can do that we will not have accomplished our duty in this House. We are here to legislate for the people of Canada, and, speaking for one class alone, the wheat growers, the farmers of the three Prairie provinces, I say that this year they will pay over $40,000,000 more than the ordinary freight rate for the shipment of their grain across the water. If that is the case, if on one crop we pay an extra $40,000,000, that calls for a remedy of some kind; and it is up to the gentlemen sitting on the treasury benches to provide some better method than exists at present for getting the Canadian crop to the markets of the world.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Some time ago I had the honour of attending a banquet of master shipbuilders and master mariners on the Great Lakes, and the shipbuilders' complaint was that they had not any protection in Canada, with the result that the ship building industry had not proceeded along progressive lines commensurate with the general prosperity of the country. I think we must all agree that in future years the great prosperity of Canada will depend largely on its export of its agricultural products, and when we consider that this year we had something like 376,000,000 bushels of wheat grown in the great Northwest and that sixty per cent of that was shipped by other than Canadian vessels, I think it does indicate that we should take some steps towards a regeneration of our ocean traffic. Something like one thousand million bushels of wheat and coarse grains were grown in the West this year. What is the use of our having a hopper of that dimension in the Northwest, filled with grain which we cannot consume in this country, unless we have a spout sufficiently large to take care of it? That spout, it seems to me, must be enlarged either by granting bonuses to encourage ship building or by building ships for ourselves, or in some other way increasing the freight accommodation on the ocean.

There is another point in connection with that, and it is that we have, practically speaking, no control over the rates on wheat or other agricultural products from Canada to Great Britain. While we have control over the rates on the railways, we have no control over the through rate; we have no control over rates outside the Dominion of Canada. If we had the control, either by ownership, or by a subsidy, we would virtually have control of the wheat from the great western country to the British market. As you all know, the consumption of wheat in Great Britain this year amounts to something like 485,000,000 bushels. I see no reason why we should not supply every part of that demand, because we are nearer to Great Britain than the Argentine Republic. The freight rate from the Argentine to Great Britain is about 80 cents, while it is 35 cents or 40 cents from Canada. We should, therefore, take advantage of the shorter distance, and there is no reason why we should not supply the greater part, if not all, of the wheat required in Great Britain. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is quite accurate when he speaks of $40,000,000 that could be saved. It may be so, because we have a product of 367,000,000 bushels of wheat, and while we will not export it all, nevertheless the price

of the wheat will be determined by our ability to export our surplus. If we have 367,000,000 bushels in Canada, and increase the price 10 cents, by extra facilities on the ocean that would be a saving of $37,000,000. These figures warrant us in at least attempting to make some provision for our great export in the future. In times of peace we are told we should prepare for war, and in times of war we should prepare for peace. We are expecting a great influx of immigrants after the war is over. Perhaps we will not have such a large influx as some people imagine, because I believe that in the reconstruction of Europe after the war a great many people will be required. Besides, we will not have so many able-bodied men in the country then as we have to-day. Nevertheless, it is admitted by the statesmen of Great Britain that there will be considerable emigration. I noticed that Mr. Bonar Law, in a recent speech, said that there would naturally be a great influx of immigrants to Canada after the war. For the reasons I have submitted, I think it is imperative upon the Government to take some steps along the line of increasing the facilities for exporting our agricultural products. My hon. friend from Assiniboia stated that the United States were not able to build steamships in competition with Great Britain. I understand there is a Bill now before Congress granting $50,000,000 for the purpose of assisting shipbuilding. My hon. friend also stated that the reason why ships were not built in Canada was because they could not be built as cheaply as elsewhere. If it is not profitable to build ships in Canada, then the only way in which to make it profitable is to give some encouragement.

Mr. TURRIFF: Take the duties off.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: You cannot take the duties off, because British ships can come in, but you can give protection to the shipbuilding industry just the same as to any other industry. I do not know which would be the better way, whether to build the ships ourselves and put them on the ocean, thereby regulating the traffic, or whether to give a subsidy; but if we can increase the facilities, increase the capacity of the spout I am certain we will go a long way towards solving the difficulties which the farmers experience in the West.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend seems to speak with authority and knowledge. He said that we might control rates by subsidizing the vessels. Did I understand him to say that?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, then, will my hon. friend explain how it is that the steamship lines which to-day are receiving a very large subsidy from this Government—one company receiving as much as $1,000,000 a year—are, as I am informed, charging the same high rates as the unsubsidized companies, and are allowed by the Government to do so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The conditions to-day are abnormal over the whole world. They are paying 80 cents a bushel for taking wheat from the Argentine to Liverpool, while we are paying 40 cents a bushel from Canada. The conditions are abnormal because of the scarcity of ships due to the war, and to the fact that many ships are engaged on behalf of the Admiralty.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But does not my hon. friend see that the very object, or what ought to be the object, of subsidizing a line of steamers from Canada would be to ensure reasonable rates at all times? What is there to warrant these steamship companies which receive a subsidy from this Government, in the case of one company to the extent of $1,000,000 a year, raising their rates from $800 to $1,000 per cent, or to warrant this Government permitting them to do so?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend knows quite well that the subsidy which is granted to these steamship companies is not for the purpose of facilitating the carriage of freight, but to facilitate the carriage of mail, and the subsidy is comparatively small. That is not the kind of subsidy to which I refer. I have in mind a substantial subsidy to ocean-going ships that would enable us to control the rates upon freight of all kinds, and particularly upon wheat.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This is such an important discussion that to enable all those who desire to speak upon it, members will have to express their views briefly. It is really the greatest question that is before the Canadian people to-day. I have no faith in Government-owned steamships. I do not believe that the traffic would be satisfactorily handled by steamships owned by the Government. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) mentioned that the condition on the freight market to-day is abnormal, and that is true. When you

go back a few years you find that the rates for carrying wheat from Montreal were practically down to five cents a bushel, and at New York the rate was about one penny half-penny per bushel. Steamers even carried wheat over as ballast, and brought it back again without waiting to discharge it. In those days, wheat was a drug on the market, and the shipowners were not making very much money. But now the business has changed, and the rates are enormously high, largely owing to the war. If you took an average of ten or fifteen years you would find perhaps that the Government would not make very much money in running the business. The Government never can run a business as economically and successfully as private enterprise. I am not arguing that the Government should do nothing. I think they should do something. I think the time has come when this matter ought to be dealt with in some practical manner. A number of proposals have been made to the minister, and I think that some of them are practical proposals. What we want to do with the shipowner is to get off his back, and let him have a fair chance at the business. There are too many restrictions at present. In Canada we have been constantly piling on restrictions. Any one who reads the Canadian Shipping Act will see that they stick out on every page, restrictions in regard to the manning of the ships, to the inspection of the ships, and so on. The great question is the cost of building. It has been stated here to-night, and it is quite true, that the high cost is largely owing to the high tariff we have in this country. When this question was up some years ago, I took the trouble to make some inquiries as to the extra cost of building ships in Canada compared with that of building them in Great Britain. It is true that a certain number of articles that enter into the construction of a ship were admitted free, the plates, for example, and a few other things; but a large number of the articles are subject to a high protective tariff. Some time ago I took the trouble of going to Collingwood to find out how much duty was paid by shipbuilders in that part of Canada, on the raw material entering into the construction of a ship. While there I was allowed to look at the books of the largest shipbuilding firm in the town. I made an abstract of the figures, and my recollection is that it averaged something like $10 on every ton of shipping; a very high tax indeed. Many articles imported into this country for use in the construction of a ship are subject to a very high duty. The consequence is that the price of the ship is increased. A proposal that was made at that time was that the duty should be returned to the shipbuilder when he turned out the finished product. A man who builds a binder in this country and sells it in the United States, or any other outside market, gets a rebate from the customs of ninety-nine per cent of the duty paid on the raw material entering into the binder. The same thing is true with regard to boilers engines, and all kinds of agricultural machinery. Why should we not apply this principle to ships? When a ship is launched on the sea it is an export. It has to compete with the whole world for business. If there is a cargo to carry it is chalked up on the blackboard at Lloyds, London, or at some other exchange, and the whole shipping tonnage of the world bids for it. The man who bids the lowest gets the cargo. Now, a man who has to pay $10 a ton more for his ship on account of duty cannot compete for the business. Shipping is like everything else: you have to get a return on your capital. If there is anything that ought to be regarded as an export it is a completed ship. I think a Canadian-built ship should be treated just as we treat boilers, and binders, and other implements that are made in this country and exported. This is a practical proposal. It is one which could be carried out, and without injury to anybody. I do not see what possible objection could be made to it. The question of tonnage is a serious one, and it is going to be more serious as years go by. I do not see why this matter should not be dealt with at the present session, and I trust the minister will bring the matter before his colleagues and try and get something done.

The United States has been referred to. Everybody knows that the United States has not been able to build up a mercantile marine, and everybody who thinks about the matter knows that it is in a very large degree due to the high protective tariff. But even the United States has made a move in the direction of building up a mercantile marine. Only last year they struck the tariff off. Here in Canada you cannot buy a ship. If a man wants to put his capital into the shipping business, he is not allowed to go out into the world and buy a ship and register it in this country unless he pays a high protective duty.

Since last July or August, when the new regulations came into effect in the United States, there has been an enormous increase in American tonnage. Since the American Government decided to allow ships to be bought and registered in the United States, under the American flag without the payment of duty, the people of the United States have bought no less than fourteen vessels that were registered in Canada. I understand that at the present time they cannot buy any more Canadian vessels, because our Government have passed an Order in Council prohibiting the sale of Canadian vessels to any foreign country. I think that was a very proper step to take, and I hope the regulation will be kept in effect during the war. At the same time it would not be a proper regulation to have in force in time of peace.

I have made two practical proposals: one is to put a ship on the same basis as a manufactured article, and allow a rebate on the raw material entering into the ship when it is completed. The other proposal is to strike the duty off and allow the Canadian ship owner to purchase a ship from the markets of the world and register it free of duty under the Canadian flag. The minister knows I have also another little hobby. We have been driving our ships away from Canada. We have actually made them seek refuge in some outside country, because we would not allow them to trade in southern latitudes. The minister will allow them to go as far north as they like. They can go to the rocky coast of Labrador, or to the North Pole in winter time, and the Minister of Marine will make no objection; but when they want to go to the sunny South, amidst the laughing waves and eternal sunshine, the minister says, No, we will not allow you to go. That has been his policy ever since he has been minister.

Mr. HAZEN: I should be delighted to see my hon. friend go South.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As you know, Mr. Chairman, there are numerous ways in which a minister can prevent a private member from securing any reform. It is impossible for a private member to get a bill through this House if the Government do not want the Bill to be passed. Two years ago I introduced a Bill to remedy the disadvantage I have spoken of. The Minister of Marine admitted that I was right. He said that the object of the Bill was good, and referred it to the Committee of Marine and Fisheries. The Committee of Marine and Fisheries never sat, and the Bill died a violent death.

Mr. HAZEN: Not a violent death, a peaceful death.

Mr. SINCLAIR: And I hold the minister responsible for it. Some hon. gentlemen have referred to Great Britain. We all know the two lines of policy that have guided Great Britain—free trade and free ships. The result is that Britain controls one-half of the world's tonnage. The British flag flies in every sea, and Britain does one half of the carrying trade of the world. She could not have done that under a protective system. She could not have done it under our system of charging a duty on ships. There is no necessity in Great Britain for a man to have a coasting license, for everything is free. If a man in Great Britain wants to buy a ship, he can go to the ends of the earth and buy it, and register it under the British flag free of duty. They will welcome it; they are glad to have it under the British register. Let us adopt a policy like that in Canada, so far as the purchase of ships is concerned. I am not making the proposal that we should abolish the protective tariff in Canada altogether. At this time, when we need money so badly, I do not think it would be practical to strike off all the duties, but we could return to a ship-owner the duty he paid on the raw material entering into his ship. It is only fair that we should do that. These are the practical proposals that I trust the minister will not forget when he takes up this matter with his colleagues.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South): It seems to me that the two grievances which the business interests of Canada have to-day in this connection are, first, the scarcity of ships, and, secondly, the high rates that shipping companies charge. These difficulties can be surmounted, first of all by building more ships, and, secondly, by having the ships built by interests who will be real rivals to the interests which control shipping in Canada to-day. I may say that the present Prime Minister of Canada, in the course of a speech at Halifax during the election of 1911, did promise some assistance in the building up of a Canadian mercantile marine.

I do not think that the right hon. gentle-

man very clearly outlined what his scheme would be, but I take it that it would not be a reduction in the tariff on materials that go into ships. What he had in mind was, I think, to encourage shipbuilding by bonuses, or that the Government itself should go into the shipbuilding business. Some people seem to look upon the Government's going into the shipbuilding and ship-owning business as a sort of bogey, but I do not so look at it. The Government at the present time and for a number of years past have been in the railway business in this country; they have built a railway and they own a railway which to-day is almost a transcontinental road. They are, I believe, operating a railroad from Winnipeg at the present time. In addition to that they have spent millions and millions of dollars in subsidizing other roads. The question that I would like to ask is this: Why should they not, as an auxiliary to their railway, build and own and control ships in this country? The Canadian Pacific railway which, to my mind, is the best organized business in this country to-day, saw that a transcontinental railway would be worthless to them unless they had in connection with it a magnificent line of ships both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific as they had at the commencement of the war. Canada cannot profitably be in the railroad business to-day unless it directly controls shipping interests which will carry the goods brought over the railways either from the West or from the near East to the Atlantic coast to their ultimate destination in the old country or elsewhere. I am against this Government assisting Canadian interests to purchase foreign ships, for this reason: what we want in this country is to build up a great shipbuilding trade and we are not going to do that by making it easier to buy foreign ships. No country in the world has ever reached any great height as a maritime country by purchasing foreign shipping and bringing it in and utilizing it. They have all attained their greatness by encouraging shipbuilding in their own country and by either controlling it directly themselves or assisting private individuals to do so. Many new industries in this country have been encouraged by various governments. For instance, our steel industry could never have reached the place which it holds in Canada, were it not for the fact that it was encouraged by bonuses from the Government or otherwise, and I think that shipbuilding in this country will not receive the encouragement which it deserves, and which is necessary to make it a success, unless the Government encourages it by way of bonuses.

Another point in favour of the Government owning a mercantile marine is that a navy is absolutely useless unless it has as an auxiliary a large mercantile marine. A Bill has been introduced in the United States Congress for the purpose of building an immense navy and the proposition with which they are grappling now is whether, when the navy is built, the United States will have a navy which is of any benefit to them, because they will not have a mercantile marine, which is an absolutely necessary auxiliary, and they are talking at the present time of getting their Government to build a mercantile marine as a necessary auxiliary to the navy if war should ever come to that country. That is the position in Canada also. I am one of those who think that some day we shall undertake to build up a navy in this country, and I think the Government of that day should, whenever that happy time will come, undertake at the same time to build, under their own control and with their own money, a mercantile marine. We are suffering at the present time from scarcity of shipping and high ocean rates. Now, what better guarantee can we have to-day, or in time to come, that shipping prices will not soar as they have soared during the present war than that we should have keen competition in shipping? Shipping, when owned by private interests, is like everything else: a monopoly is created and the interests come to an agreement that such and such shall be the ocean rates and such and such the rates on the Great lakes. What better way would there be of keeping down the rates than that this Government should control a mercantile marine which would compete with private shippers? It would not put them out of business at all, but it would control the rates. Undoubtedly the time has come when the Government should take some steps, and I am glad to see that for once hon. members on both sides are agreed that the time has actually come when some steps should be taken by the Government to encourage shipbuilding in this country for the various reasons set before the House to-night. To encourage shipbuilding in Canada the Government must take some bold forward step. Perhaps, in some instances, the duty on materials that go into the construction of

ships should be lowered. That may prove of assistance, but the chief thing in starting an industry of this kind is to give it an impetus by way of a bonus. In this country we have built up a great steel and iron industry which was started and encouraged in that way, and that industry is busy at the present time, in my own native province, and in my own constituency, and also in the central provinces, in filling war contracts; but what is going to be the result and the condition of those steel industries when the war is over? They will be like Othello, with their occupation gone, and unless some new industry arises which will consume steel in this country they are going to be in rather a bad state. If the Government encourages steel shipbuilding in this way the products of our steel mills will be utilized; the wheels of industry will be kept moving in the steel business, and in the maritime parts of this country a huge industry will be restored, and business generally will be promoted. I believe that we are as capable of building ships in this country as are the people of any other country in the world. I do not care what the Prime Minister said or did not say; his statement may have been misconstrued. I believe that he knows, as everybody in Canada knows, that we are capable of doing everything that can be done by the people of other countries.

I believe this is the most important question which public men in Canada have to grapple with. It is as important to Canada as the war. True, the war is the all-absorbing topic, but we in this House are dealing with the war in the way that we think right, by voting all the money necessary and encouraging recruiting. But we must not forget that there is a future for Canada. The British flag will fly over Canada a hundred years from now, notwithstanding the war. We must lay plans for the future, and nothing in those plans will do so much for Canada as assistance by this or any other Government to build up a great shipbuilding industry in this country.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: One speaker on the other side stated that there was a tariff on ships imported into this country. There is a tariff on ships imported from foreign countries, but not on ships imported from England, Ireland, or Scotland. Most of the ships imported into Canada are built in Great Britain. Let us look at this matter in a broad way. It is stated that we can build our own ships. It is possible for us to do so, providing the steel industries will engage in the business of rolling steel. Where does Britain get the steel that goes into her ships? I understand that more than half the steel going into ships built in Great Britain before the war was rolled in Belgium and the United States. It is true that this steel goes into that country free of duty.

I think that in this House there are enough men of ability to solve this question. It may be that if the duty were taken off steel, the firm of Vickers Maxim or some other firm in Canada with means could enter into this industry. That is a question that can be solved. It is not necessary to appoint a commission for that purpose. I would suggest to the Government that they get assistance from the men in this House in solving the problem, and that to that end a committee of this House be appointed, composed of business men, to confer on this subject. I do not know whether the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) would agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) or the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in regard to the facts in this case. But I think we ought to attempt this question within the four walls of this House. The Government to-day is engaged in the problem of the present war, and every moment of the time of ministers is taken up with these problems. But I think that a great question, such as this, which is engaging the attention of all the business men in this country, should receive the attention of the business men of this House. I have no doubt that members of the Government would take suggestions from the members of this House on this subject. There seems a consensus of opinion that Canada should have ships and should have them at once. We all agree on that. How can we obtain these ships as cheaply as they are built in Great Britain? That question the Government can solve, I believe, with the House. There would be no harm in making a trial by appointing a committee. We may not all agree, but let us set aside our politics for a time and see if we cannot deal with this grave and important question. It is a question for this Parliament to solve. What are we here for? We are here to do the business of the people of this country, and this question of ship-

building is one of the greatest pieces of business in which we can engage. The hon. member for St. John put the matter fairly to the House when he stated that it is necessary that we should have ships to carry the products of this country. But he does not say how these ships are to be obtained. He says that we might enter into the building of wooden ships. I understand that advertisements are out in the Maritime Provinces for carpenters to go to British Columbia to build wooden ships. They have not asked for help from the British Columbia Government, I understand. But we want to go further; we want to be on a par with the people of Britain; we want to build steel ships, ships that will last much longer than the wooden ships, and we want to do it as cheaply as Great Britain does.

Mr. NICKLE: I have listened with great interest to this discussion, for shipbuilding is a matter that has engaged my attention for three or four years. If anything were necessary to bring home to me the difficulty of the problem, I think it would be found in the speeches of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The hon. member for Assiniboia comes from a rural district where grain is the chief product, and with characteristic shrewdness he sees that if the cost of a ship is increased, the cost of transporting grain by that ship must be increased. And, as the price of the article of export is fixed in the foreign market, when the cost of transportation is increased, the return to the producer must be lessened. Therefore, he says: Let us have free trade in all that goes into the making of a ship, because in that way you will lessen the cost of transportation. The hon. member for Guysborough comes from the East. He is not particularly concerned about the cost of transportation, but would like to see shipping developed on the seaboard. Therefore, he says: Let us take the duty off ships, and let the ships of all countries come into this country free of duty; in that way you will build up a great marine. But the hon. member for South Cape Breton sees that if the duty is taken off steel, a great business in his constituency will suffer. Therefore he says: Do not take the duty off steel; leave the duty on the component parts of the ship; develop the steel industry in Canada, pay the builders a bounty and we shall have a great mercantile marine. Let us face the question fairly and squarely. England has developed a great manufacture of ships. Three things have contributed to her success in this matter. She has coal, she has steel, and she has cheap labour. So her vessels cover the seven seas, and she controls the shipping of the world. The hon. member for Guysborough says: Let us rebate to the manufacturer of ships whatever duty the Government collects on the commodities that enter into the composition of the ship. Now, I have given this matter some thought, and know whereof I speak when I say that this would not solve the problem in its entirety. Two factors enter into the cost of an article—the material and the labour. If you were to rebate to the manufacturer every dollar he had paid in duty, he would still be at a disadvantage, comparing the wages paid to the skilled mechanic here with those paid in England. Further, in a highly organized manufacturing industry such as shipbuilding, the Canadian manufacturer is at a disadvantage because the overhead charges per dollar of production are infinitely greater than in the very highly organized and efficient plants that they have in England.

You have to go farther than rebate to the Canadian manufacturer the duty that he pays on the article. You have to develop some scheme by which the difference in wages is met. It would be manifestly unfair to ask the steel worker in this country to take a wage that would not bring him an adequate return for his labour. If you attempted such a thing the inevitable result would be that he would turn his attention to some other means of earning a livelihood. That leaves you but one other way to manage the situation, and I quite agree with what hon. members on this and the other side have said that the Government should face this shipbuilding problem. I see no way of doing it unless you can develop some system by which a certain tonnage bounty is going to be given. There is a small subsidy paid, so small that it does not amount to much. But on taking this matter into consideration, there are three things that you have to keep in view. You have to keep in view the fact that the farmer of the West will not stand an increased freight rate, because that lessens the profit on his product; you have to take into consideration, in the second place, the fact that the skilled artisan is

not going to take a small wage to develop a national industry, and you have to take into consideration that if Canada wants a shipbuilding industry established, the entire people must bear a part of the burden during the period while that industry is in its development stage.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was done with this $20,000 last year?

Mr. HAZEN: We spent $8,528.94 out of the $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is in a general way.

Mr. HAZEN: There was some expenditure at Bear river, Margaree harbour, Guysborough harbour, Barrington passage, Yarmouth harbour, North Head, Grand Manan, St. John river, Charlottetown harbour, Summerside, Lachine, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, near Amherstburg, and Port Dalhousie. Half of the amount was spent near Amherstburg in removing the wreck of the City of London. It was removed by F. J. Trotter, of Amherstburg, under contract. The expenditures at the other places named were comparatively small.

Mr. PARDEE: What was spent at Lake St. Clair?

Mr. HAZEN: The wreck of the Charles Crawford was removed by F. J. Trotter under contract at a cost of $1,450. During the current year our expenditure has been very trifling, being less than $1,000 up to the 31st December. We ask for $20,000, but the expenditure might not be over $1,000 entirely depending on the wrecks that take place.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: What was the expenditure at Margaree harbour?

Mr. HAZEN: The wrecked steamer Electra was removed by Captain G. LeBlanc under contract and the expenditure was $150.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How was this tender called for?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot give that information as I do not happen to have it here, but I will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am afraid that it was only a contract in name. I do not think there was any contract. The contract, as far as I could find out, was given by the man who has the patronage for the county.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let that item stand.

Mr. HAZEN: We can discuss this matter on some other item.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am not particular; I do not mind, but I do not like to hear the statement made that this work was done by contract. I do not think it was.

Mr. HAZEN: That is the information given me by the officers of my department and my deputy minister says that he is satisfied that it is correct. However, I will get the information.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the rule about the removal of these wrecks? I understood that the owner of the vessel had to remove a wreck at his own expense.

Mr. HAZEN: That is the rule. If there is a wreck, we ascertain who are the owners of the vessel and we give them notice to remove the wreck. Some times they do it and there is no further trouble, but in other cases they do not do it promptly and we have to do it and then we endeavour to collect from the owners. In some cases we succeed in collecting, but in some cases these vessels are owned by people who are really not worth anything and we do not succeed. But, the rule is that we notify the person to remove the wreck and if he does not we do it, charge the cost to him and endeavour to collect it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have something to say about the next item, for "winter mail service," and as it is now eleven o'clock, I think we might leave it for another time.

Mr. HAZEN: This is for the winter service between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse by the ice boats. Is that the item that my hon. friend wishes me to discuss?

Mr. MACDONALD: I think we have got along very well, and it is rather late. I assume that is the general vote for that purpose?

Mr. HAZEN: This is for the service between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine when you have to cross by open boat. There are times when no steamer can cross and there is a crossing at the capes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think the minister would lose anything by adjourning, because my hon. friend would like to discuss that matter.

Mr. HAZEN: I am not objecting, but I did not suppose that that was the item that my hon. friend desired to discuss.

Mr. MACDONALD: What I have to say will be very much on the general question.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Hazen, the House adjourned at 10.56 p.m.

Friday, February 11, 1916.

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

SUPPLY.

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

Ocean and river service—inspection of live stock shipment, $5,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Where is the inspection made?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): It is made now chiefly at Montreal. This item is the same year after year. The inspection is to see that all live stock are properly placed on board the vessels and have proper quarters.

Mr. MURPHY: Are the inspectors permanently attached to the department or are they just engaged for each shipment?

Mr. HAZEN: They are permanently attached to the department.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: Is there an inspection of stock going to different points?

Mr. HAZEN: This is not an inspection of stock; it is an inspection of the provision made on board the vessels for the stock, to insure that they are properly quartered.

To continue subsidy for wrecking plants—Quebec, Maritime provinces and British Columbia, $45,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many wrecking plants are there in each of the provinces?

Mr. HAZEN: There are altogether three wrecking plants in Canada, one for the St. Lawrence, one for the Maritime Provinces, and one on the Pacific coast.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who has the contract for the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: The Quebec Dredging and Wrecking Company. The Dominion Coal Company act in Nova Scotia and their contract extends to the Bay of Fundy. The British Columbia Salvage Company have the contract for British Columbia.

Mr. MARCIL: Has there been any change as regards the agreement with the Quebec Dredging and Wrecking Company?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: What was paid last year to the Dominion Coal Company?

Mr. HAZEN: $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will my hon. friend give the amounts paid to each of these companies?

Mr. HAZEN: The St. Lawrence, $25,000; but in a sense we are in partnership with this company, there being a provision that if their earnings are above a certain amount, a proportion of the subsidy we pay comes back. The company in the Maritime provinces receives $10,000, and the one in British Columbia, $10,000. The amounts are practically the same as they have been for a good many years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How much did you receive last year from the Quebec Dredging and Wrecking Company?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think we received anything. The year before we received several thousand dollars. The amount depends on the number of wrecks; if there are no wrecks, we get nothing; if there are wrecks and the plant works a good deal, we get something back.

Mr. MARCIL: Were there many wrecks last year on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: Not very many.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the wrecking plant at Lévis or is it lower down from the river?

Mr HAZEN: The headquarters are at Lévis but we allow the vessel to run to a certain point below and a certain point above Lévis. She is equipped with wireless so that she can reach any point within a reasonable time. It was thought advisable, for various reasons, to allow the boat to engage in towing and that sort of work because it gave the vessel something to do, and it was thought desirable that the men employed on her should be kept occupied. If the boat was left lying at Lévis, it was thought that the crew would get out of condition and not be as well able to perform their duties as if they were kept working.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the department taken into consideration the advisability of having a wrecking plant further down the river?

Mr. HAZEN: No, that has not been considered necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Wrecks occur there, and if a wrecking plant was placed further down the river, it could get to the scene of an accident sooner.

Mr. HAZEN: This plant can get there in pretty quick time. These vessels are all equipped with wireless so that there is very little delay in getting to the scene of a wreck.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: In the Maritime Provinces the Government does not own the plant at all?

Mr. HAZEN: It does not own the plant at any of these places.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How is the work performed; is it done by contract?

Mr. HAZEN: By contract with the different companies.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Are tenders called for or what is the arrangement?

Mr. HAZEN: It is about ten years ago since the contract with the Dominion Coal Company was entered into.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Can my hon. friend give us the exact terms of the contract?

Mr. HAZEN: We pay them $10,000 a year in consideration of which they maintain a wrecking plant, divided in the summer between Halifax and Sydney, and they furnish or place at the disposal of ship owners requiring their services, the following steamers, when required, the Cabot, Cohan, Cacouna, Cape Breton, Louisburg, and the tugs, D. H. Thomas, C. M. Winch, Spring Hill, and the barge Glenville. The steamers I have mentioned and the tugs D. H. Thomas and C. M. Winch are located at Sydney in the summer and at Louisburg in the winter. The tug Spring Hill is located at St. John and the barge Glenville at Halifax. The contract expired in 1912 and was renewed for a period of two years. I think it has been continued since that time by agreement

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: Is there any restriction by the department upon the rates charged when these boats go to a rescue?

Mr. HAZEN: My recollection is that the charges are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does this wrecking plant have anything to do with such cases as that which occurred when a Government steamer with a minister aboard collided with some other boat? Was that a wreck or only a collision?

Mr. HAZEN: Only a collision.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has that been cleared up.

Mr. HAZEN: The matter was investigated by the Wreck Commissioner, who made a report, and in consequence of that report the captain of the steamer Hugh Fleming had his certificate suspended and the captain of the other vessel, who also was found to be in fault, had his certificate suspended for a time. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) asked me with regard to the operation of the steamers in the lower St. Lawrence. From time to time, as required, we send steamers during the winter season to Anticosti, Seven islands, and other places. The same practice is followed this year as in other years.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Perhaps the minister can give me now information I asked for last night as to the removal of wreckage from Margaree harbour; the minister stated that this work was done by tender and contract.

Mr. HAZEN: It was represented to the deputy minister that this was an urgent matter, and consequently he instructed Mr. Harvey, the agent of the department at Halifax, to adopt what means he thought best to get the wreck removed. Mr. Harvey entered into a contract for $150. My deputy tells me that the file bearing upon the matter is in the Department of Justice under instructions to collect from the owners of the vessel. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chisholm) wish to see the file?

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I am not particular about the file. The statement of the minister was that this had been done by tender and contract.

Mr. HAZEN: I said it had been done by contract, but I did not say that tenders had been called for.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I understood the minister to say that tenders had been called for. As to the urgency of the matter, I may say that the wreck had been there for a year and a half before its removal. I may tell the minister, further, that this work was done in accordance with the usual custom of patronage, so far as I can see. The man in charge of the patronage there was asked to get a friend to do the

work. The friend did the work and got the figure he asked. I am not complaining about his getting the money, for he earned it. But to leave it to be understood that tenders had been called for is not right.

Mr. HAZEN: It is a small matter and did not come to my attention at the time. I can only give the facts as they are given to me by officials of the department.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not ask the Minister of Marine to divulge any state secret, but in view of the threats of renewed German activity at sea, could he tell us whether any precautions have been taken for the protection of shipping in the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: I would rather give that information privately to my hon. friend.

Ocean and river service—unforeseen expenses, $5,000.

Mr. HAZEN: That is the usual vote for unforeseen expenses.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much was spent last year.

Mr. HAZEN: Last year $1,572, and in the present year up to December 31 last, $88.17. It looks as if we should have enough to carry us through this year.

Mr. MICHAUD: Would this vote be used to meet cases of urgency like that mentioned by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte).

Mr. HAZEN: No, that comes out of the vote for removal of wrecks.

Mr. MARCIL: In case of a wreck on the Baie des Chaleurs, which station would answer the call—Quebec, Halifax, or St. John?

Mr. HAZEN: A vessel equipped with wireless could communicate with either Quebec or Halifax. Quebec would send help as the Baie des Chaleurs is within the Quebec district.

Mr. MARCIL: Before a rescue call could be answered by sending help from Quebec, the vessel might be lost. I would urge upon the minister the importance of utilizing Gaspé as a substation for the wrecking service.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Last evening the question was raised by the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) of the shortage of coal in some of the towns and villages along the cost, that are not reached by railways. The hon. member thought it was due to the shortage of shipping. It may be partly due to that, but I know, as a matter of fact, that great difficulty is experienced by small vessels in getting coal at the mines. They are kept waiting so long for cargo that they will have to go out of the business of carrying coal altogether unless something is done to improve matters in this respect. I do not know what the Government or the department could do in a matter of that kind, because as the coal mines are owned by private companies, it might be difficult to interfere. At the Magdalen islands—the same conditions prevail in Prince Edward Island—they can get coal only by means of sailing vessels, and these vessels are kept waiting so long at Pictou, Sydney, and other coal ports that they often go without their cargo. It is quite probable that a vessel getting a cargo only after considerable delay will not return for another; it would not be profitable to do so. It would be desirable that the minister take into his immediate consideration whether or not he can do anything to overcome this very serious difficulty.

Mr. HAZEN: I think my hon. friend has put his finger on what is really the greatest source of trouble. The difficulty is that the coal companies own their own wharves. The coal is brought down on the wharves on spur lines and there loaded into vesels which the companies charter for the purpose of taking the coal up the St. Lawrence and to other points. When the smaller vessels from Prince Edward Island and other points go there, they are often kept waiting for a long period of time until the large vessels are loaded. If the matter were taken up with the Dominion Coal Company and other companies in Nova Scotia, possibly some arrangement could be arrived at that would obviate the difficulty.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand that these companies exist under charter of the Dominion Parliament .

Mr. HAZEN: No; the coal companies in Nova Scotia operate under provincial charters.

Mr. TURRIFF: It seems to me that the Government should have some control over these companies. The Government should insist on their providing wharves for the smaller vessels. At a time when promptness of shipment is very important, it is unfair that vessels should be obliged to

wait a week or two weeks before being loaded.

Mr. HAZEN: As these companies are incorporated by provincial charter, we have absolutely no control over them. It seems to me that if the matter were taken up with the coal companies they would see the desirability of themselves building small wharves for the smaller vessels.

Mr. HUGHES: Would the minister take some steps in that direction?

Mr. HAZEN: I should be very glad to use my good offices in a friendly way.

Mr. HUGHES: That in itself might result in some relief.

Mr. OLIVER: This is but one instance of what is occurring all over the world at the present time, certainly all over Canada. The tendency is for the big interests to use their charters and powers to squeeze smaller competitors out of business. While the Government may not be in a position to take direct control of the business of the large companies against whose operations objection is taken, in this as in all other cases it is the business of the Government to act as the champion, or agent, or organizing head of the small interests and enterprises. By legislation, by supervision, by enactment, or by administration, the Government should attempt in some measure to counterbalance the disadvantage under which the larger interests place their smaller competitors, so as to give the small competitors a chance in their competition for the business of the country. That is what has been done by the Grain Act in the matter of car distribution. The question has actually been taken hold of and dealt with in that Act, and while it may not be possible to apply its terms to all these transactions, yet what has been done in this respect has been of great benefit to that particular interest, and should be done as far as it can be done in respect of all other interests where the conditions are approximately the same.

Mr. HAZEN: I rise not to disagree with the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton, but to point out to the hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island, that I think the good offices of the Government of Nova Scotia would prove more effective than my good offices in connection with a matter of this kind, and for this reason: The coal mines are the property of the Government of Nova Scotia, and are under lease to the operating companies. If my hon. friend would apply to his friends in the Nova Scotia Government, I think they may be able to persuade the owners of the coal mines of the desirability of making provision for the loading of the smaller vessels without undue delay.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: It would seem that this Government ought to have some jurisdiction over the coal mining operations, which form part of the trade and commerce of our country. The Government has made arrangements whereby shippers by rail are fairly dealt with; surely something can be done in connection with the operations of these coal companies, even though the mines be owned by the province of Nova Scotia. This is a long standing grievance which has been brought to the attention of the Government on many occasions during past years by Mr. A. G. Bailey, with whose correspondence I am quite sure the minister is familiar. If the grievance were confined entirely to the one province, as the minister suggests, Mr. Bailey would not have brought the matter to the attention of this Parliament as he has done. It is a matter of transportation that affects the trade and commerce of the country and therefore this Government should deal with it in some way.

Public Works—capital (Marine Department), ship channel, river St. Lawrence, $1,172,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This large item is in connection with the work that is being carried on in the St. Lawrence ship channel. It is to make provision for the maintenance and operation of the ship channel dredging fleet, as well as general additions to the machinery and plant, all according to the detailed Estimates which I have here and which I shall read if hon. gentlemen are interested in them. The increase of $135,000 is in consequence of the large additions made to the fleet from year to year. There are elevator dredges with tugs at an estimated cost of operation of $45,000; two self-propelling steel elevator dredges at an estimated cost of $100,000; hydraulic dredges, at an estimated cost of $118,000, and so on.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister give us some information of the operation at Sorel during the past year?

Mr. HAZEN: I will read the memorandum giving the details of the work. It is as follows:

During the season of 1915, 15 dredges and attending plant were kept at work day and night, deepening and improving the ship channel,

from Montreal to the foot of the Island of Orleans, removing a total amount of 8,462,957 cubic yards of material, varying from soft clay to hard shale rock.

Considerable work was done widening the channel through Montreal harbour, in St. Mary's current and Longueuil shoal, where it it proposed to widen the channel from 700 to 800 feet.

Good progress in deepening of the channel to 35 feet at extreme low water was made, between Three Rivers and Montreal, eight miles in length having been accomplished during the last season.

There remains very little of the channel through lake St. Peter that is not deepened to 35 feet.

The Cap Charles channel, Cap-à-la-Roche district, was completed to 30 feet at extreme low water, and widened from 300 feet to 450 feet and 650 feet at the Curve.

A new range of lights was constructed to mark the new centre line. The channel was buoyed to give the increased width and opened to navigation.

The Grondines channel was also completed to 30 feet in depth and 450 feet in width. A new range of lights was constructed to mark the new centre line. This channel was also buoyed out to give the increased width.

The widening of Cap-à-la-Roche curve is almost completed, but there remains considerable deepening and cleaning up to be done yet. There is a large area of rock which has been broken by the rock cutter, in readiness for next season's work.

The new channel for light draught vessels and tows, through the islands opposite Sorel, to lake St. Peter to a depth of 15 feet at low water and a minimum width of 400 feet was completed and will be opened for navigation next spring. New lighthouses have been constructed to mark the different courses. This will oblige all tows, etc., to keep out of the ship channel. There is now a distance of over 50 miles, between lake St. Peter and Montreal, where the tows and light draught vessels can keep out of the ship channel. This will avoid the delays and annoyance caused to ocean steamers by these vessels.

The dredging operations in the north channel below Quebec have been carried on vigorously, and good progress has been made, two dredges being kept at work during the whole season. They removed 2,197,568 cubic yards, there still remains 6,928,805 cubic yards to be dredged. This channel is to be 1,000 feet in width and is being deepened to 35 feet at extreme low tide. Where there was only 7 feet at low tide, there is now a depth of about 26 feet.

With the new dredge now building at Canadian Vickers, Limited, Montreal, greater progress will be made. The completion of this dredge has been unavoidably delayed owing to conditions arising out of the war.

A commencement has been made on the construction of the compensation dams, as recommended by the commission appointed to investigate upon the water levels of the river St. Lawrence at and below Montreal.

In order to lessen the cost, it was decided to utilize the dredging material taken from the ship channel and deposit it on the site of the proposed dam.

A considerable amount was dumped on the following sites:

Repentigny (between Ile à Bague and Ile Bellegarde), chenal Corbeaux (between Ile de Grace and Stone island), chenal des Barques (between Ile aux Barques and Ile du Moine), Pointe du Lac, at foot of lake St. Peter.

It is proposed to continue depositing at these points next spring while the water is high, in order to be able to utilize as much of the dredged material as possible.

Referring to the construction of compensation dams mentioned above as being recommended by the commission, hon. gentlemen will remember that a few years ago a Commission was appointed to investigate the question of water levels, representations having been made that on account of the deepening of the channel, and for other reasons, the level of the river was being very much lowered. In consequence of those representations a commission was appointed to investigate the question of the levels from Montreal down to the sea. The commission consisted of Professor Haskell, Dean of the engineering school at Cornell, who had had an extensive experience in dealing with similar matters on the Mississippi river; Mr. V. W. Forneret, engineer in charge of the ship channel work, and Mr. Stewart, chief of the Canadian hydrographic survey. Their report was laid on the table of the House last year with plans. It showed that there had been a considerable fall in Montreal harbour which was due to the removal of the obstruction at St. Mary's current and below and that there had been also a fall in the water below, but not of great extent. These gentlemen reported that that could be avoided by erecting compensation works to hold back the water at various points below lake St. Peter and that this would be comparatively inexpensive because the work could be done largely by taking the material dredged out of the river and placing it so as to make dams between certain islands. Thus with a comparatively small expenditure the levels would be brought back to what they were before, and of course these dams would be permanent. That work was commenced this year. The total estimated cost, which will extend over a number of years, will be about $400,000. At Sorel the Government work goes on pretty much as usual. The dredges and the scows and the tugs are at work, and there is some new construction work being performed there. They are building tugs, and scows, and other boats that may be necessary for the deepening of the channel. The number of men employed is practically the same from year to year.

Mr. TURRIFF: Who is the superintendent of dredging on the Lower St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: The gentleman in charge of the dredging and other work on the ship channel is W. B. Forneret, who occupied the position when I became minister, and he is considered a competent man.

Mr. TURRIFF: What position does Mr. Kastella occupy?

Mr. HAZEN: He is not in my department?

Mr. MARCIL: What was the depth of the channel of the river St. Lawrence in 1915? Was it more than in 1914?

Mr. HAZEN: Last year, which was an unusually dry season, I think the level was a little lower than usual.

Mr. GRAHAM: I may recall that a few years ago we had a discussion as to the effect of certain works on the St. Lawrence west of Montreal, on the level of the river east of Montreal. There was a commission appointed at that time to investigate the water levels as they were affected by these works west of Montreal; did that commission report?

Mr. HAZEN: That matter is under the control of the Public Works Department, and probably the Minister of Public Works will give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wanted to have the attention of the Minister of Public Works called to the matter. From time to time, certain works are being enlarged on the river west of Montreal, and in the vicinity of the various rapids. In fact, the largest power development on the continent is possibly in that vicinity. It is natural to suppose that from time to time further application will be made for extended rights, and for the development of greater power. Reports have been made by very competent engineers as to other powers on the St. Lawrence west of Montreal, not including the Longue Sault. I would like to have the Minister of Public Works tell us later whether any new power is to be developed on the St. Lawrence, and what the report of the commission appointed a few years ago was as to the probable effect on the water levels east of Montreal of the further development of power.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be glad to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the matter.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any part of the Sorel works been used for the manufacture of munitions?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Was that matter considered in any way?

Mr. HAZEN: Months ago my department communicated with the Shell Commission informing them that we would be very glad indeed to put the works at Sorel in the way of manufacturing munitions or of assisting in that work, but the Shell Commission did not think it was necessary or desirable that they should be so used.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister an estimate of the probable cost of dredging that north channel?

Mr. HAZEN: We are working with the intention of getting the channel to a depth of 35 feet. It will take at least five years to complete that channel.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no estimate of what the work will finally cost?

Mr. HAZEN: We are voting this year a little over $2,000,000, and at the same rate, the cost in five years would run between eight and ten millions.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the depth now?

Mr. HAZEN: Thirty feet over the whole distance at extreme low water.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the object of dredging the north channel?

Mr. HAZEN: It is to get rid of the dangers and difficulties of the south channel. It is thought that on the north side the dangers to navigation would be greatly lessened.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any intention to abandon the present navigation route once the north channel is complete?

Mr. HAZEN: When the north channel is complete, I think all the large ocean going vessels will use it.

Mr. MARCIL: What does the minister intend to do at Longueuil. The minister once made an important speech in which he promised that very extensive works would be carried out at Longueuil for the purpose of making the harbour available to ships of the largest kind.

Mr. HAZEN: That comes under the control of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. Montreal runs for fourteen or sixteen miles along the river and across to the south shore. I believe that the Harbour Commissioners have in contemplation a project for making extensive additions there when circumstances permit. On

account of the war, public works of all kinds are not proceeding as rapidly as could be desired, but the Board of Harbour Commissioners are working up to a plan for the development of the harbour there and I believe that in the future, as it is inconvenient to have the harbour stretching so many miles below the city, it is the purpose to extend the development to the south shore, and to connect the harbour on the south shore with the north shore by means of a bridge at a point adjacent to where the Lachine canal enters the harbour.

To provide for construction and completion of dredging plant for River St. Lawrence from Montreal to Father Point, $452,715.

Mr. HAZEN: The items that are involved are as follows:

Maintenance of ship yards at Sorel ..	$64,615
Improvement of ship yard..	3,100
New construction..	60,000
Completion of new self-propelling steel elevator dredge for work below Quebec..	325,000
Total..	$452,715

There was an amount of $871,000 voted last year.

Mr. MURPHY: Is that dredge being built at Sorel?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it is being built by Vickers Limited. It is a dredge with a much greater capacity than any dredge in Canada to-day. It was hoped that it would have been completed before this so that the channel might be completed at as early a date as possible, but that has been found impossible.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How many dredges belonging to the Government are there on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: Eight elevator dredges, two self-propelling steel elevator dredges, one hydraulic dredge, two suction hopper dredges and two dipper dredges. We have fifteen dredges in addition to stone lifters, sweeping tugs and vessels of that description.

Mr. PUGSLEY: These dredges can only be employed, I suppose, for about six months in the year?

Mr. HAZEN: These vessels are under our control on the St. Lawrence ship channel, but, of course, there are a lot under the control of the Department of Public Works.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: All these dredges represent the investment of a very large amount of capital and they are only kept employed for about half the year. I have often thought that, by making proper arrangements, a considerable portion of the plant might be used to advantage in the Maritime Provinces in winter, in the harbours which are open the year round.

Mr. HAZEN: These dredges work in water where there is no very great rise or fall of the tide and, while there might be
4 p.m. places in the Maritime Provinces where some of them could work, still for many of the Maritime Province harbours, you have to get a dredge which goes deeper because of the rise and fall of the tide. I might point out that the work these dredges are doing is very heavy, and they have to be repaired every year. The winter is the time for making these repairs so that at the earliest possible date in the spring they may be able to go back to work. However, the hon. gentleman's suggestion is worthy of consideration. I admit there might be something done in that respect.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some years ago, when the late Government was in office, one dredge was taken to St. John and was operated in connection with the Government wharf at the head of the harbour.

Mr. HAZEN: Was that one of the dredges under the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not sure, but it was a Government dredge, and it was very well adapted for that purpose.

Mr. HAZEN: Does the hon. gentleman remember the name of that dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not; it was one of the ladder dredges which can be used at any depth of water. The reason I speak of it is that, I have in my mind the dredging required to be done in St. John in connection with the development of Courtenay bay. That work ought to have been practically completed by this time, but, as my hon. friend knows, progress has been very slow indeed. Upwards of four years have elapsed since the contract was entered into; and very little has been done beyond building the breakwater. No large amount of work has been done in the way of dredging, and the delay in the dredging, I suppose, has prevented the building of the wharfs and that, or some other reason, has prevented the building of the dry dock.

I have spoken only of this great work at one of the ports of the Maritime Provinces; but the same remark would apply to other ports, like Halifax. If some of the large number of dredges which are used in the upper Canadian waters in the summer could be brought down to the Maritime Provinces in winter, much more progress could be made and there would be less expense to the country. I do not find any fault because this has not been done, as the late Government did not do any more along these lines than this Government has done, but I do not see why some suitable arrangement cannot be made so that dredging work in the Maritime Provinces can be carried on in winter by a number, if not all of the dredges that are operated on the upper Canadian waters in summer.

Mr. HAZEN: The subject is worthy of consideration.

New ice-breaker for River St. Lawrenec, $510,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This ice-breaker which is being constructed by Vickers Company, Limited, under contract, should have been completed now, but it has been delayed through reasons arising out of the war. It will be the finest ice-breaker in the world when it is constructed. Hon. gentlemen who live along the St. Lawrence know how important it is to keep the ice broken on that river during the winter months. It not only has the effect of causing the early opening of navigation and of enabling steamers to get to the port of Montreal several weeks in advance of the time when they otherwise would be able to do so, but, in addition, it prevents flooding and consequent great damage to the low lands below Montreal. Every year we do as much work as possible with ice-breakers. This ice-breaker will be of modern construction and will possibly be the best in the world when it is completed. It would have been completed now but for conditions which arose in consequence of the war. Last year there was in the Estimates a vote of $500,000 for this purpose, and, although I think we shall not be able to spend more than $250,000 during the current year, we are asking for a further vote of $510,000.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—agencies, rents and contingencies, $160,000.

Mr. HAZEN: There is an increase of $10,000 in this item, due to the annual increases in the salaries of the clerks in the various agencies as authorized by the schedule established in 1911, to promotions and additions to the staffs of some of the agencies owing to increased work and extended premises, and to postage and some other items which were formerly charged to lighthouse maintenance, but which are now charged to this item. We have agencies as follow: In Nova Scotia, at Halifax, with sub-agencies at Pictou and Sydney; in New Brunswick, at St. John; in Prince Edward Island, a sub-agency at Georgetown; in Quebec, at Montreal; in Ontario, headquarters at Ottawa, with agencies at Parry Sound and Fort William, and a sub-agency at Kenora; in British Columbia, at Victoria, which includes also the agency at Prince Rupert. I have before me the items of the expenses of the different agencies if any hon. member wishes me to read them.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the minister going to do any ice breaking work in the St. Lawrence this year?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. We will do it with the Montcalm and the Lady Grey probably quite as well as it has been done during past years. The ice bridge has been kept from forming in places where it usually forms.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand the department sold one of its ice-breakers?

Mr. HAZEN: Last year we sold the Earl Grey to the Russian Government. They asked us to sell it to them for military purposes in order to keep open the port of Archangel in the White Sea. This year they came again and urged us to sell the Minto, and, as soon as the car ferry starts between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, the work for which the Minto was intended, as was also the Earl Grey, that is, keeping open the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, will be at an end. We sold them the Minto, and provided them with a captain and crew, who took her to Archangel.

Mr. MARCIL: Then there will be less ice-breaking done this year on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: No, quite as much as last year, because last year the Earl Grey and the Minto were on the Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick route. The same vessels are on the St. Lawrence for ice-breaking this year as were there last year.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the minister this year give some attention to Campbellton and Gaspé?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think it will be possible to do so with the plant at our disposal.

Mr. MARCIL: Navigation is held up there sometimes for a long time.

Mr. HAZEN: I know.

Mr. GRAHAM: At Prescott there is, under the management of this department, a depot which, I am told, is run on very strong party lines. Living as I do but a short distance from that point, I naturally hear the complaints. I believe that a large number of men have been deprived of their employment, undoubtedly on the recommendation of the minister, who comes from that riding. But that is not what I primarily rose to speak of. That depot apparently has been leased to a company.

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Or a part of it.

Mr. HAZEN: No part at all. I think I know what my hon. friend refers to. There was no lease at all to any company.

Mr. GRAHAM: Have they the depot for nothing?

Mr. HAZEN: They haven't it; nobody has it. A request was made to me to allow some industry at Prescott to load some cars on the track which runs into the yard at the depot. As it was a temporary matter, I communicated with the agent Mr. Taylor, asking him if he saw any objection—if it would in any way interfere with our work or its efficiency if this permission were granted. He wired me that it would not interfere in any way, and therefore this temporary permission was granted. There is no lease or anything of that sort. I think it must be that to which my hon. friend refers—or perhaps he is misinformed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps I may have been misinformed. That is not what was in my mind. I would be the last person to object to accommodation being given to any one in that way. I understood a portion of the works was being used for the manufacture of munitions.

Mr. HAZEN: No. If the hon. gentleman knows Prescott, he knows that on the St. Lawrence above our works there is a foundry belonging to some private individual where munitions may be made, but none of our property is being used for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is sure that no portion of it is being used for that purpose?

Mr. HAZEN: Absolutely.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know whether I am glad or sorry to hear that, because some of it might perhaps have been used to advantage for making munitions. My information was that a company was using a portion of the Government property in connection with its work. I do not know that I would object very much to that if the terms were proper; in fact, I think I am a little disappointed that these works, which are larger than will be necessary for some years, have not been utilized in the manufacture of munitions. Could my hon. friend tell me how many employees there were in those works in the year 1911 and how many there are now? I think nearly all those who were there in 1911 have gone and new ones have been put in their places, and there is rather a hard feeling amongst many people in the vicinity over the manner in which the employees of the Marine Department at Prescott have been used.

Mr. HAZEN: I have not got the information here, but I will get it for my hon. friend if he desires to have it.

Mr. MARCIL: Will my hon. friend get for me the same information with regard to Sorel?

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister mentioned a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Montreal. Is that bridge to be built in the far distant future, or now?

Mr. HAZEN: I think the Harbour Commissioners are considering it seriously. They are making general plans looking to the future, and I think the not very distant future having regard to the way the business of the port is developing.

Mr. MARCIL: Have any plans been made?

Mr. HAZEN: I believe the Harbour Commissioners have under consideration a certain plan.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any danger of obstructing navigation?

Mr. HAZEN: If it were an obstruction it could not be permitted, but I cannot imagine that the Commissioners vested with the control of the harbour will do anything to obstruct navigation.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it at some point between St. Helen's Island and the outlet of the Lachine canal?

Mr. HAZEN: I believe so.

Salaries and allowances of lightkeepers, $475,000.

Mr. HAZEN: The expenditure under this head in 1913-14 was $415,000, and in 1914-15 it was $449,999. There is naturally an increase from year to year, for new lights are constantly being established, involving the appointment of lighthouse-keepers and the maintenance of the lights. Last year's expenditure was divided as follows, according to provinces:

Nova Scotia	$118,923 01
Prince Edward Island	15,218 43
New Brunswick	48,589 53
Quebec	82,680 43
District of Montreal	30,512 04
Ontario	91,358 21
British Columbia	62,717 69
Total	$449,999 34

The expenditure for the current year up to 31st December last was $337,971.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why is it that in the Estimates of this department the revote is not shown as in the case of the Estimates of the Public Works? I refer the hon. minister to page 67 of the Estimates. He will see there a column showing the revotes, and so one can calculate what the expenditure has been.

Mr. HAZEN: That has never been the practice in the Marine and Fisheries Department. All votes lapse and a new vote is asked for. In the case of the Public Works Department there is an estimate for each wharf, bridge or other work, but in the Department of Marine and Fisheries the votes are general, as in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the hon. gentleman says that for the current year the expenditure is only $337,000.

Mr. HAZEN: That is the expenditure up to 31st December, and we have four months to go. As a matter of fact, we spend closely up to the appropriation. It is the habit of our department to put the estimate in this way, and different departments have their different ways of doing these things.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The advantage of the way followed by the Department of Public Works is that a member of the committee can see what is the total expenditure of the year. But under this other method we have to ask the minister in every case.

Mr. HAZEN: It is no trouble.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But it takes time.

Mr. MARCIL: Are improvements made in the lighthouse system as time goes on?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, our lights are kept thoroughly modern. This House has never questioned the votes necessary for this service, and I think it can be safely claimed that in Canada we have lights equal to any in the world. The hon. member (Mr. Marcil) is familiar with the St. Lawrence, and I need not speak of that. But if one making a trip from Port Arthur to Prescott will observe how the lights show on the American side and on the Canadian side, he cannot but come to the conclusion that our lights are better than those of the United States. So far as the buildings are concerned, and the houses for the lighthouse keepers, the Americans have the best of us—theirs are of more expensive construction than ours; but a comparison of the lights is all in our favour. And not only are new lights being added from time to time, but in the style of lights we keep well abreast of modern improvement.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the advisability of building of concrete, and so making the towers fire-proof, taken into consideration?

Mr. HAZEN: All the large modern towers are being put up in concrete.

Mr. MARCIL: That is particularly important in view of the fact that so many of the lighthouses use coal-oil.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is electricity used for lighthouse purposes to any extent?

Mr. HAZEN: Hardly at all. The lights are generally at points far removed from electric plants, and in these out-of-the-way places it would be expensive to maintain an electric-lighting plant exclusively for the lighthouse.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have in mind a place where it might possibly be done.

Mr. HAZEN: The chief engineer of my department, Colonel Anderson, who has been in the department for forty years and has a most intimate knowledge of the lights, has not favoured the use of electric light in lighthouses. He says that some accident might happen to the wiring or in some other way and the light fail in the midst of a storm when it was of the most supreme importance that it should be kept going.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is just the time it would fail.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes

Mr. MARCIL: Have lights been installed on the Hudson bay route?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, we have twelve lights installed.

Mr. MARCIL: Are more to be installed?

Mr. HAZEN: Not at present.

Mr. MARCIL: Last year or the year before I insisted on the importance of life-saving stations on the lower St. Lawrence. Admiral Kingsmill reported against the idea. But I think that in view of what has happened on the ocean lately, the department might well re-consider its decision. The danger of shipwrecks occurring emphasizes the importance of life-saving stations on the lower St. Lawrence.

Mr. HAZEN I confess that the statement made by the hon. gentleman greatly impressed me. I thought it a reasonable one. But the technical officers of my department do not think such a life-saving station necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Perhaps not in time of peace but in time of war.

Mr. HAZEN: There have been no more wrecks in time of war than in time of peace. But I will take the matter up further with the technical officers, and, in view of that, I would ask the hon. gentleman at what points on the coast he thinks it would be desirable to have these stations?

Mr. MARCIL: I would suggest that one be established on the Gaspé coast, in the vicinity of Cap Rosier and Fame point. It might be well to have others at the lower end of Anticosti, at the entrance of Belle Isle Straits, and at Father point, where the vessels call for and drop their pilots.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not see the necessity for one at Father point.

Mr. MARCIL: That is where the Empress of Ireland went down, with the loss of hundreds of lives.

Mr. HAZEN: On that occasion our men went out from Father point and rescued many. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is made in good faith and is worthy of every consideration. I assure him that I will take the matter up again.

Mr. MARCIL: I am glad that the minister makes this promise. The St. Lawrence river has been so well equipped during the last few years that it is regrettable that it should be faulty in this one respect.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the matter of the lighting of the Hudson bay channel, what is the attitude of Mr. Anderson on the whole Hudson bay project?

Mr. HAZEN: Has the hon .gentleman read Mr. Anderson's report of last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I read a report, and also, more recently, an interview which has been criticised and commented upon quite freely in the press. The deduction drawn by the press as to what Mr. Anderson's recent remarks meant was that the department is hardly in favour of the Hudson bay scheme, that, according to Mr. Anderson, the season of navigation would be very short. I do not say that I agree with Mr. Anderson, and it is possible that his remarks have been twisted out of their original meaning. It would be very interesting to the country, however, if the minister who is head of the department which has charge of the lighting of the channel would give his idea as to the length of the season during which the channel can be used, after it is well lighted and provided with wireless.

Mr. HAZEN: It was as an officer of the Hydrographic Survey that Mr. Anderson visited Hudson Bay in 1914 and made the report to which my hon. friend refers. I think that that report has had attached to it a meaning which it does not bear. From its reading one would think that there was a much shorter period of navigation in Hudson straits than is actually the case, for this reason: the Hydrographic Survey was carried on at points somewhat away from the main line of travel through the straits. I did not anticipate that this matter would come up to-day, but when the estimates for the Hydrographic Survey are taken up I shall be glad to give my hon. friend further information.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: With reference to the item for salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, I did not observe that the minister explained the increase of $25,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This service increases year by year. New lights and lighthouses are constantly being added, and from time to time the lightkeepers get small additions to their salaries. The amount is provided in order that we shall have a sum sufficiently large to meet all the requirements of the service.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: I do not purpose bringing up the old, threadbare subject of dismissals, but I have in mind the case of a lightkeeper whose dismissal was sought by certain persons. This gentleman had many friends on the Conservative side, and the minister finally decided that he would not dismiss him. In order to satisfy the applicant for the position, the minister appointed him as assistant, and the two are now doing one man's work. I had thought that the minister's heart was not quite as obdurate as it was some years ago, and that he was finding places for those persons who were looking for positions. If it is the general practice to appoint two men to do the work of one, I can readily see how an increase of $25,000 could come about. Would the minister tell me who is the lightkeeper at Cape St. George, Antigonish, whether there is more than one lightkeeper there; if so, who is the second man; what salaries they receive, and when they were appointed?

Mr. GRAHAM: About a year ago a sad accident occurred in the county of Renfrew between Combermere and Barry's bay, by which several persons lost their lives. Mr. Pringle, who conducted the investigation, made a very strong report as to the unseaworthiness of the vessel, the Mayflower, which would imply faulty inspection.

Mr. HAZEN: Not faulty inspection. I understand that the boat should not have been allowed by the Collector of Customs to leave port.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought at the time that the boat had been proved to be unseaworthy, even if equipped with all the appliances mentioned.

Mr. HAZEN: She did not have proper boats and life-saving appliances.

Mr. GRAHAM: She went down through somebody's fault, with a sad loss of life. I thought that under the circumstances the Government might have seen its way clear as those who were left behind were not in very good circumstances, to give some aid, the wreck having been at least partly due to the neglect of some Government official. Is there any such provision in these estimates?

Mr. HAZEN: My recollection is that the Mayflower was wrecked some three years ago on the Madawaska river; that she left during a heavy storm although her captain had been warned of the danger; and, she did not have proper life boats or apparatus, there was loss of life. I do not remember that there was a suggestion of any liability, legal or moral, attaching to the Government in connection with it. It would not be a matter particularly for my department. I do not remember giving any answer about it before.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said I thought the Minister of Finance gave an answer.

Mr. HAZEN: I have no recollection of any suggestion of the kind and have not given it any consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I made the suggestion myself, and the Minister of Finance said the Government would consider it. I do not attempt to make out a case of legal liability on the Government; but I thought that, as some person in the employ of the Government was at fault, the Department of Marine and Fisheries might well recommend a small grant to those who were left behind.

Mr. MURPHY: My recollection coincides with that of the hon. member for Renfrew. The inquiry established the fact that the boat should not have been given a license as it was in a dilapidated and dangerous condition. The warning referred to by the minister was given to the captain on the night of the storm. The boat practically foundered.

Mr. KYTE: In what service is the steamer Noreen?

Mr. HAZEN: She was in our employ at one time.

Mr. KYTE: I see in the Auditor General's Report a payment to A. B. Crosby, of Halifax, for the rent of this boat.

Mr. HAZEN: The former headquarters of the department at Halifax, situated in the dockyard, were required for naval purposes, and we had to move across to the Dartmouth side of the harbour. This boat was employed for a time in ferrying the workmen from Halifax to and from their new place of employment.

Mr. KYTE: A. B. Crosby was paid $2,950 for the hire of this boat from August 31, 1914, to February 28, 1915. That is a very respectable rent for the use of the Noreen. She was a steamer about fifty years old, originally known as the Lily, and owned by the Imperial Government when they had forces at Halifax. The boat was abandoned by the British Government and was

purchased by A. B. Crosby, former member for Halifax, at a very low figure. I think the sum paid for her use for six months was altogether out of proportion to her value. I am glad that the charter is at an end.

Mr. HAZEN: This included also the pay of the crew, I suppose four men; the coal, and oil, and all expenses of maintenance. The rental would come to about $16 per day. The boat was reported upon by our officials as well suited for the purpose, and the price was reported as being fair and reasonable.

Mr. KYTE: I venture to say that she did not cost Mr. Crosby $2,950 when he purchased her from the British Government.

Mr. HAZEN: I suppose that the four men would receive $8 per day in wages, or more.

Mr. KYTE: I would be glad to know that the minister is paying $2 a day for seamen; I doubt if he is paying more than $30 a month.

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) were here he would say that it was a very moderate wage. But put the wages at $6 or $7 a day, and add the cost of coal, and oil, insurance, and repairs, and I think the charter was fair and reasonable. I am not sure that I can give the information asked for by my hon. friend from Antigonish. I have the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department for the year ended 31st October, 1915, and in the list of lighthouse keepers I find Cape George, A. L. McEachren, September 16, 1898, $680.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Who is his assistant?

Mr. HAZEN: There is no assistant entered here; it may have occurred since, I do not know.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Will the minister give me the information later? What I want to know is how many lightkeepers there are, when they were appointed, and what is the arrangement.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. KYTE: Is it the practice of the department to supply furniture and bedding to lighthouses? I see an item on page O-70 of the Auditor General's Report, from which it would appear that blankets, 56 pairs; mattresses, and pillow slips, costing altogether $407.57, were supplied by Gordon and Keith, Halifax, to the Department of Marine, under the head of "Maintenance of Lights."

Mr. HAZEN: There are two points in Nova Scotia where articles of that sort are furnished, Sable Island and St. Paul's Island. There are no lighthouses which get furniture. While I cannot speak positively, it may be that the blankets and mattresses to which my hon. friend refers were intended either for Sable Island or for St. Paul's Island, or it may be that they were supplied for some of the marine vessels that attend to the lighthouse work.

Lighthouse and coast service—maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $750,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This money is required for the purpose of defraying the cost of the maintenance of all the aids to navigation, including the cost of supplies, food, lighthouse cleaning materials, the cost of delivering supplies, including the freight and cartage, and also the cost of repairs for such aids to navigation, including material and labour. The amount we ask for is the same as was voted last year. Up to the 31st December of this year we have spent $477,363, so that our expenditure for current year will be well within the sum voted at the last session.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the vote increased much within the past few years?

Mr. HAZEN: The expenditure has gradually increased, but not to a very great extent. For 1912-13 it was $688,660; for 1913-14, $699,785; and for 1914-15, $712,447; for the present year, judging from the expenditure up to 31st December, unless something unforeseen occurs, it will not be so large as it was last year.

Mr. MARCIL: What is done with requests for lighthouses?

Mr. HAZEN: All requests for lighthouses or buoys or aids to navigation are submitted to the Lighthouse Board. The minister has, of course, the power to overrule the decision of the board.

Mr. MARCIL: Has that been done in many cases?

Mr. HAZEN: It is very rarely done.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals, and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work, $750,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This item is very general in its character; it even provides for

the construction of wharves. I do not think it is proper, but I am told that it has been the practice for a good many years to include the building of wharves in this vote. One would scarcely look for a provision of that kind in an item intended to cover the construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation. Will the minister inform the committee how much of the $750,000 voted last year has been expended, and what it is proposed to do with the vote for the coming year?

Mr. HAZEN: For the year 1914-15 there was expended $996,000 in round figures, and up to the 31st December of the current year we had spent $506,681.70.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much of that was expended on wharves?

Mr. HAZEN: This year we propose constructing a new depot at St. John, and we are estimating for that. In New Brunswick we are providing for the completion of a wharf with new buildings, etc., $30,000; for buoys and beacons, $5,000; general improvements, $15,000; unforeseen works and repairs, $30,000. In this item a considerable amount is estimated for unforeseen works. A lighthouse might be burned down, or some other kind of accident might happen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to know the amount of money expended on wharves, with special reference to St. John for the current year.

Mr. HAZEN: For this wharf tenders were invited, and six were received. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, Frank L. Boon.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the amount of the tender?

Mr. HAZEN: $185,000.

Mr. CARVELL: How much has been expended on the wharf up to date?

Mr. HAZEN: The other tenderers were:

William Cooke	$183,500
M. Connolly	202,500
John A. Adams	235,500
Manning W. Doherty, the Maritime Dredging and Construction Co., Ltd.	239,475
Daniel C. Clark	246,820

The lowest tender was accepted, that of Frank L. Boone, of, I think, St. Mary's, at $185,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, what was the cost of the land?

Mr. HAZEN: That is outside of the land. The land was obtained on a valuation made by Mr. Fred. Sayre, Mr. Lockhart, and I forget who the other one was. I think there were others. It was found impracticable to utilize the existing wharves, or the inner portion of the wharf, and, on the advice of the chief engineer, an arrangement was made with the contractor whereby the wharf was extended into the street 170 feet, for which he was allowed $47,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In addition to the tender?

Mr. HAZEN: In addition to the contract price.

Mr. CARVELL: $185,000 plus $41,800.

Mr. HAZEN: $226,800. The preparation of the foundation at the outer end of the wharf presented difficulties, but these were overcome, no additional compensation being paid to the contractor. I will give all the details which I have in the memorandum before me.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Including the original purchase of the land?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not got that here. That was several years ago, and it was discussed in the House at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, it was discussed, as well as the way that the amount was arrived at.

Mr. CARVELL: From whom was the land purchased?

Mr. HAZEN: It belonged to the estate of Enoch Colwell, or some of the Colwell family. Towards the completion of the work, some settlement occurred at the end of the wharf, throwing the concrete out of line, but apparently not endangering the structure in any way. One thousand dollars was deducted from the contract price to make this good when it was certain that settlement had finally ceased. At one point the depth of water required was not found; $500 had been deducted from the contract price to make this good. A change in the construction of the wharf was carried out, involving the decking of a large portion and the driving of a number of piles to support the decking. A quantity of the fill was removed at the same time, to relieve the pressure from the front of the wharf, at a total cost of $11,250. That amount must be added to the figures. Additional payments amounting to some $6,000 were made to the contractor during

the progress of the work, some of these amounts being for extras on account of the contract as provided for, the largest items being for the substitution of stone filling at certain points, to relieve the pressure on the cribs, and to place some additional stone outside the stone fill foundation, as an additional safeguard, certain ice protection to the nose of the pier, and a few other similar items. The balance of the payments was for work done by the contractor outside the contract, the use of his plant and equipment for various tests and examinations made by the department, etc. In all, the total amount paid to date to the contractor in full settlement is $244,000, in round numbers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is, $60,000 more than the original price?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, but that included the inner part which I have explained. That is approximately the average of the three highest tenders received for the outer portion of the wharf alone, when tenders were originally invited. The average of all the tenders for the outer portion of the wharf alone, exclusive of the one accepted, is $225,750. I may say to my hon. friend that the wharf is now in use loaded with buoys, chains, and other departmental material. A shed has been erected upon it, tracks laid, a large derrick installed, and further improvements in the nature of fencing, lighting and grading are under way. The total estimated cost of these works is $15,000. The work will be completed well within the estimate.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is that wharf built of?

Mr. HAZEN: It is built of concrete.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is its size?

Mr. HAZEN: It is quite a large wharf; I have not the exact dimensions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who was the inspector of the wharf?

Mr. HAZEN: The officers of the department. It was built under the direction of Col. Anderson and Mr. Fraser, the assistant engineer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who was the local inspector?

Mr. HAZEN: J. P. Mosher, and, of course, the engineer of the department at St. John, Mr. Stanley Macdonald. No provision was made in the contract for berths on the down-stream side of the wharf, because it was assumed that this material could be taken out by the Dominion Government dredges if found necessary. This work is quite feasible, and arrangements have been made to have the necessary dredging done by the Public Works Department without further cost to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CARVELL: Could the minister give the length of the wharf along the river front, and also the depth back to the land?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not that information here, but I shall be pleased to drop my hon. friend a line giving him the exact dimensions.

Mr. CARVELL: I am very much obliged to the minister for giving us this information. The port of St. John is more than an ordinary country seaport; it is one of the national ports of Canada. Anything that is done in a port like that should be done along business lines and not as a matter of political convenience, without using a stronger term than that. Now, one would imagine, from the very mild and gentlemanly statement made by the minister this afternoon, that this was an ordinary work, carried on under ordinary conditions, and that the Dominion Government had an asset for the $244,000 already expended and $15,000 which will be expended, making a total of aboutt $260,000, outside of the amount paid for the land. I do not intend at this particular moment to go into any discussion of the land question, but if my hon. friend, when furnishing the remainder of the information, will tell us who the mortgagee of the land was, as well as the owner of the very small equity, it would be a very interesting piece of information to the House and the country at large.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend all possible information.

Mr. CARVELL: I had heard about this wonderful piece of engineering, and, during the month of September or October last, I had an hour to spare in St. John and I went to look it over myself. I am not an engineer, but I have eyes and some reasonable degree of understanding. I wish the minister had a photograph of that wharf in order to lay it on the table of the House. It would be an inspiring exhibit, and something which I think the hon. gentleman ought to produce and allow the newspapers

5 p.m.

to get hold of. This is the most despicable piece of political jobbery I have ever seen in Canada.

Mr. HAZEN: Oh, no.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, that may be a pretty strong term. The minister says that it is a concrete wharf. So it is. I could not get down into the bowels of the thing and see how it is built, and I have not a copy of the plan and specification, but I saw it at low tide. It is a concrete-faced wharf. I do not know what the foundation is like. Not only are these great slabs of concrete, about five feet wide at the top and probably wider at the bottom, split and cracked, but there are cracks in the concrete from six to eight inches wide extending from the top down as far as you can see, probably 25 or 30 feet. If you look along the face of the wharf, it is up and down like the waves of the sea.

Mr. MURPHY: Like the grades on the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. CARVELL: Why, I think there are grades of ten per cent; at any rate, there are grades of five per cent along the top of the concrete slabs, and when you come over the top of the grade the concrete has to break away you could almost drop a boy through some of the cracks in the concrete slab. The place I speak of would be the northwest corner of the wharf, five or six feet back from the corner, where it is broken off entirely, and the whole front slab of concrete which faces the channel has gone out into the channel one or two feet. A line was run from this point fifty or sixty feet to a place where the wharf came back to the straight line, and workmen started to chip the concrete off in order to straighten it if possible; but, after working at that for a while, they quit, and the wharf stands there with its face chipped off and some iron bolts sticking out of it. If you tried to moor a vessel alongside of the wharf, you would rip the side out of the vessel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are the iron bolts to hold the concrete together?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know. If you go along thirty or forty feet, you come to a place where the wharf comes to the line again, and then you come to another place where it bends out into the channel. I was told that there was not enough water along the face of the wharf to float a vessel drawing fifteen feet.

Mr. ROGERS: Which wharf is that?

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, it is not the big one. I will come to that later on. There is another wharf down there which belongs to the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, but that is a-million-and-a-half-dollar affair. It is 800 feet long and 300 feet wide and is built of concrete slabs. Part of it is falling into the channel, and my hon. friend is trying to tie it together with hay wire. This is merely a hint to my hon. friend that we shall have a discussion about it later on.

To come back to the wharf of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, there is no doubt that it is his child: It was conceived by him, built by him, and I presume he will take the responsibility for it. He will have to take the responsibility for it at St. John when the time comes.

Mr. HAZEN: I certainly will, and I am quite prepared to take the credit for it also.

Mr. CARVELL: The foundation of this wharf was evidently never intended for a wharf. I am told that the trouble was caused by the fact that the engineers would not level off the bottom; they did not take out the boulders because it would cost a little money. The bottom was therefore left uneven, and they first put down cribwork which was intended to come up to low water mark, and then they were to put a concrete facing on top of the cribwork. As soon as the weight of the concrete was put upon the cribs, the cribs settled down and conformed to the slope of the bottom of the river, and wherever one of the great boulders stuck up, of course the concrete slab had to break in two, and that is the case all over the wharf and on all sides of it. My hon. friend says that they did not do any dredging on the lower side. If they were to dredge on the lower side of the wharf, the whole thing would tumble into the water.

Mr. HAZEN: We are dredging there now, and we intend to continue doing so.

Mr. CARVELL: If you dredge there without building another wharf in front of this one, what little concrete you have there will tumble into the river. Really, I have not painted the picture half as bad as it really is. My hon. friend says that they changed the specifications. They had to change them. Under the original specifications they were to fill this wharf; but if they had filled it full, there would not have

been anything there to-day, because it would have spewed out into the river on both sides. They did not dare to fill it up; they filled the centre with piling, covered that with planks, and the planks are as uneven as the waves of the sea. I give my hon. friend credit for the engineering ability of his engineers, because a great deal of skill has been shown in the buildings and the works. This is a wharf belonging to the Marine Department; it is to be the home of the marine service in that part of the country; it is the place where the boats of the Marine Department are to lie for purposes of outfitting, taking in supplies and having repairs done, and one would naturally expect to find some buildings on the wharf in which the work could be done and the supplies stored. The engineers have at least shown some engineering ability in the fact that they did not erect the buildings on the wharf, but away back on the dry land. Those buildings will remain all right, because they are back on the land and have a good foundation. The engineers did not dare to build them on the wharf, because they knew that the whole thing would spew out into the sea. They have now a wharf there costing about $260,000, up to which they can not bring a boat drawing fifteen feet of water, on which they can not erect a building in which to store their supplies, and which is absolutely useless to the people of Canada. Why did they erect a wharf in such a place as that? For the information of gentlemen who do not understand the river St. John at that point, I may say that at about a mile above the location of this wharf are the reversible falls, in a narrow gorge through which the river runs, and where, at certain seasons, the tide drops 27 or 28 feet when the water is flowing out to the sea, and at other times the water is flowing up the river. All members from the Maritime Provinces have passed this gorge in travelling over the Canadian Pacific railway, and I presume that many other members have been there. From that point to the harbour is a narrow gorge, through which the water tears its way as it does through very few rivers in Canada; yet those engineers went up into that narrow gorge and bought a piece of land, for some reason which no one can explain except that some one wanted very much to sell it, and built their wharf there instead of going down to the harbour front where they would have had smooth water.

There are times of the day when I believe it would not be safe to tie a vessel alongside this wharf. The hon. minister spoke of protecting the nose of the wharf from ice. Think of building a wharf costing a quarter of a million dollars in such a position that it has to be protected from ice. No man working in the interest of the country would build such a wharf in a place like that when there are dozens of locations, half a mile or more further down, where the wharf could be properly built, and where it could do some good. The tide there runs, I think, from twenty-three to twenty-seven feet. These are the conditions, and they must be faced. Laying aside the question of the location of the wharf—a location which, as I have said, no engineer would choose if he wanted to make this wharf a public utility to Canada—there are special conditions to be considered. In the first place, in making a foundation for a concrete wharf you must allow for the twenty-seven foot rise and fall of the tide. Then, you must have at least ten feet above high water to allow a vessel to lie alongside the wharf. Then, below the lowest level of the water, you must have whatever depth you wish to allow for a vessel to come to the wharf. If you allow for vessels of twenty-foot draught, you must allow altogether fifty-seven feet from the top of the wharf to the river bottom. They did not dredge the foundations of the wharf far enough, and so when they tried to get the twenty feet or whatever it was they wanted, the whole thing spilled out into the river. I hope the minister will explain some of the things I have described. If my description is not in accordance with the facts, I want him to say so. He must have the information on this subject. He must know how much water there is in front of the wharf; how much there is on the upper side and how much on the lower side. He must know the width of the cracks in the concrete slabs. He must know the variation of level of this wharf and how much filling they were afraid to put in the centre and so filled in with piling covered with planks.

Since my visit to that wharf I have received more than a dozen letters on the subject. Unfortunately most of them are anonymous, and so I do not wish to lay them before the House. But if I should read them I think the minister would be somewhat surprised to learn what some of his constituents think of this work. I have here one.

Mr. HAZEN: Is it anonymous?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. The writer says:

I will give you my name when living under a better administration, but circumstances force me to conceal my identity.

I will send this letter to the minister if he likes.

Mr. HAZEN: Never mind. I think neither of us takes much stock in anonymous letters.

Mr. CARVELL: It comes from some one who dared not reveal his identity. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this work is a shame and a disgrace to Canada; it is something which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries cannot laugh away, something he cannot get rid of with a jocular remark. It is a matter which the people of St. John expect him to face. It is so disgraceful that it will require something more than a laugh and a joke on his part to set it right.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is never extremely moderate in his language, and in his speech of to-day he has not departed from his usual style. Permit me to say, I had not the slightest thought of dismissing the subject with a laugh or a joke. The marine depot was a necessity at St. John, in consequence of the ballast wharf previously used for the purpose of storing buoys, chains, etc., having been transferred to a company which erected on the site a large sugar refinery. That fact was realized by my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) when he was a member of the Administration. In the Public Works Estimates of 1909-10—I think it was that year—an item appeared of $50.000 as the first instalment toward the construction of a marine depot at St. John. I understand that my hon. friend had in view a site farther up the harbour than this——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Over the Reversible Falls.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, that would be all right; it is beyond the current.

Mr. HAZEN: That would be all right, but there would be difficulty in getting up and down the falls.

Mr. CARVELL: Vessels could pass twice a day.

Mr. HAZEN: The necessity for the work was recognized by everybody. The Marine Department must have a place for storage, and it must be a wharf in order that the vessels may go and take the articles required to the points where they are to be placed from time to time. So, we looked for a site. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) speaks of finding a site further down the harbour, but it is most difficult to secure a site on the harbour of St. John for any purpose.

Mr. CARVELL: Would not there be a site along by Hilliard's mill?

Mr. HAZEN: I think that that property was one of those offered to us. But the prices were many times in excess of the site where the wharf has been constructed. After full consideration of the matter, this site was purchased, and it was purchased at a price less than the valuation placed upon it by three gentlemen in St. John, all familiar with real estate conditions. One of those was Mr. Fred Sayre, and another was Mr. Lockhart. I think there was a third, but I have forgotten who it was. The city of St. John made us a gift of their rights in certain lots. The wharf was designed by the engineers of the Marine and Fisheries Department. The chief engineer is Col. Anderson, a man of the highest professional qualifications and standing who has been in the department for over forty years. The assistant engineer is Mr. Basil Fraser who has been assistant engineer, I think, for about twenty years—my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) will know. The designs were prepared in the department under the direct instructions of these gentlemen, who, before preparing them, had visited St. John and inspected the site, and so knew exactly what was wanted to meet the needs of the situation. Their reports are in the department. After the designs were completed, tenders were asked for, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

The wharf has been constructed under the direction of engineers of the Marine and Fisheries Department, who tell me that they are prepared to justify everything that was done in connection with the work. In a tidal harbour difficulties are always encountered in wharf construction; I think this is the first concrete wharf ever built at the city of St. John. I desire to say that there is nothing in connection with this whole matter that is not open to the fullest inquiry and investigation on the part of members of the House. There was a settlement at the front of the wharf which did cause a certain cracking at the front.

Mr. CARVELL: It is cracked all along the sides as well.

Mr. HAZEN: No, it is not.

Mr. CARVELL: I was there and saw it; in the river side you will find cracks in the concrete.

Mr. HAZEN: It is not cracked all along the side; I have been there, too. My hon. friend speaks of this wharf as if it were a tumble-down structure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When did the hon. minister see it last?

Mr. HAZEN: About the first of January. If I can rely on my engineers—and I think I can—the wharf is as solid a structure as it can be; the slight settlement that has taken place has in no way impaired its strength. As to my hon. friend's assertion that vessels cannot lie at the front of the wharf without being smashed to pieces, I need only say that the vessels of the Marine Department, the Aberdeen and the Lansdowne, have been docked at the face of the wharf time and again since its construction. The main part of the wharf is all that could be required for the placing upon it of the large buoys which are used in the Bay of Fundy, and the different things required in connection with the buoy service. When I was there, buoys running up into hundreds of tons in weight were upon that wharf. The storehouses are built further back, in the position recommended by the engineers as the most convenient, having regard to the uses to which the wharf is to be put.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the depth of water at the lower side?

Mr. HAZEN: It is not very great; I cannot give the exact figures. At the front it is deep.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How far below the surface of the mud at the lower side of the wharf is the bottom dredged?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot tell that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend must realize how important these things are.

Mr. HAZEN: I know that they are important. The engineers of my department say that the wharf was constructed with the view of having it dredged on the lower side. It can be dredged on the lower side to a depth amply sufficient for the boats of the Marine Department. Arrangements have been made with the Public Works Department by which that dredging, if it has not already been done, will be done in the near future. The engineers, who were vested with the control of operations from the time the contract was made, tell me that the wharf is a thoroughly substantial and excellent structure in every way, that it will admirably serve the purpose for which it was constructed and will last for very many years. Some engineers hold that concrete construction in tidal waters is a mistake. I know an eminent harbour engineer in the province of Quebec who thinks that wharfs in tidal waters should be constructed not of concrete, but of timber. However, time will establish whether or not that view is correct. I myself am not an engineer; I rely upon the opinion of those in whom I have confidence; those opinions I have stated to the Committee. My hon. friend is at liberty to see every file and paper in connection with this transaction from the very first to the very last. My instructions to Colonel Anderson and to Mr. Fraser were to see that the work was carried out thoroughly and well, to give no advantage to anybody for political reasons, and to see that the contract was carried out to the letter and with due regard to the public interest. Had I known that this matter was coming up today in the way that it has, I should have brought with me information as to the depth of dredging, the depth to which the concrete is laid, and so on.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the depth of water at low tide on the face or river side of the wharf?

Mr. HAZEN: It is deep enough for the Aberdeen and the Lansdowne, which are the two boats used by the Marine Department in the buoy service in the Bay of Fundy. I presume it is at least fifteen feet. I will send my hon. friend the information as to this.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. minister send me a copy of the plans and specifications of the foundation part? I am not so particular about the concrete.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to furnish my hon. friend with all plans and everything in connection with the matter from beginning to end; there is not a single thing which I have the slightest objection to my hon. friend seeing. I presume the blue prints of those plans are obtainable; I will see Colonel Anderson to-morrow. In the event of my not being able to obtain them at once, if my hon. friend will come to the department I will ask Colonel Anderson or Mr. Fraser to show him the plans, to offer any explanations he may desire and to answer any questions he may ask.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a very fair offer, but I should prefer having the blue prints.

Mr. HAZEN: If I can get them, I will.

Mr. CARVELL: There is plenty of time; any time during the session will do. The wharf will probably stand during the next three or four months.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps longer than you and I will stand.

Mr. CARVELL: I should like to have the information before the session closes. I am not casting any reflection on Colonel Anderson; that is why I want to see the plans. Until I have an opportunity of examining them, I am going to assume that the plans and specifications are all right. I have no doubt that if the wharf had been built according to the plans and specifications, we would not have the condition of affairs that we have to-day. I am objecting not to the plans and specifications, but to the way the work was carried out in St. John. It is a fact that a proper foundation was not made, that the old boulders were not removed from the foundation, and that the filling of the cribwork went down from the very top. You can see great holes inside the concrete slabs where the filling that was put into the cribwork has gone down and out. The holes may be filled up now, but they were there last September. I am glad that my hon. friend takes such an optimistic view of this matter, but I do not agree that a concrete structure which shows cracks from five to seven inches wide, running down perhaps twenty-five or thirty feet, will remain standing for all time.

He has more faith in this crib standing up without any visible means of support than I have or the people of St. John have. Many men to whom I have talked expect to see the thing go to pieces at any time. I make the prophecy that if the Minister of Marine occupies the position he does to-day for two years more, he will either tear the thing down and build it anew or build another wharf around it.

Mr. HAZEN: Will my hon. friend make a little sporting bet on that?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, I will make a prophecy anyway.

Mr. HAZEN: I will tell him what I am willing to do with him. If his prophecy proves true, I shall be very glad to give $500 or $1,000, or whatever amount may be agreed upon, to any charity the hon. gentleman may name. If it does not prove true, I want him to give a similar amount to one I will name. Perhaps this should not go in Hansard.

Mr. MURPHY: I will hold the stakes.

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend might be disposed to let the thing stand up a little longer than would be safe in order to get my thousand dollars.

Mr. HAZEN: It will be there when you and I have shuffled off this mortal coil.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is gambling on a sure thing, because he will not be there.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend can not get away from this condition of affairs by any such sporting offer as this. He has to face the situation as it is, and if I have improperly described it, he is at liberty to describe it properly and to set me right where I am wrong. But I have not improperly described it; I have described it as it is. I have not painted the picture as black as it is; and before the session of Parliament is over, we will be able to show other works in St. John of very much greater importance than this that are just as bad as this, and show exactly the same condition of political corruption existing in other portions of the harbour of St. John as I am afraid existed in this portion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Marine states that my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), is not usually moderate in his expressions of opinion and has not been so in this case. I have observed that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., does not very often go wrong. He has a faculty for finding out where errors have been committed and where wrong has been done, and perhaps, when he has discovered those errors and those instances of wrong-doing he is pretty forceful in the expression of his opinion. I do not think any one could blame him for that, that is his duty. He is here, a member of Parliament, representing a portion of the people of this country, and I think in this matter, as in other matters which he has felt it his duty to bring to the attention of Parliament and of the country, he has simply been doing what was absolutely correct and should be expected of him as a member of this House. The hon. member has made a very strong statement, which has not been answered by the minister. He has stated that upon the southern side of this wharf there is scarcely any water, and that if the mud there is dredged out

to a depth sufficient to allow vessels to lie there at low tide, the structure will tumble over to the south and become a wreck.

Mr. HAZEN: The engineer of the department says very differently.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the minister says he went there in January of this year, and yet he cannot tell the depth of the water on the southern side of the wharf which he has constructed in his own constituency, in his home city, and in which he has evidently taken a pride. He cannot say whether the depth of water is one foot or five feet.

Mr. HAZEN: It has always been intended to dredge that out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But does not my hon. friend see, as a gentleman having ordinary judgment, that you cannot dredge out on the southern side of the wharf unless the wharf setting runs down to at least one or two feet lower than you are going to dredge?

Mr. HAZEN: Exactly, and the engineers say that is being done, that it is to be dredged out sufficiently for boats to lie there at low tide.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Carleton says that the foundation has evidently not been properly prepared for the wharf. He has also stated that there is a great crack, in fact, not only one crack, but several, extending from the top of the wharf right down to the lowest part, and that it can be seen at low tide.

Mr. CARVELL: And that is on the lower side of the wharf as well as on the face and to some extent on the upper side, but not to the same extent as on the lower side and on the face.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is an extremely serious statement, and yet my hon. friend the minister, who was there only a few weeks ago, does not deny it.

Mr. HAZEN: I do deny the statement that the wharf was all cracked.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of course, the hon. member for Carleton does not mean that there are not some parts of it that have no cracks, because if it was all cracks there would be no wharf: it would be all space and no solidity. When my hon. friend from Carleton states that there are large cracks extending from the top to low water, both in the front and lower side, and on the upper side as well——

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. CARVELL: To some extent on the upper side as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have heard many stories with regard to this wharf, both as to the purchase of the property and the construction of the wharf upon it. Many complaints have been made to me, and I have received many anonymous letters. I intended to go myself and make an examination of the wharf before this session of Parliament, and I was very glad when I learned that my hon. friend, the member for Carleton, who is, I think, a more practical man than I or the minister, had gone to make an examination of the wharf. The minister cannot ignore a statement like this, It is a statement made by the hon. member for Carleton on that serious responsibility which rests on every member of this House when he makes a statement with regard to public matters. I should think that there must be on the files of the department some reports in reference to this wharf, and that the minister should let the item stand until he can give information as to the purchase of the property, who were interested in the land, and the reasons why that site was chosen. We should have the whole file with reference to this wharf. With regard to the site, I think there is very strong ground for criticism. When I was Minister of Public Works I had recognized the importance of building a marine wharf. No one can question the wisdom of the Minister of Marine in determining to build a marine depot at the port of St. John. I also recognized the difficulty of getting suitable sites, although this was especially the case before the improvements were undertaken at Courtenay bay. I always thought there were just two available places for the marine dock which could be got cheaply. One was the property above the falls where there is a deep bay running into the land, where there would be splendid accommodation and where land could be acquired at a trifling cost, certainly as compared with the great cost of this property. The other would be in Courtenay bay. Courtenay bay is a large area, and I always thought that when it was properly dredged there would be a splendid site for a marine dock which would cost comparatively little because the site would be owned by the Government and the only expense would be the dredging operations. But I suppose, in view of the slowness with which the dredging of Courtenay bay has been going on, the Marine Department would have had to wait a long time upon the Minister of Public Works before they

could get a site for a dock at Courtenay bay. Perhaps if the Minister of Public Works felt that his colleague needed a site for a dock it might have spurred him up to a little more activity, and this certainly would have been more pleasing to the people of St. John. Probably the difficulty has been, not so much with regard to the plans as with regard to the mode in which the contractors carried out the work. I may inform the minister that there are very extraordinary rumours going around the city of St. John —they have been current for some time— that Mr. Boone, who was nominally the contractor, was not the real contractor.

Mr. CARVELL: That is right.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Boone is not a wharf builder.

Mr. HAZEN: The Boones are a family of wharf builders; his father was one before him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Boone of St. Mary's?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, the Boones and the Haines have been building wharves for years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Boone may have built some small wharves on the river St. John, costing from $500 to $1,000, but he is not a wharf builder in the sense of being a contractor for large wharves in tidal waters. I venture to say that he never built a concrete wharf in his life. Is the minister able to say that Mr. Boone has had experience in concrete work?

Mr. HAZEN: I think he had in connection with piers and bridges; I am so informed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At all events, Mr. Boone has not been a wharf builder in the sense of building wharves in tidal waters, and the rumour is that he was not the real contractor, but that the parties really interested in the contract were political friends of the minister, residing in the city of St. John.

Mr. HAZEN: I know that Mr. Boone was there on the work from first to last, from morning till night, while the work was under construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then can the minister tell us what experience Mr. Mosher had?

Mr. HAZEN: He is a practical man; I know he has had practical experience.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where does he reside?

Mr. HAZEN: At St. Martin's.

Mr. CARVELL: What is his business?

Mr. HAZEN: He is a lumberman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was Minister of Public Works I was always very careful to see that in works of this character we had as local inspector a man of a great deal of experience.

Mr. HAZEN: In addition to Mr. Mosher, the engineer of the department was there every day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But Mr. Mosher was supposed to be the inspector.

Mr. HAZEN: Subject to the orders of the engineer of the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Mosher has had no experience in concrete work, and yet he is the man upon whom the engineer would depend.

Mr. HAZEN: He is a very practical man.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He may be a very practical man, but unless he understands work of this character, the work is apt to suffer. Then I would like to know what experience Mr. Macdonald has had of concrete work.

Mr. HAZEN: He is a competent engineer, and I presume he has had experience in building.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is important for us to know what experience Mr. Macdonald has had in this class of work, because there is the lamentable fact, if what the hon. member for Carleton states is true— and I have not the slightest doubt that what he states from his own observation is true—a very deplorable piece of work has been perpetrated in connection with this contract. I would suggest to the minister that we had better have the matter cleared up before the item passes, and that he produce all the papers in connection with the work. Then the matter can be threshed out, and if there is no fault to be found I shall be very glad. I am sure that no one will be better pleased to find that there was no fault than my honourable friend from Carleton. It gives me, and I am sure, it gives him, no pleasure to find fault; we would rather be in the position of being able to praise work that has been done. I would like to see the works at St. John of so substantial a character that they would be a credit to the Government and a source of pride to the community. It will not lead to any delay to let this item stand, and to have

the papers and reports in connection with the wharf at St. John brought down.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think that anything is gained by allowing an item to stand. I want the House to get the fullest information, and I am perfectly prepared, when the motion is made, to bring down all the papers, correspondence, and contracts in connection with this matter. Rather than put my honourable friend to the trouble of moving for a return I am even prepared to give him the information without any formality at all. If there is to be an investigation based on those papers, surely the place to pursue it would be the Public Accounts Committee, where there would be an opportunity of calling witnesses connected with the work. I have no desire to avoid the fullest investigation into this matter, but I would suggest that the item be passed, and I will consider the motion far a return made and bring down the papers. Of course the purpose of the inquiry would be shown in the motion, and perhaps it would be better if such a motion were made. I would be very glad indeed to ask Colonel Anderson and my deputy minister to place everything before my hon. friends if they care to come to the department. I do not like to delay the passage of Estimates if it can be avoided.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the minister will see that, while we appreciate his offer, to go to the department would place us at a great disadvantage. I have not sufficient knowledge of enginering to digest plans and specifications and other papers in connection with a work of this kind in an hour and a half or an hour, which would be as long as an officer in Colonel Anderson's position could afford to spend with us. But if I had those documents I think I would be able to fairly digest them, and I think my hon. friend from St. John would have the same ability. I am not particular as to whether the item passes or not. I think it would be better to let it stand, because after an investigation of these plans and papers I would like to make some other remarks. I look upon it as a matter of such grave importance that we should have a chance of discussing it with a full knowledge of the facts.

Item allowed to stand.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister has given us the items for New Brunswick, but not for the province of Quebec.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. HAZEN: In Quebec the works contemplated are at Amherst Island, one of the Magdalens, a new lighthouse and fog alarm costing $25,000; at the Upper Traverse, repairs to pier, $8,000; buoys and beacons, $10,000; general improvements, $15,000; unforeseen works and repairs, $25,000; Quebec agency, repairs to wharf, $22,000; in all $100,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is $25,000 not a large sum to expend on a lighthouse?

Mr. HAZEN: It is for a lighthouse and fog alarm. The light is to be a very powerful one, and there is also to be a powerful alarm.

Lighthouse and coast service—signal service, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the nature of that service? Is it in connection with wireless telegraphy?

Mr. HAZEN: Signal stations have been established for years for the purpose of maintaining communication between shipping and the shore. These are located at St. John, Halifax, Cape Race, and on the river St. Lawrence, and the Great Lakes as far west as Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much is expended on the service?

Mr. HAZEN: The vote is $60,000. In 1914-15, out of our total vote of $60,000, we spent $52,310, and up to the 31st December we spent $42,516.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there a Marconi station on the Baie des Chaleurs?

Mr. HAZEN: No, I do not think so. There are stations at Fame Point, Quebec, St. John, and Halifax.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister considered the advisability of having a life-saving station on the Baie des Chaleurs?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think that the technical officers of the department consider it necessary, because they say that a ship in the Baie des Chaleurs could communicate by wireless with either Quebec or Fame Point.

Mr. MARCIL: The great bulk of the steamers going up the Baie des Chaleurs are not equipped with wireless.

Mr. HAZEN: All ships under the law, if they are on a voyage that takes them a certain distance from land, have to be equipped with wireless.

Mr. MARCIL: Whether they carry passengers or not?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes; but, of course, vessels on the Baie des Chaleurs are always in sight of land, and they would not come under that provision.

Mr. MARCIL: Lumber boats are not equipped with wireless.

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Yet they go across the ocean.

The committee took recess.

SIGNAL LIGHT ON PARLIAMENT BUILDING.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) referred the other day with appreciation to the work that had been performed by the Pubic Works Department in equipping this building so promptly and conveniently for the purposes of Parliament. If I may be permitted, I would like to express my warm appreciation of the indefatigable energy and personal attention which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) himself has given to these matters. I have personal knowledge that he has been most active and indefatigable, ever since we met here on Friday afternoon last, and certainly the arrangements which have been thus carried out have been much more satisfactory than could have been expected. He desired me to announce to the committee that the time-honoured custom of having the light above the Parliament buildings will be carried out in the future. Arrangements therefor have already been made, and he has had placed on my desk a little button, which he has asked me to press, and which will illumine the top of this building for the first time since we have been sitting here.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 22, to incorporate Edmonton and Southwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 23, to incorporate the Ontario, Niagara Connecting Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 24, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 25, to incorporate the Western Canada Telephone Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Corporation of the city of Brantford.—Mr. Cockshutt.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Cnair.

Lighthouse and coast service—administration of pilotage and maintenance and repairs to steamer Eureka, $56,300.

Mr. GRAHAM: What steamer is that?

Mr. HAZEN: The pilot steamer at Father Point on which the pilots go to and come from vessels, and which has been in the service for a number of years. This is the same appropriation as we had last year. In 1914-15, we spent $42,904.64, and the expenditure up to the 31st of December, 1915, was $33,026.10. The expenditure next year will, we expect, be considerably under the estimate, but we think it wise to ask for the same amount as we asked for before, because it may be found necessary to make some extensive repairs upon the boat.

Lighthouse and coast service—maintenance and repairs to wharves, $10,000.

Mr. HAZEN: We receive this vote every year. As hon. gentlemen know, after wharves are constructed by the Department of Public Works they automatically come under the management of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and when repairs are necessary, our department puts repairs on the wharves to an amount not exceeding $50 in each case. If larger amounts are required, they have to be put in the Estimates of the Department of Public Works. In 1914-15 we spent $9,993 and, up to the 31st of December, 1915, we spent $4,731.13.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Where are these wharves situated?

Mr. HAZEN: Everywhere throughout Canada on the coasts and lakes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Do I understand that when repairs amount to more than $50, the work is done by the Department of Public Works?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I call the attention of the minister to a wharf at Margaree harbour that was constructed some seven or eight years ago at a cost of four or five or six thousand dollars. That wharf has been in a disabled condition for the last four years, and can not be used at all. It will take $25 to repair it.

Mr. HAZEN: At present?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Yes, at present, and for the last three years. It is absolutely useless now, for the simple reason that no attention has been paid to it.

Mr. HAZEN: We will have it repaired right away.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I made an effort before to get it repaired, but unfortunately I am on this side of the House.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to have it repaired. That is a thing to be attended to promptly.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are the large harbours under the department of my hon. friend?

Mr. HAZEN: Some of them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know why it should be so, but it has always been the case that these harbours are under different heads. For instance, the Toronto harbour is under the Harbour Commission at the present time. Does it come under the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: And still a good deal of work is being done by the Public Works Department.

Mr. HAZEN: Nearly all of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose my hon. friend would not be in a position to tell me how the work is going on because he is not doing it.

Mr. HAZEN: No, the Public Works Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much has the Marine Department spent on the harbour at Toronto?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think we have spent a dollar in that harbour on wharves, dredging, or work of that sort. There is a life-saving station in the harbour, which comes under the control of the Department of the Naval Service, but I suppose it is not to things of that kind that the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. GRAHAM: I took some little part when the present Harbour Commission for Toronto was established, and I would like to find out how it is progressing. In years gone by, I think, Toronto had the poorest harbour facilities of any of our great cities in the way of loading and unloading, and when the Commission was formed great improvement was expected. But that improvement, I think, has not arrived with the rapidity that was looked for. I do not know whether there has been friction between the Government appointees and the city appointees, or whether they are getting along harmoniously.

Mr. HAZEN: There are commissions and commissions. The Montreal Harbour Commissioners, for instance, are all appointed by the Government of Canada. It might be said that they are, in a sense, a branch of the Marine and Fisheries Department. The title of the harbour is vested in these Commissioners. They prepare their plans for improvements, and get the approval of the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the Marine and Fisheries Department for what they undertake to do. Then, under authority that is given us by Parliament, by Acts passed from time to time, we advance them money for the work. The work is carried on and is inspected by the officer in charge. The Harbour Commissioners pay the interest on the money that we have advanced. So, it may be said that improvements there cost Canada nothing, because interest is paid on all the money advanced. Of course, it cost Canada something in this way,—the interest they pay is three and a half per cent which was about the rate the Dominion paid at the time the Act was passed, but, of course, money costs the country more now. The organization of the Harbour Commission of Toronto is different from that of the Montreal Commission. Some of the members are appointed by the Governor in Council, some by the city council and some, I think, by the Board of Trade. They do not borrow money from us, but they administer the harbour, collect the harbour dues, such as they are, and carry out improvements. They do not act directly under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Then, there are some harbours that are not managed by a commission. For instance, there is the harbour of St. John. The City Council is the conservator of the harbour and appoints a harbour master. The Government has built public works there which have come under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The department appoints wharfingers who collect dues, and the money, which amounts to a considerable sum each year, goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The hon. gentleman will thus see that there are dif-

ferent organizations governing different harbours.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the hon. gentleman give me the names of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners?

Mr. HAZEN: I thought that would be found in the report of the department, but while I find here the report of the harbour master, I do not see the names of the commissioners.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Referring to the Auditor General's report of expenditure under the heading "Repairs to Wharves," I find last year a large part of the money was spent in watching sheds. I find the names of sixteen men paid $2 or $2.50 a day, from January to April, for watching sheds. Will the minister please explain?

Mr. HAZEN: It was necessary last year, as a precautionary measure, to put guards on our sheds and wharves.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Were all these men on the same wharf?

Mr. HAZEN: I should not think so. We have two wharves in the city of St. John used by the large ships in the winter seasen. The sheds on these wharves have to be guarded both night and day in case of an attempt being made to destroy them. Any successful attempt of that kind would hamper the trade of the country tremendously, and would also interfere with the transport of munitions and other articles going forward for use in the war.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: Have the resident engineers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries instructions to report the small repairs to wharves that may be needed? If not, in what way does the department receive information on this subject?

Mr. HAZEN: The resident engineers are expected to report to the engineers' branch of the department in Ottawa any need of small repairs that may arise, and they do so, so far as I know.

Mr. CHISHOLM: To the Engineers' Branch of the Public Works or of the Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. HAZEN: Small repairs are reported to the Marine and Fisheries. But if the amount involved is over, say, $50, it would be the duty of the resident engineers of the Public Works Department to report to the department to which they belong.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I have an idea that a great many resident engineers understand it to be their duty to report only to the Public Works Department.

Mr. HAZEN: They are quite right. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman misunderstood me. It is the duty of the resident engineers of the Marine Department to report where small repairs are necessary, but in the case of larger repairs, the engineer of the Department of Public Works reports to the department to which he belongs.

Mr. CHISHOLM: And then is it the duty of the Department of Public Works to communicate with the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I know many cases in which the resident engineers have had their attention called to the need of repairs to wharves built for the accommodation of fishermen, and in nearly every case the engineer of the Department of Public Works was ignorant of the fact that provision had been made whereby money could be obtained from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to make these repairs. Instructions should be sent to resident engineers that this money is available, so that they can act on the principle "A stitch in time saves nine."

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand that the Montreal Harbour Commissioners were appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. As the minister has explained, the Government provides the money and the Harbour Commissioners pay the interest on that money at the rate of 3½ per cent, the title of the harbour property being vested in the commissioners.

Mr. HAZEN: That was the case until the last session of Parliament. In order to obviate the difficulty arising from a proposed civic taxation of wharves, which would run into millions of dollars, we passed an Act at the last session, approved by the Montreal city council, declaring that this harbour property was the property of the Crown.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it was the late Sir William Van Horne, who, discussing the question of transportation, endeavoured to emphasize the importance of keeping the harbour of Montreal in an efficient state in order to cope with the inward and outward traffic that ought to pass through that

port annually. During the season of navigation Montreal is the centre of a great traffic, both inward and outward. No matter how efficient are the transportation facilities afforded between Eastern and Western Canada, unless the outlet and inlet be properly equipped the handling of the traffic will be greatly handicapped and cannot reach its highest state of efficiency. We have expended many millions of dollars in the construction of canals; at the present time we are really building a new Welland canal. Many millions have been expended on harbours west of Montreal, in the Great Lakes and along the river St. Lawrence, and large sums have been expended in the system of canals from Cardinal east. With the three transcontinental railways, the harbours of Quebec and Montreal, as well as those of the Maritime provinces, must be kept in an efficient state, otherwise the expenditure of money for navigation purposes and railway facilities between Eastern and Western Canada will avail nothing. It is the object of Canadians, I believe, not only to carry our own traffic east and west, but so to improve our facilities that we shall be able to carry a portion of the traffic of the great nation to the south. I have never had any fear, no matter what tariff policy might be adopted, that Canadian transportation facilities would not be kept busy by the traffic that would come to them. During the past year Montreal has handled a great deal of grain. An enormous crop of grain has been taken from the West, and I think it is in contemplation to increase still further the facilities at Montreal harbour. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, an able body of men, as they always have been, find themselves very much crowded at this time by the movement of our western crop. I think the ratepayers of Canada are all interested in the question of how to get the products of the farm carried to the factory with rapidity and at a reasonable rate. These harbours, which afford an inlet and outlet for the great traffic of Canada, must be looked after to the utmost of our financial ability, because by equipping them adequately we provide the means of increasing the value of our products. Can the minister tell us what are the proposed improvements of the facilities in Montreal, what improvements have been made this season, and what is the plain of the Harbour Commissioners for the future? With the further development of the West, and with the continued large production in our eastern provinces, the necessity for the development of Montreal harbour becomes more pressing. I have been reading during the past few days of the increased traffic through Montreal which is destined for ports in the United States. We want to afford such facilities that it will be cheaper and more expeditious not only for ourselves but for at least a portion of the United States as well to send their traffic through our ports, giving our ships, railways and workingmen the advantage of handling that traffic, and at the same time giving our own producers and consumers the benefit that must come from the improvement of our transportation facilities.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend is quite right in the statements that he makes. A few years ago the port of Montreal was a very small port from the standpoint of grain shipments; to-day it is the largest grain port in America. The total quantity of grain received at or transferred in the harbour in 1906 was only 944,321 bushels. In 1908 it was 8,661,000 bushels; in 1911, 21,007,000; in 1912, 25,000,000; in 1913, 43,349,000; in 1914, 62,318,000. So, from 1912 to 1914 there was the enormous increase of 37,000,000 bushels. The harbour facilities have been pronounced by port authorities who have inspected them to be among the very best on the continent of North America. Only two years ago the port authorities of New York published a report approving in the highest terms of the work of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and the method on which their work was being carried out. As my hon. friend has intimated, the commissioners have done excellent work. The commission that was in charge of the work when I came to office, consisting of Mr. Stephens, Mr. Ballantyne and Mr. Geoffrion, was an excellent commission, and I deeply regretted that these gentlemen, after serving for some time, felt that owing to the pressure of private business it was necessary for them to hand in their resignation. Mr. Ballantyne had told me some time before that it would be impossible for him to continue, owing to the necessity for his giving attention to large private interests. Being impressed with the value of his work, I urged him to continue it, but after considering the matter he decided that he could not do so, expressing his deep regret, and his appreciation of my urging him to stay. I am glad to say that I was able to make recommendation to council, after consulting the Board of Trade

and business interests in Montreal, for the appointment of three gentlemen who have proved to be worthy successors of the members of the former commission. The work of the present commission, consisting of Mr. W. J. Ross, Mr. Farquhar Robertson, and General Labelle, has been progressive and prudent, and has, I think, met the views of those interested in the trade and traffic of Montreal. They have been adding to their elevator accommodation and are contemplating further additions during the present year. My hon. friend will find in the last report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries an extract from the report of the Montreal Harbour Commissioner regarding the further storage that is required. From that extract and from my personal conversations with the commissioners, I think I may say that they are improving the elevator accommodation there as rapidly as is feasible, to meet the existing conditions and requirements. They are making also arrangements for further extensive warehouses and sheds made necessary on account of increasing business; and so long as Canada grows, so long as Canadian trade grows, so long will Montreal grow and so long will further facilities have to be prepared, year after year, if that port, the great entrepôt of Canada in the summer, is to keep pace with the growing importance and trade of the country.

Mr. MARCIL: Has there not been a considerable falling off in the trade of the harbour of Montreal during 1915?

Mr. HAZEN: The revenues last year showed a decrease. That was in consequence of war conditions and the difficulty of getting tonnage.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the minister give an idea of the quantity of Canadian grain that went by American ports?

Mr. HAZEN: Of course, a very large quantity goes by American ports every year; but, on the other hand, during the year ended 31st March, 1915, a very considerable quantity of American grain went out of Montreal.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any hope that during this season Montreal will be better supplied with tonnage than last year?

Mr. HAZEN: I am in hopes that as this grain is necessary to feed the people on the other side of the water the British Admiralty will see the necessity of providing plenty of transports for carrying the grain, as they are now doing for freight from Maritime Province ports.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the steamers now running to Halifax and St. John run to Montreal in summer?

Mr. HAZEN: I have no doubt they will, as many of the war supplies now passing through Maritime ports will be sent through St. Lawrence ports in summer. I have no doubt the Admiralty will arrange to have similar transports plying to St. Lawrence ports during summer.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the minister say anything in regard to the harbour of Quebec, in view of the opening and operation of the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. HAZEN: The report of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec is to be found in the last report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at page 309. The work has proceeded very satisfactorily, and the facilities afforded in the harbour for the accommodation of large vessels are better than ever before. I quote this paragraph from the report of the commissioners, the report of their very efficient engineer, Mr. Boswell:

> The facilities offered in the harbour of Quebec for the accommodation of large vessels have been demonstrated in a decisive manner when the embarkation of the first Canadian overseas contingent took place in the latter part of September. Thirty-one steamships, ranging in tonnage from 4,686 tons to 18,564 tons have been accommodated at the commissioners' deep-water docks and wharves for taking on board the men, horses, ammunition and supplies of the first contingent. Several of these vessels were bunkered here, and supplied with fresh water from the commissioners' water works, which are connected with the city water works.

Work has been done at the Louise embankment, and elevator accommodation at Quebec is completed and ready to handle grain. The new elevator is of the most modern type and thoroughly efficient.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it being utilized this winter?

Mr. HAZEN: It is in a condition to be utilized. I do not know whether there is any grain there or not, but, of course, it will not be until navigation of the St. Lawrence commences that it will be actively used. I certainly hope that Quebec will become a great grain port, and that grain coming over the National Transcontinental railway will go to Quebec, so that the facilities that have been provided will prove a great blessing to the port and a great business convenience.

Mr. MARCIL: The very extensive improvements in the harbour are being done by the Public Works Department?

Mr. HAZEN: Improvements in Quebec harbour have been carried out by several departments. The harbour commissioners have done very extensive work there. The extension of the embankment around towards the river St. Charles, which will afford accommodation for some of the largest class of ocean steamships, is being done by them. They have also erected an elevator at that point. Then the Public Works Department have been doing certain very important work, and are now engaged in important work at the St. Charles river, designed to furnish a harbour for the smaller trading vessels.

Mr. COPP: I understand that the improvements on the public wharfs of the country are under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries up to $50. Take the province of New Brunswick. I think the department has only one resident engineer at St. John. Under these conditions, who reports to the department on the condition of the smaller wharfs throughout the province?

Mr. HAZEN: The wharfinger. He occupies a small position and is paid by a percentage on his collections. He is appointed by an Order in Council. The wharfinger is supposed to report either to the agent of the department in the province, or, if he thinks fit, to the department direct. It may be that wharfingers sometimes fail to do so; their remuneration is small, and there may be occasions when they neglect to report. But clearly it is the wharfinger's business. He should report either to the agent of the department at St. John, who would communicate with us, or to the resident engineer at St. John who would report to the department.

Mr. COPP: The reason I asked the question is that I had occasion during last summer to go round different places in the province, and I noticed that there were a number of small wharfs which could be repaired at very little cost for the accommodation and convenience of those who use them, but which, if not repaired, would in time involve a considerable expenditure. This is particularly so in the case of the small wharfs on the rivers. When the ice goes out in the spring it is apt to damage these small wharfs, and unless the repairs are attended to at once, a greater expenditure is rendered necessary. I would suggest that there should be some official of the department in each county whose business it would be to report to the department when repairs to these small wharfs are necessary. It would be a great saving to the department, and a great convenience to those who use the wharfs.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Lighthouse and coast service—to provide for breaking ice in Thunder Bay and Lake Superior and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation, $40,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This item is to provide for ice-breaking in Thunder bay, lake Superior and other points. Thirty thousand dollars is the amount spent for breaking ice in Thunder bay for the purpose of keeping navigation open to as late a date as possible in order that the grain vessels may get down to the harbours in the lakes below. The contract of the Canadian Towing and Wrecking Company amounts to $30,000 for three years. There is a small amount of $500 that is paid on a contract with a tug owner, to keep open the navigable channel from different points on the north shore from the date when the regular passenger boats on this route cease running in the autumn until the ice is sufficiently strong to enable horses to cross in safety. The people living on St. John island have to go to the mainland to their market, which, I think, it at Sault Ste. Marie. The only other item is one of $300 for keeping open the River Ste. Croix between St. Stephen, New Brunswick, and Calais, Maine. A similar amount of $300 is paid by the Government of the United States. In addition, we watch very carefully every fall as to the necessity of ice-breaking in the Sault river for the purpose of getting the grain down at the very last moment. This year it was not necessary in that case, but every year we find it necessary to watch it.

Mr. PARDEE: As this item is in connection with the coastal service, I desire to bring to the attention of the minister, and of the other ministers who are present in the House, a report which appears in to-night's Toronto Globe, and in regard to which, I think, it would be only fair to give an assurance to the people living along the border of the province of Ontario. The item in the Globe is headed: "Plotted against Sarnia tunnel — San Francisco indictments against German officials—Scores of charges laid." The despatch is from San Francisco, dated February 11, and it states:

A total of 61 indictments were returned here to-day by the federal grand jury in the alleged German bomb and shipping plot cases.

It gives the names of the Germans, and mentions that three hundred other individuals and firms were accused. Then it goes on to say that several of these men whose names are mentioned, have been indicted on a general charge of conspiring to set on foot a military expedition against Canada from within the borders of the United States. In view of the reports, published within the last day or two, that Germany proposes, on and after the first of March, to recommence her submarine warfare, I think the matter requires consideration. I am not in any sense desirous of being an alarmist, but it has struck me in this sense, and I think the Government should consider it, that if Germany's threat is carried out it would have the effect, perhaps, of stirring up German feeling in the States, and it would be well for the people of this country to have an assurance from the Government that everything possible is being done for the protection of our frontier I repeat that I do not in the least desire to be an alarmist, nor do I desire to raise questions which ought not to be raised at the present time. Nevertheless, one cannot help feeling, and one cannot shut his eyes to the fact that there is a grave situation as between the United States and Germany, and that in view of the number of German people in the United States and in Canada an exceedingly serious situation might arise. In these circumstances I think it would be well, if it is not asking too much of the Government at the present time, to have some assurance that all steps are being taken to safeguard the frontier.

Mr. HAZEN: I am very glad to be able to give my hon. friend the assurance that every possible precaution is being taken to see that points along the frontier, which might be referred to as strategic points, where there is a danger of damage being done, are protected. There is a secret service organized for that purpose, and every vigilance is being observed. It cannot be conceived that the United States would allow its frontier to be used as a base for attack upon Canada. Every possible precaution, I can assure my hon. friend, is being taken to prevent anything of the sort.

Mr. MARCIL: What gives colour to this thing is that one of the persons against whom proceedings are now being taken in San Francisco in connection with plots against Canada is Francis Bopp, Consular General of Germany at Montreal for many years, who was a familiar figure in days gone by there, who frequently attended the openings of Parliament here, and who was thoroughly acquainted with everything connected with Parliament and the country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I noticed in last year's Auditor General's Report that there was a certain sum of money paid to Sir Cecil Spring-Rice for ice patrols and the destruction of derelicts. I assume there is some international arrangement between Canada and the United States in regard to this work. It would be interesting to the committee to know what arrangement has been made between the two countries, and if it is in existence at the present time, or whether it was simply an arrangement for one year.

Mr. HAZEN: That amount was paid under an agreement come to at the International Convention for the Safety of Ships at Sea. My hon. friend will remember that three years ago a conference was held in London at which all the maritime nations were represented and at which the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the representative of the Canadian Government. An agreement was come to in regard to the lifeboats that should be carried, the draught of ships and different precautions for the safety of ships and of persons travelling upon them. Among other questions considered was that of the removal of derelicts. Sometimes a derelict would be found floating around the Atlantic ocean outside of territorial waters and it would not be the special business of any one to remove it. An agreement was come to by which, as regards the North Atlantic ocean, the Government of the United States would undertake the work of removing derelicts.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What proportion of the cost are we liable for?

Mr. HAZEN: There is a scale agreed upon under which each nation which uses these waters shall contribute its share. The amount we contribute is two per cent of the cost.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We are not carrying on any observations of our own with regard to icebergs and derelicts?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it was felt by the members of the convention that the best way would be to place the responsibility upon the shoulders of one of the parties to

9 p.m.

the convention and allow the others to contribute to the cost. The amount which we pay as our share, two per cent, I have always thought a very reasonable part of the cost.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Who pays the other ninety-eight per cent?

Mr. HAZEN: Great Britain pays twenty per cent of the whole, we pay two per cent, the United States twenty per cent, and France, I think, fifteen per cent. Other nations pay a share.

Mr. GRAHAM: I notice by the press that the Grand Trunk Pacific intend to operate a line of boats regularly between Prince Rupert and Alaska. I think they say that it is to be a weekly service, but I forget at what periods the service is to be performed; at all events, it is a regular service. Will that necessitate any further expense along the route between these two points on account of the extra traffic for increased lighting?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so. That coast is very well lighted. We have put in a very extensive system of lights in recent years. Three years ago I went up as far as Skagway and came down through the Alaskan territory. Large and expensive steamers have been running on that route for a great many years. I would fancy that a great deal of the route traversed by those boats lies in American waters. It may be necessary that some further lights are required in Canadian waters but at the present time I do not think that any very great expenditure would be required for that purpose.

Mr. THOMPSON: Perhaps I can enlighten my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), as I have to travel over that route while coming to this Parliament and going back home. As he will recall, Prince Rupert is just south of the Portland canal, which is the boundary line between Alaska and British Columbia. Within a few hours from the time the boats leave Prince Rupert they are in American waters, and from there to the port in Alaska, to which they run, Skagway, the coast is lighted, as far as it is lighted, by the American Government. As far as the Canadian section of the route is concerned, I fancy there will be no extra expense.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it well lighted?

Mr. THOMPSON: I tell the Americans that it is not lighted as well as our section is. I think the section we are responsible for is lighted very much better; in fact, I always feel safer when I get within range of our own lights, although it is all fairly well lighted.

Lighthouse and coast service—repairs to Maritime road, $1,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that in Gaspé county?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: The usual amount?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Could not a larger amount be voted for that road so that it might be made more permanent?

Mr. HAZEN: No, I think we are voting all we can be expected to. It was put there originally as a road for our telegraph line, an aid to navigation. The whole country is now practically settled, and if there is need for $1,000 now, there was a greater necessity for a larger amount years ago. I was down on that coast last year, on my way to Anticosti, and it seemed that, looking at it from the steamer, although I went ashore at Gaspé, the coast was remarkably well settled. There is no reason for voting any more. I doubt if there is any great necessity for this, but inasmuch as it is a help to the people there, I do not like to strike it out of the Estimates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is much needed. What my hon. friend the minister saw while looking from the ship were settlements at the mouths of the various little rivers, but some of the largest sections of the road are probably in the mountains bordering the river St. Lawrence. Originally the amount was voted for the maintenance of the telegraph line, it being a Government line.

Mr. HAZEN: This is where the telegraph line connects with Anticosti, is it not?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. I would advise my hon. friend, when he takes a jaunt down the river, to stop on the coast and see for himself in what state the road is. Several sections of the road have been repaired by the Provincial Government, but really, if a round sum, say something like $10,000, were spent, he could locate part of the road elsewhere, and then have a permanent road and stop paying this $1,000 yearly. I would be pleased to see my hon. friend on that coast, which is a very hospitable one, and perhaps if he saw the road he would change

his mind with regard to the item under discussion.

Mr. MARCIL: When the Intercolonial railway was built, the old road in the Matapedia valley was replaced, and, the valley being very narrow in certain places between the mountains and the river bank, the road was placed much higher in the hills to make way for the Intercolonial. As this road ran through many miles of unorganized territory, its upkeep became a very heavy burden on the people of the Matapedia valley, and at one time it became utterly impassable in certain sections, the bridges falling and the road giving way completely. Although I have worked hard to get material assistance, I have failed, but the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) was more fortunate, and last year and the year before he has had work done in the unorganized districts of Bonaventure and Rimouski. My hon. friend will find many unorganized localities in the Gaspé district through which this road runs, and there is a greater reason for putting it in proper condition, because it is the only way of access to the Government telegraph lines and lighthouses. It would be an economy to give a round sum, because it would cost the Government much less than $1,000 a year to have the road put into proper condition once and for all. Otherwise this appropriation of $1,000 a year may go on indefinitely. The precedent adopted by the Department of Public Works should be adopted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Amount required to pay $300 per annum to the following retired pilots: Ls. R. Demers, Théodule Lachance, Charles Brown, Jos. Lapointe, Nestor Lachance, Paul Gobeil, Barthelemi Lachance, Alphonse Asselin, Chas. Normand, Napoléon Rioux, Elzéar Desrosiers, Hubert Raymond, Arbel Bernier, Laurent Godbout, Adelme Pouliot, Edmond Larochelle, L. E. Morin, A. T. Simard, Jos. Plante, Victor Vézina, J. G. Dupil, Raymond Baquet, Alfred Larochelle, $6,900.

Mr. HAZEN: This item is $300 less than it was last year, because one of the pilots has died.

Mr. GRAHAM: Were these pilots retired in the natural way, or were they asked to retire?

Mr. HAZEN: The arrangement is a very old one. The hon. gentlemen will recall that a good many years ago The Canada Shipping Act fixed the number of pilots at Quebec as not exceeding 125. It was felt by all the maritime interests at Quebec that it was not in the interest of the shipping of the port that there should be so many pilots. An arrangement was come to, therefore, I think early in 1903 or 1904, by which these men were to retire at a certain age until the number got down to seventy-five, and on retirement they were to receive a pension of $600, of which $300 was to be paid out of the pilot fund and $300 by Parliament. This arrangement, which was made by the Administration of which my hon. friend was a member, was made undoubtedly in the belief that it was in the interest of the shipping of the St. Lawrence ports. We are simply carrying out that arrangement.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it intended that this arrangement shall be extended to other parts of Canada?

Mr. HAZEN: The arrangement was made at the time with regard only to the river St. Lawrence and the Quebec pilots. There are two sets of pilots, one at Quebec and one at Montreal.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why should we pension the Quebec pilots and not the pilots at Halifax, St. John, Canso, and other ports in Canada?

Mr. HAZEN: The time to have fought out that question was when this arrangement was come to and confirmed by Parliament, which was some years before I became Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there an Act of Parliament authorizing the payment of these pensions? Does this mean that the pilots are permanent pensioners on the revenues of Canada for all time to come?

Mr. HAZEN: During their lifetime.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this confined to the river St. Lawrence and only to a certain number of pilots on that river?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. I will read the information I have on the subject, but substantially my hon. friend has stated the case:

In connection with the Government allowance to supplement pension of certain Quebec pilots, it may be said:

Section 443 of the Canada Shipping Act fixes the number of Quebec pilots at not exceeding 125.

Section 434 declares that the existing rate of pilotage shall not be altered unless the net income of each member of the Quebec Pilots' Corporation acting and practising as a pilot has been less than $600 on an average for three consecutive years immediately preceding, in which case it shall be the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to submit to the Governor in Council for approval a by-law estab-

lishing such increased rates of pilotage as are deemed necessary to secure the pilots an annual income of not less than $600.

On the 20th of July, 1905, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries replaced the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec as the pilotage authority for the pilotage district of Quebec (4-5 Edward VII, chapter 34, section 2). At that date there were 118 pilots on the list.

The shipping interests in Quebec among others wrote the department in 1904 complaining of the excessive number of licensed pilots. They said, "If the present large number of Quebec pilots is retained the pilotage rates will have to be increased so as to give each member of the corporation a stipend of $600 per season as provided by law. This will add considerable additional expense to the St. Lawrence route, which is already too expensive."

It was deemed advisable by the department to forestall any such demand for increased pilotage rates. Steps were therefore taken to reduce the number of pilots to a maximum of 75 and a minimum of 70, which was generally agreed would be sufficient for the service. To bring about this, it was necessary to make some provision for the pension of the pilots to be retired. The pilots' fund was only paying some $215 by way of pension at that time. The Pilots' Corporation agreed to bring their contribution up to $300 a year for the pensions of those pilots who would be compulsorily retired under the arrangement to reduce the number of licensed pilots to 70, provided the department contributed a like amount. This would make a payment of $600 a year to those pilots, which was the minimum rate of average earnings under section 434 of the Canada Shipping Act.

In a memorandum made by Commander Spain about the end of March, 1906, it is stated that the Government contribution of $300 a year to each Quebec pilot on retirement would continue until the number was reduced to 75.

An Order in Council was passed on the 5th of December, 1906, authorizing the payment by Government of a grant of $300 per annum as pension to all Quebec pilots on reaching the age limit of 65 years, and a similar pension to those under that age if retired on ground of physical incapacity. There is no mention of the fact that this arrangement is to apply only until the number of pilots is reduced to 75.

The contention of the pilots is supported by the correspondence which they have, and by the fact that the agreement come to was that future pilots who were pensioned would receive $300 from the Government even when the number fell below seventy. The number of pilots now in active service is between seventy and seventy-five.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who has control of the appointments of these pilots, so that they may not increase in number indefinitely?

Mr. HAZEN: The pilots licenses are issued to-day by our department. We have an official in charge. This is in compliance with the recommendation made by the Pilotage Commission, and so far as I can find out, the conditions, which formerly were not satisfactory, are infinitely more satisfactory now. The number of pilots will not be allowed to increase unless the shipping of the country increases tremendously, far more than is expected. It is a matter of history in the department, and I am giving the facts as they are given to me. According to that statement of facts, the Government of the day came to the conclusion—I will not say unfairly or unwisely—that the only way to get the number of pilots down was to supplement by $300 a year the pension the pilots received from the Pension Fund.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It must strike everybody that this matter is not yet settled, because it is not satisfactorily settled. There can be no reason why the Quebec pilots should receive pensions from the public treasury and the pilots in other parts of Canada should not. That goes without saying. There are other matters connected with the pilotage on the river St. Lawrence that operate injuriously to the trade of that river and of the country. For example, a ship coming up the St. Lawrence must employ two pilots, one from the gulf to the city of Quebec, and the other from Quebec to Montreal. Those who are engaged in trade on this route tell me that it would be much better to have the same pilot take the ship from its entrance into the river right up to the city of Montreal. Shipping people tell me that one of the great difficulties is to keep away from the pilot or to get rid of him. Many of these ships have their own pilots. But pilotage is compulsory, and it is doubtless a great injury to the trade that vessels are compelled to employ two pilots when they do not need one. For instance, there are about twenty boats employed by the Dominion Coal Company in carrying coal from Sydney to Montreal. The captains of these boats know the river as well as the pilots do, and so they do not need the pilots. Yet they have to pay the pilotage just the same. We are spending millions of money dredging, equipping and lighting the St. Lawrence channel, in order to attract trade, but questions such as this pilotage question must do much to injure trade. The matter requires the attention of the Government. I suggest that it be taken up by the minister in an active, energetic way and that all these matters be settled and these pilots brought to reason. If it is necessary to have compulsory pilotage, let us have it. But I question very much that

it is necessary. I think it is an old system that grew up long ago when pilots were scarce. But if, now, pilots are tumbling over one another, and we have to send them home and pay them to stay at home, surely there are enough to carry on the business without making pilotage compulsory. No doubt, if the business is opened to competition, there are excellent men who would look after the business and would carry it on better than it is being carried on at the present time. I hope the minister will take this matter up, as it is a real grievance.

Mr. HAZEN: The matter has been taken up and taken up very seriously, and great reforms have been made. We appointed a commission made up of a representative of the Shipping Federation of Canada, and representatives of other shipping interests. The commission went into the matter with the greatest possible care. As a result of its inquiry, the commission made recommendations, and every one of those recommendations has been carried into effect. In consequence of this, I understand, pilotage on the St. Lawrence is in a condition more satisfactory to the shipping interests and to all others affected by this business than it has ever been before. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) raises the question of the necessity of compulsory pilotage. That question has been discussed in practically every part of the world. You can find the greatest divergence among shipping people on this subject. The question is raised why the vessel that does not take a pilot should be required to pay pilotage dues. Well, the argument that has prevailed practically everywhere is this. It is absolutely necessary, for the safety of shipping, to have an efficient corps of pilots. With the great commerce on the river St. Lawrence, and in view of the character of the navigation from the Gulf to Quebec and from Quebec to Montreal, practically through a channel which, though lighted, requires local knowledge to understand the lights, I do not see how any one can argue that you could get along without an efficient corps of pilots. Very well, how are you going to maintain them? There are some captains who would take the risk and pilot their own vessels. But if you allow these captains who have local knowledge to pilot themselves and not pay towards the pilotage fund, the earnings of pilots will be reduced, and so you will not be able to maintain a corps of trained, intelligent, efficient men to act as pilots. As a result, you will have disasters to the ships coming into the port. That is the argument that has appealed to the shipping people in most places.

My hon. friend condemns the system on the St. Lawrence in another respect. He says that there should not be one pilotage district from Montreal to Quebec and another from Quebec to the sea. I do not think he will get the owners of the large liners that run to Montreal to agree with him, the men to whom—as they have large sums of money invested—it is of the utmost importance to have efficient pilots. The distance from Father Point, where the pilot is usually taken on, to Montreal is 350 miles. A pilot on a boat travelling at a rate of fifteen miles an hour would have to be at his post about twenty-three hours in bringing the vessel from Father point to Montreal. No pilot could stand on the bridge of a ship and direct its movements for twenty-three hours; he would probably sleep at his post and endanger the safety of the vessel. My hon. friend will find it to be the general opinion of those who have large sums of money invested in the liners which pass between Quebec and Montreal that it is necessary to have two pilots in order to bring the vessel from Father Point to Montreal. This route will be much easier of navigation when the work which is now being carried on is finished. I do not say that it is very dangerous, but in thick weather great care must be taken in guiding the ship through the Traverse and the ranges of lights along that route. The pilot who brings a vessel from Father point to Montreal must be constantly on the alert. The route from Quebec to Montreal is practically a lane running in different directions and full of sharp curves; after bringing a vessel from Father point to Quebec, the pilot would not be in physical condition immediately to take that vessel from Quebec to Montreal. Considering the fact that the navigation between Quebec and Montreal is as I have described, one would think that accidents along that route would be numerous; but it is a curious fact that that route has been practically free from accidents while accidents happen when there is plenty of sea room on either side, due, I suppose, to some error in judgment. I can assure the hon. member for Guysborough that when I came to the department this matter was discussed from every standpoint; a commission was appointed representing the different interests concerned, and improved

conditions have resulted, practically no complaint now being made by the shipping interests. No doubt some captains could guide their own vessels with safety, and it may be a little hardship on them to pay pilotage; but that is a condition of affairs that occurs almost everywhere. Besides, the time may come when those men, under circumstances of bad weather, may be glad to get a pilot to bring them safely into port. Under any system, I care not what it may be, there is generally something objectionable to some one. On the whole, however, I think this system is working splendidly. The pilots are under the direction of a superintendent directly responsible to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the system has given more general satisfaction and is attended with less risk and fewer accidents than has been the case for many years past.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend has given every possible argument which could be advanced by the pilots, but he has not dealt with the interests of the shippers. I assure my hon. friend that there is no such system as this in any of the great ports of Europe. There is no compulsory pilotage in the port of New York, which is the destination of many more ships than pass up the river St. Lawrence.

Mr. HAZEN: The conditions there are very different.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Compulsory pilotage is justifiable only when there is a scarcity of pilots; when you cannot find men who will devote themselves to the business of piloting ships, and who will be always on hand when ships arrive. The real origin of compulsory pilotage was the lack of men who were willing to take the responsibility of waiting for the vessels as they came in, the result being that in many cases vessels were unable to obtain pilots when they wanted them. But in the river St. Lawrence, where large numbers of men are competing for the pilotage business, there is not the slightest need for any system of compulsory pilotage. The system exists only for the purpose of creating revenue for the pilots; if they did not have political influence and the control of three or four hundred votes no such system would exist in Canada to-day. This system has been established and maintained in the river St. Lawrence through the political influence of the pilots; I am not saying that one party is more to blame than the other, but we all know that this is a fact. We may assume that every ship travelling on the St. Lawrence and arriving at the port of Montreal is insured.

Mr. HAZEN: The insurance rates would go up very considerably if no pilots were available there.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In cases where the insurance companies provide that if the vessel goes ashore or any accident happens, the insurance shall not be paid, the owners will take good care to get a pilot. Under the present system of wireless telegraphy, it is the easiest thing in the world for the captain of a vessel approaching the coast to arrange for his pilot to meet him at a certain point. The agent of the owner at Montreal or Quebec can get in touch with a responsible pilot and arrange that the pilot shall meet the vessel at Father Point or wherever he may be required. That is the way it is done in New York, Liverpool and London; why should it not be done that way on the river St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: How does the approach by water to the city of New York compare with the approach to the city of Montreal?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am aware that there is a difference, but that is no reason why the ship owner should not be allowed to employ his own pilot. He will find his pilot just as he finds every other man whom he wants in his service; it is quite unnecessary for the public to find a pilot for him or to compel him to take a pilot if he does not want one. If he is a competent captain and can take the ship to port himself, he may not need a pilot; if he does need one, he gets the man he wants. That is the business way of doing this thing, and when the Dominion of Canada gets a little older, that is the way it will be done. It would be a credit to the port of Montreal and it would make trade cheaper and more satisfactory in every way if this most intolerable system were discontinued and the people allowed to do their own business and employ their own pilots.

Mr. COPP: Have the pilots in my hon. friend's constituency made request for a provision similar to that which applies to the Quebec pilots? I fear for my hon. friend, and somewhat for myself as well—that if this discussion comes before the pilots of the Maritime Provinces, we shall hear something about it in the future.

Mr. HAZEN: We have had this discussion year after year.

Mr. COPP: When the pilots of the Maritime Provinces read this discussion, they may desire to obtain the same provision for themselves. I would think that the provisions which apply to the pilots in Quebec should apply also to pilots in other parts of the Dominion. How long have these men to be in the business before they become licensed pilots?

Mr. HAZEN: The Quebec pilots are practically born and brought up in the service. They enter as apprentices, serve a certain length of time on river vessels, and a certain length of time on deep sea vessels. They usually start as boys; they can not become pilots after they are 30 years of age.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I should not allow to go unanswered the references to the pilots which have just been made by the hon. member for Guysborough. The hon. gentleman is greatly mistaken when he proclaims in this House and for the information of the country at large, that our pilots are of no use. My whole life was spent on the shores of the St. Lawrence. Every year shipwrecks have occurred, and that very often when the ships were under the guidance of very capable pilots, who had made the trip, practically two or three times a month. Nevertheless shipwrecks will happen. And of course, if ships of the large size of those which are at present doing the service between the old country and Canada, were left under the sole guidance of the captain, you may be sure that accidents would be not only as numerous, but would increase three-fold and four-fold.

Possibly the hon. gentleman never ascended the St. Lawrence in a ship, otherwise he would have noticed the numerous breakers which the pilots have to avoid before getting to port.

I hope the views expressed by the hon. gentleman in regard to the usefulness of pilots will not prevail.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could the minister give us any information as to the comparative rates of insurance on the Canadian and American routes?

Mr. HAZEN: That subject is dealt with by the Department of Trade and Commerce. Of course, the comparison is slightly against the St. Lawrence route, as the insurance companies regard it as an extra hazard when a vessel has to enter a river. Representations are being constantly made by the shipping men to the Government on the subject, and, as a matter of fact, there has been a very great lowering of the St. Lawrence rates owing to the increased safety of that route on account of the improved aids to navigation. But the insurance rates are not yet as low as the New York rates.

Mr. ROGERS: The difference is about sixpence a quarter.

Telephones in connection with aids to navigation, $5,000.

Mr. HAZEN: I would move that that item be reduced to $500. It has been inserted in the Estimates year after year at $5,000, but I do not know why. For the year 1914-15 we spent under it $8.50, and up to the 31st of December this year $1.50.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

New Vessel to replace the Maisonneuve, $2,500.

Mr. HAZEN: This vessel has been out of commission for the past three years. She was condemned as absolutely unfit for service, and we have sold her at about the price she would bring for junk. We were given this vote last year, but in consequence of conditions connected with the war we have been trying to make expenses as light as possible, and so we chartered the Maggie May, which did the lighthouse work on the Ottawa river during the last year.

Allowance to harbour master at Amherstburg for supervision of lights and buoys on St. Clair river, the Detroit river, and lake Erie, $400.

Mr. PARDEE: What lights does he take care of?

Mr. HAZEN: We have no agency in that district, and this official brings in the buoys in the fall and puts them out in the spring. The buoys are, of course, very valuable, and must be taken in before the ice comes, and we have found this to be the most economical way of dealing with them.

Repairing C. G. S. Montmagny, $70,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This vessel was sunk in collision. We advertised for tenders for raising her, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, the Levis Wrecking Company, at $27,977. The contractors have to raise the boat and deliver it at the wharf at Levis. Then it will cost $70,000 to put the vessel in proper condition for service. The vessel was built in Sorel and cost

$275,000, so that it is well worth while spending this $70,000, as she will then be in as good condition as a new vessel.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the repairs be made in the Government shipyard?

Mr. HAZEN: We have not decided that yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If not, I presume public tenders will be called for.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, if the work is of such a character that a specification on which to call for tenders can be made by the engineer.

Mr. MARCIL: She was sunk at the Isle d'Orleans?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Were any lives lost?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, a number.

Mr. MARCIL: Were claims made by the dependents of those lost?

Mr. HAZEN: An inquiry was conducted by Captain Demers, whose report was a severe arraignment of the officers of the boat. One man who lost his life in the wreck was reported to have acted like a hero, and we made provision for his family.

Marine hospitals, including grants to institutions assisting sailors, $75,000.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: What does that include?

Mr. HAZEN: This is for the Marine Hospital service. It is difficult to determine from year to year the amount required to cover the expenditure for this service. It is necessary to vote a sum which frequently is in excess of the amount required. In 1914-15 we spent $65,477, and up to the 31st December, this year, we had spent $48,008. It is expected that the amount asked for will be more than enough to cover the expenditure during the coming year unless something unforeseen happens.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many institutions are there?

Mr. HAZEN: There used to be one in almost every shipping port, but they have been nearly all abolished. A marine hospital is not maintained at any port or in any city where there is a public hospital. There are only four marine hospitals in existence at the present time. The system which prevails is that, in a city where there is a public hospital, we have an arrangement by which the hospital authorities take care of the sick sailors at so much per day. We pay $1.50 per day at the present time, and it costs the country very much less than under the old system, while the sailors really get better attention than formerly.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: This amount includes, I understand, the amounts paid to doctors who attend sick seamen outside of the hospitals. There are certain ports where there are no hospitals, and it is a unique condition—at least I regard it as such—that a seaman going from one port to another in the same province does not get the benefit of the sick mariners' fund. If a seaman, for instance, should leave the province of Nova Scotia and go to the Magdalen islands, a distance of 20 or 25 miles, he is entitled to benefit under that fund; but, if he leaves any port of the province and goes to another port in the province, he does not get the benefit. I would like to know from the minister the reason for that.

Mr. HAZEN: No sick seamen's dues are collected from vessels that go from one port in the province to another port in the same province. If a vessel goes from one port in a province to another port in another province, the vessel pays the dues. I suppose the reason why the benefit of the fund does not apply to vessels going from one port in a province to another port in the same province is that it was thought they would be near their homes, and that therefore it would be unfair to collect dues from them.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: The mariners themselves do not regard it as an advantage not to pay the dues. They regard it as a privilege to pay them. It is an extraordinary condition of things that a seaman leaving, we will say, a port in the province of Nova Scotia and perhaps going 300 or 400 miles away from home, does not get the benefit of the fund, whereas if he just crosses the straits, or to a neighbouring province, he does get the benefit. The seamen are anxious to have the privilege of paying their dues. The fee is a small one, according to tonnage, I think, but it gives the sailors a very great privilege. This is not the first time I have brought the matter to the attention of the minister; in fact, I brought it to the attention of the late Government, and to the attention of the minister last year. I would like to see some regulation by which if this benefit is to obtain at all, it would be neces-

sary for the mariner to go outside of his province to get it.

Mr. PARDEE: Do these grants apply to sailors on inland waters?

Mr. HAZEN: No, the dues are paid only by sailors of salt water ships.

Mr. COPP: Suppose a doctor should report that a seaman is being attended to, and the ship should go away without his being paid, is the Government responsible for the payment.

Mr. HAZEN: It is up to the Marine Department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the condition of this fund at the present time?

Mr. HAZEN: The receipts from the fund are larger than the expenditure. In 1914 the receipts were $72,602.43, and the expenditures $65,397.85.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Can the minister tell us what the total surpluses have been since the introduction of the fund.

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot tell that, but I have the receipts and expenditures since 1904. In 1904 the receipts were $61,000 and the expenditure $50,000; in 1911 the receipts were $67,000 and the expenditure $54,779; and in 1913, the receipts were $70,000 and the expenditures $54,000. There must be a considerable sum to the credit of the fund.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like to inform the minister that his officers are very strict in the administration of this fund. If they were as careful in regard to other matters connected with the Government as they are with regard to this fund, we would not have such big deficits. I am constantly receiving complaints from sailors who have been treated in the most technical way by officers of the department in connection with the administration of this fund. There ought to be some compassionate allowance, if no other. Let me give the minister one case. A sailor, by the name of Captain Angus Macdonald became ill on the coast of Cape Breton while navigating his ship and he was sent to the hospital in North Sydney. His family who live in my county were very anxious about him, and before he was altogether fit to be removed, he was taken out of the hospital by his family who were anxious to get him home.

Mr. HAZEN: Against the advice of the hospital authorities?

Mr. SINCLAIR: He became so ill that he was unable to complete the journey home, and he was put in a boarding house.

Mr. HAZEN: I know all about it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I want to make my case first.

Mr. HAZEN: It is unnecessary to make your case, because we have paid the amount. It was before me this morning for the first time, and I decided that it was a fair and proper thing that the bills should be paid.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am very glad to hear that. But your officers rejected that claim, and this widow had to go without her money for many months, to consult lawyers and get them to write affidavits and make statements in order to have her claim settled. That should not be the case. When legitimate claims of this kind come before you, although you may not be technically liable, they should be paid. This widow should not have been put to all the annoyance and trouble that she was put to.

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend argued the matter much longer I would be almost afraid that I had made a mistake in ordering these bills paid. I am not disposed to find fault with my officials for what they did. The matter was brought to my attention for the first time this morning, and I thought I was leaning to the side of generosity in doing what I did. This man was in hospital, he was being treated there, he left the hospital contrary to the advice of those who were responsible for him, when he was not in a condition of health to go. He went away to another town and took ill there, and a doctor and nurse were called in. Under these circumstances, if they were dealing with it as a matter of absolutely strict justice, I would not be disposed to say that our officials were wrong. It is the business of the officials of the department to deal with things from the correct, legal standpoint, and in the interests of the treasury. The minister feels that he has a good deal more liberty than his officials, and, after weighing the whole case, I thought it was safer to err on the side of generosity rather than be too strict. So this morning, after going over the case with the official who has charge of that work and the deputy minister, I gave directions that these bills should be paid.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Is the minister disposed to remove that difficulty that I have referred to?

Mr. HAZEN: Does my hon. friend think that the men who are interested as owners of vessels in his part of Nova Scotia would prefer to have the advantages of this Act on condition that they pay to the fund just as others do if they are travelling from port to port in their own province?

Mr. CHISHOLM: That is my opinion. I took the trouble to get the opinions of those people that I happened to meet, and I am disposed to think that they are very anxious to have that right. It would save them a good deal of trouble. It is a great encouragement for the men who go aboard a ship to know that they are protected in respect to this matter. I know that sailors prefer to go on a vessel that is plying from one province to another rather than a vessel plying between ports of the same province. A man may become ill, and he knows that when he falls into the hands of a medical man he will be well looked after. I would like to see that disability removed for the benefit of mariners.

Mr. HAZEN: That is an old provision of the Act. I have been intending to bring the amendments to the Canada
10 p.m. Shipping Act, which I had prepared a couple of years ago, before Parliament, but last year it was not thought desirable that there should be any more legislation than could possibly be avoided, except legislation in connection with the war, and the position seems to be the same this year. I will give what consideration I can to it, and endeavour to ascertain what the reasons were at the time of the passage of the Bill for the enactment of this provision. If I feel that it imposes any undue hardship upon the shipping interests I shall feel disposed to favour a change.

Mr. GAUVREAU: A petition was presented to the department by the lighthouse keepers asking for the establishment of a retiring fund. Has the minister any project in his mind looking to the granting of the prayer of this petition? Has he any scheme of his own for the establishment of a retiring fund for lighthouse keepers?

Mr. HAZEN: There was a superannuation existing for civil servants, which Parliament repealed a few years ago. Those who enter the service now, with a few exceptions, such as the judges, have no superannuation secured to them, and it is a little difficult to see why, that being the case, lighthouse keepers should be placed upon a different plane from other employees of the Government, and those engaged in other pursuits, for instance, engineers and conductors upon the railways. It may be that lighthouse keepers can make some arrangement amongst themselves, as the railway men do. I do not see how this Government, in view of the position that Parliament took in repealing the superannuation system, could inaugurate a system for the lighthouse keepers alone.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Was that the answer given to the lighthouse keepers when their petition was presented? They want to know if you are going to allow them a retiring fund.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not remember what the correspondence was. I will look it up tomorrow. If they want to form a fund the officers of my department will give them all the assistance and advice they can.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Will there be any assistance from the Government if they undertake to establish a fund for themselves? Will the Government be prepared to give them a sum of money with which to start their retiring, or pension, fund?

Mr. HAZEN: I am not prepared to say that at present. There are difficulties in the way. You are treating one class differently from another. If we are to have any system of retiring allowances, or Government assistance, it should be made to apply pretty generally to all classes of employees.

Mr. MARCIL: They have such a system on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. HAZEN: Do the Government give any assistance?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government give a certain amount, just as the railway companies give a certain amount to their employees.

Mr. HAZEN: Something might be done on that line.

Mr. GAUVREAU: So that we can understand that there is hope that they will have some relief from the Government?

Mr. HAZEN: We shall be very glad to look into the matter.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 10.08 p.m.

Monday, February 14, 1916.

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

REPORT.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended 31st March, 1915; volume IV.

EXTENSION OF THE TERM OF PARLIAMENT.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House hath agreed to their Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, respectfully requesting that His Royal Highness will be pleased to transmit the joint Address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, most humbly praying that he may graciously be pleased to give his consent to submitting a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend certain provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867" by filling up the blank therein with the word "Commons."

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker respecting the appointment of Mr. C. W. Boyce as Clerk of Votes and Proceedings be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) inquired as to the possibility that a subscription to the Government loan might come within the provisions of the Independence of Parliament Act. I have had that matter looked into, and have received the following memorandum on the subject:

Section 19 (c) of the Senate and House of Commons Act (Revised Statutes, chapter 10), in dealing with the independence of Parliament, enacts as follows:

19. This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons by reason of his being...

(c) a contractor for the loan of money or of securities for the payment of money to the Government of Canada under the authority of Parliament, after public competition, or respecting the purchase or payment of the public stock or debentures of Canada, on terms common to all persons.

DAMAGE TO PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Inquiry was made a few days ago as to the damage to the Library. I asked for a report from the Joint Librarians, and the report reached me to-day. I think it desirable to read it for the information of members:

Library of Parliament,
Ottawa, February 14, 1916.

Sir,—In response to your request for a report on the condition of the Library and the losses sustained by the fire of Thursday night, February 3, we have the honour to report as follows:

Some exaggeration prevails as to the extent of the loss sustained. During the night of the fire, in accordance with instructions from the chief of the fire brigade, a large number of volumes were removed by the library staff, and by the troops kindly and promptly offered by Colonel Street, of the 77th.

These were stored in various places and the volumes that had to be left partly in the open were protected by the men of the Public Works Department as well as was possible.

Later in the night the removal was countermanded by chief of the fire brigade. The last load of these books so removed was returned on Thursday, February 10. There has therefore not been time to re-arrange the books and ascertain the loss in removal and the damage by water.

Our actual total loss by fire is certainly large, but is confined to books in the reading room and gallery above, as follows:

1st. An extensive collection of rare editions of the Bible.
2nd. A very large collection of English pamphlets.
3rd. A still larger collection of reviews magazines and periodicals of various kinds: Quarterly, monthly and weekly, both French and English.
4th. A valuable collection of ecclesiastical literature and law covering more than a century.
5th. Some valuable scientific encyclopedias and dictionaries in the French language.
6th. A great number of valuable donations from the Imperial Government such as the Rolls series, etc.
7th. A fine collection of the reports of the American Bar Association obtained at considerable cost not long ago.

In the course of time, and when space can be available again, the Librarians consider that the most of these losses can be repaired, through the usual library agencies, without departing from the customary routine of business, and without making undue, if any, demands on the Treasury.

Especial attention is directed to the little damage done by water. Though many millions of gallons of water covered the floor and poured out through the doors from Thursday

night to Sunday afternoon, hardly any found its way to the basement, a testimony to the honest work done by the contractors in 1876, when the Library was constructed.

Those volumes that were at all damaged by water have been placed in a position to be dried; and little fear is felt that many will be destroyed. Some rich volumes of illustrated works of the 18th century may be soiled, but at present we know of none that will be ruined.

If exaggeration prevails as to our losses, no praise can be exaggerated in being bestowed on the work of the Library staff on the occasion of the fire.

Mr. Hamlyn Todd, whose name is traditionally associated with the Library, was fortunately able to force his way through the cordon of military and police, and got access to the Library by the side door, in time to exhibit his usual energetic disposition and capacity in raising the lower tiers of books from the water and in directing the operations of the removal of the books by the military and messengers.

Mr. MacCormac, who was present at the outbreak of the fire, promptly had the iron doors leading into the corridor closed against the on-rush of smoke and flame. He was probably instrumental in saving the lives of some members who were in the Library by refusing to open the doors and by sending them safely through the side door, usually kept locked and bolted since the police took charge of the buildings.

Two others of the staff, Messrs. Meiklejohn and Argue, who were present rendered most valuable and intelligent service on the occasion; and since the fire and after access was had to the Library, all the staff have been most industriously and intelligently engaged in restoring order.

The clerks in charge on the occasion personally desire that credit should be given to the firemen, to the soldiers of the 77th and to the police for the effective assistance volunteered and rendered.

The librarians are requested by Mr. Todd to particularly thank Mr. Controller Fisher and Mr. Harry Stewart who were at once able and willing to render service on the occasion.

At such a time of terror and confusion, it is gratifying to report that all who were present on the occasion, or who were able to obtain access to the Library were able to be of service in an unaccustomed and nerve-racking emergency.

Some complaint was felt and made concerning the strictness of the cordon which was kept about the Library preventing the access of those who might have been of some use. But on reflection, the librarians are bound to say that the soldiers and the police could not have been expected to discriminate among persons they did not know, and that in carrying out their orders to the best of their knowledge, they were but doing an obvious duty.

We have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servants,
A. D. DeCelles,
General Librarian.
Martin J. Griffin,
Parliamentrry Librarian.

To the Honourable the Prime Minister.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

DISTURBANCES AT CALGARY AND CAMPBELLTON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the right hon. Prime Minister any information to give the House respecting the riots which are reported to have occurred at Calgary?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that any report has been received in the matter; I will consult the Minister of Militia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I shall repeat the inquiry to-morrow.

Mr. MARCIL: May I ask the Prime Minister if the Government has taken any measures concerning the control of enlisted men in places where liquor runs freely? In Campbellton last pay-day no less than twenty or twenty-five enlisted men were put under guard; the conditions would seem to be somewhat similar to those at Calgary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not aware that the disorders in Calgary were due to the use of liquor, although it may be so. My attention has not been directed to the alleged disturbance at Campbellton; I shall ask the Minister of Militia to make a statement with regard to both matters.

WAR TAX ON LAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. TURRIFF: It is stated in the press that the Minister of the Interior told an audience of immigration agents in Chicago the other day, that "there are no war taxes on Canadian land and never will be." I wish to ask the minister if he made that statement and if he did, is that the policy of the Government?

Mr. ROCHE: There were no press reporters at our meeting. No statement of that kind emanated from my lips.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 27, respecting The Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 29, respecting certain patents of The Pedlar People Limited.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 30, to incorporate Seaport Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 32, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

THE VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. What amount of money has been paid by the Intercolonial railway or the Government of Canada to the government of New Brunswick as their proportion of the earnings of the Valley railway, so-called, down to December 31 last?

2. Has the province of New Brunswick received 40 per cent of the gross earnings of said railway since the beginning of its operation? If not, what percentage of said earnings has the province received?

3. Was an agreement signed between the two governments around the first of January, 1915, or shortly thereafter, for the operation of the said railway on what is known as the 40 per cent basis?

4. Has a new agreement been entered into between the two governments within the last month or six weeks as to the operation of the said road and the distribution of the earnings thereof?

5. Under said new agreement what proportion of the gross earnings are payable to the province of New Brunswick?

6. Did the Department of Railways and Canals in the month of December last order the cessation of the operation of the said road to take effect on the 1st day of January instant?

7. If so, what were the reasons for such order?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. None, but there is due to the province of New Brunswick, under the arrangement whereby the province was to receive 40 per cent of the gross receipts, $18,733.65, accruing during the nine months ended December 31.

2. No. From the commencement of operation, January 1, 1915, until March 31, 1915, the arrangement was, that the provinces and the Dominion should each bear one-half of the deficit, if any. Under this arrangement, the province owes the Dominion $2,977.51.

3. There was no formal agreement.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Ordered cessation of the temporary arrangement which led to negotiations which resulted in the order to continue operation after January 1, 1916, on terms to be arranged.

7. The non-completion of the road.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CAR PURCHASES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Is it the intention of the Railway Department to purchase any more cars for the Intercolonial railway during the present year?

Mr COCHRANE: The matter is under consideration.

WAR SUPPLIES—SHELLS.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Has any contract been made with the Invincible Steel and Iron Products for the manufacture of shells? If so, how many, and what is the contract price, and what is the amount?

2. What contracts, if any, have been made with any other companies or persons for the manufacture of said shells, and at what price?

3. Was the tender of the Invincible Steel and Iron Products the lowest tender?

4. What other tenders were there?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government has not made any contract with the Invincible Steel and Iron Products. If my hon. friend refers to a contract made by the Shell Committee or the Imperial Munitions Board, application should be made to them for the information.

Mr. MACDONALD: How is that information to be obtained?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By application to the board.

Mr. MACDONALD: Verbally or in writing?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In whatever way my hon. friend would think suitable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Through the Government?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, not at all.

Mr. PARDEE: Would it be to Mr. Flavelle?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Flavelle is chairman of the board.

WHITEHEAD COLD STORAGE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was any expenditure made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Department of Agriculture, or by any other department of the Government since October, 1911, to assist cold storage at Whitehead, Guysborough county, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, how much was the expenditure, and to whom was the money paid?

3. If there is a cold storage plant at said Whitehead, which has been assisted by the Government, on whose property is it situated, and in whose name does the title thereto stand?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Yes. At Whitehaven.

2. $1,477.89. To J. S. Wells, Ltd.

3. J. S. Wells, Limited.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY PENSIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to establish a fund by which

old and incapacitated employees of Government railways, who do not come under the Provident Fund, can be provided for?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

COLE HARBOUR WHARF.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the Department of Public Works taken any steps towards the expenditure of the $8,300 that was voted six years ago, and revoted every session since, for the purpose of constructing a public wharf at Cole Harbour, Guysborough county, N.E.?

2. If not, when does the Government intend to go forward with his work?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Nothing more than to acquire the necessary land.

2. Like many others, the construction of this wharf is held in abeyance, for the present, as it is deemed advisable to restrict expenditures to such works only as are absolutely necessary or under contract, therefore it is impossible to state when this work will be constructed.

IMPORTS OF NECKLACES.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Has the Government collected any duty on diamond or pearl necklaces, or jewellery of that description, brought into Canada from England or elsewhere, within the last six months?

2. If so, what amount of duty has been collected, at what port or ports were the entries made, and what are the dates of entry?

3. By whom were the importations made, and what is their estimated value?

Mr. REID: Diamond or pearl necklaces are not separately enumerated in the Customs statistical records, but are included under the item, "Jewellery, not otherwise provided for," and the total duty collected under the latter heading during the six months ended January 31, 1916, amounted to $175,820.13. It is impracticable to give the information asked for as a reply to an inquiry. It is not usual to give information as to the value of individual importations at the Custom House.

TELEGRAPH POLES, VICTORIA, N.S.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Did the department purchase new telegraph poles for that section of the line between Ingonish Ferry and Meat Cove, county of Victoria, Nova Scotia?

2. When were the poles delivered, and at what price?

3. What were the dimensions called for in those poles?

4. Were they subject to inspection?

5. By whom were they inspected?

6. Were they all accepted?

7. How many were rejected, and for what reason?

8. Were tenders called for in respect to the supplying of those poles? If not, how were the contracts awarded, and to whom?

9. Who had the giving out of the contracts?

10. Is A. B. Macdonald still the inspector of Telegraph Lines in the Island of Cape Breton? If not, why was he removed and who was appointed in his place, and at what salary?

11. What salary was paid to A. B. Macdonald as Inspector of Telegraph Lines?

12. When were the telegraph poles above mentioned delivered on the ground?

13. Have the said poles been erected? If not, when are they to be put in place?

14. Was there a report made to the Department of Public Works on the conditions of the poles from Ingonish Ferry to Meat Cove before the purchase of the new poles?

15. By whom was the said report made and where, and was it in writing?

16. Was the purchase of the said poles ordered by the minister? If so, when?

Mr. ROGERS: 1. Yes.

2. Delivery of poles on ground completed as follows: John E. McLeod, March 17, 1915; Rev. R. Rankin, April 12, 1915; Jos. R. McNeil, May 1, 1915; Duncan H. McDonald, May 24, 1915. Spruce 90 cents each, fir, 85 cents each.

3. Minimum 23 feet long, 5 inches diameter at small end.

4. Yes.

5. By C. P. Livingstone, Superintendent of Construction.

6. No.

7. Fifty-five of the total delivered, not being according to specification, were rejected and replaced by others of the proper size and quality.

8. Several persons between Meat Cove and Ingonish Ferry were invited to submit offers to supply the poles, and those of John E. McLeod, Rev. R. Rankin, Joseph R. McNeil and Duncan H. MacDonald were accepted.

9. The General Superintendent of Telegraphs at Ottawa.

10. Yes.

11. $1,800 per annum.

12. Answered by No. 2.

13. Some have been erected; the balance will be put in place when the state of the ground will permit of the work being carried on.

14. Yes.

15. Report made in writing by D. C. Dawson, superintendent at St. John, N.B.

16. Yes, on February 15, 1915.

MEAT COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. What steps have been taken towards building the breakwater or front protection at Meat Cove, county of Victoria?

2. (a) Was the timber for that work purchased? (b) If so, who had charge of the pur-

chasing, (c) and from whom was the timber bought?

3. How much has been expended on the said work?

4. What are the particulars of the expenditure?

5. When is the work to be completed?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. In 1914-15, materials were purchased.

2. (a) Yes. (b) Wm. H. Burton, Bay St. Lawrence, N.S. (c) 1915, February 21, H. B. McEachern, $64.56; Stephen McKinnon, $33.20; John McKinnon, $18.32; Paul McLellan, $27.20; Simon Fraser, $46.24; John D. Fraser, $11.12; John Jos. McLellan, $34.32; D. D. Fraser, $34; H. L. McEachern, $19.60; John R. Fraser, $25.60; Jas. J. Fraser, $26.80; Farquhar Fraser, $21.20; Neil D. Burton, $148.20; Sandy McKinnon, $18.48.

3. $537.84.

4. The purchase of timber and salary of foreman, W. H. Burton.

5. Will be considered when Parliament provides the necessary funds.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS CABLE.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. When was the cable first laid between the Magdalen islands and Bay St. Lawrence, county of Victoria, Nova Scotia?

2. (a) Is the said cable in working order now? (b) If not, when did it break or cease to be operated?

3. (a) Was there any effort made to locate the break and repair the cable? (b) If so, when, and with what result, (c) where was the break, and how far from the Nova Scotia end?

4. Is there any particular reason why the said cable was not repaired and operated during the year 1915?

5. Who is in charge of the cable and telegraph station at Bay St. Lawrence now, when was he appointed, and at what salary?

6. Has there been more than one man appointed by the Government to superintend said station? If so, what are the dates of appointments, names and salaries?

7. (a) Is the present superintendent of said station, or any one appointed by the Government to assist, a competent operator? (b) If so, where did they or either of them obtain the necessary training or knowledge of telegraphy?

8. (a) what are the duties of the superintendent of the cable station at Bay St. Lawrence, apart from his work as a telegraph operator, and (b) is the superintendent supposed to be an operator?

9. Is the cable between Bay St. Lawrence and St. Paul's island in operation? If not, what is the matter with it?

10. When did it go out of commission?

11. (a) Was there any effort made to repair it? (b) If so, when and with what result?

12. Is there any other communication between St. Paul's island and the mainland during close navigation, except the above mentioned cable?

13. When are the cables from Magdalen islands and St. Paul's likely to be repaired?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. 1st September, 1906.

2. (a) No. (b) 26th December, 1914.

3. (a) Yes. (b) On 19th December, 1915, an attempt was made but abandoned on account of continuous gales. (c) Nine miles off Nova Scotia shore.

4. Yes, cable steamer Tyrian was having boilers and portion of machinery renewed.

5. J. R. McNeil, appointed 1st October, 1914, at $720 per annum.

6. Yes, N. McDonald, assistant operator, appointed 28th July, 1914, at $420 per annum.

7. (a) Presumably, as no complaints have been received that they were incompetent. (b) Taught by one of our instructors.

8. (a) No other duties. (b) Yes.

9. No.

10. Became interrupted on 30th August, 1915.

11. (a) Yes, on 23rd December, 1915. (b) The effort had to be abandoned owing to continuous gales.

12. Not to the knowledge of this department.

13. During the coming spring efforts will be made to repair.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Did the British or French Governments purchase any horses in Canada for army purposes since 1st August, 1914?

2. If so, how many, and when did they stop buying horses in this country?

3. Has the Government made any representations to the Government of Great Britain or France in regard to the number of horses obtainable in Canada? If so, with what results?

4. Are the British and French Governments purchasing horses in the United States for army purposes?

5. When did the Canadian Government stop buying horses for military purposes?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The Government is informed that the British and French Governments have purchased horses in Canada for army purposes since the first of August, 1914. I understand also that the French Government is buying horses in Canada at the present time.

2. The British Government has not been purchasing horses for some months; I think since about November. I would not feel at liberty to give information to the House as to the number of horses purchased as it would be against the policy which the British Government has pursued in such

matters. The British Government does not give information as to the numbers of horses, or munitions, or anything of that kind which they purchase.

3. Representations were made to the Government of Great Britain with regard to the number of horses obtainable in Canada, and the British Government was asked to communicate these representations to the French Government. The result was that in August last an arrangement was made between the British Government and the French Government, by which the French Government should be permitted to purchase horses in this country.

4. The Government is not aware whether the British and French Governments are purchasing horses in the United States for army purposes.

5. The Canadian Government stopped purchasing horses for the reason that an arrangement was made during the past summer by which the British Government would purchase whatever horses might be necessary, not only for the British forces but for the Canadian forces as well. That arrangement was made in the early part of August, and I believe that since about that time the Canadian Government has not been purchasing horses for military purposes.

SEED GRAIN LIENS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. What number of liens were taken by the Government for advances to settlers in Western Canada during 1914 and 1915 for seed grain, forage and relief?

2. What is the total amount of the said liens?

3. What is the total amount of money advanced for seed grain, forage and relief in Western Canada during 1914 and 1915?

Mr. ROCHE:

	Seed grain.	Fodder and relief.
1. Number of liens.	52,927	130,528
2. Amount of liens.	$7,569,224 68	$4,664,324 05
3. Amount expended by Government exclusive of administration expenses..	7,924,386 55	4,702,645 05

As some disputed accounts are not yet paid and as apparently there has been duplication of securities in a number of cases, the figures in connection with fodder and relief are given subject to further revision.

PORT HOOD WHARF.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

What amount has been expended on repairs to Port Hood wharf each year from 1896 down to the present time?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. ROGERS: $28,034.39, expended as follows:—

1896-1897, $1,500; 1897-1898, $440; 1898-1899, $1,100; 1899-1900, $699.99; 1900-1901, $820.38; 1901-1902, $1,237.36; 1902-1903, $199.99; 1903-1904, $1,500.09; 1904-1905, $1,799.86; 1905-1906, $600.06; 1906-1907, $1,615.30; 1907-1908, $1,-999.91; 1908-1909, $1,199.96; 1909-1910, nil; 1910-1911, $1,297.48; 1911-1912, $1,357.86; 1912-1913, $195.77; 1913-1914, $4,984.74; 1914-1915, $5,199.11; 1915-1916 (31st January), $286.53; total, $28,034.39.

BOUNTY TO BEAM TRAWLERS.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

1. What year or years was bounty paid to beam trawlers?

2. Was an Order in Council passed probibiting the payment of such bounties? If so, in what year was it passed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 1909.

2. Yes. February 22, 1911.

EASTERN HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

What is the total amount expended on dredging Eastern Harbour from 1878 down to the present time, and what year was each of the amounts which make up this total expended?

Mr. ROGERS: Eastern Harbour at Cheticamp, N.S. $113,785.93, expended yearly as follows:

1878-1885, nil; 1885-1886, $9,753.09; 1886-1887, $4,361.50; 1887-1888, $6,491.73; 1890-1891, $1,360.43; 1891-1892, $4,895.75; 1894-1895, $1,801.85; 1895-1896, $3,490.08; 1901-1902, $9,655.22; 1903-1904, $6,540.06; 1904-05, $2,395.64; 1909-1910, $39,051.65; 1912-1913, $8,726.27; 1913-1914, $15,262.66; 1914-1916, nil. Total, $113,785.93.

OWNERSHIP OF WATER-POWERS.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has the government or any member of it, agreed with the government of Ontario, or any person or persons, to transfer to the said Government of Ontario, any right or title it may possess in water-powers situated in the province of Ontario?

2. If not, are negotiations in progress looking to the conclusion of such an agreement?

3. Will such agreement include developed as well as undeveloped powers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Litigation in the courts is outstanding between the Government of the province of Ontario and the Government of Canada with regard to the respective rights of Canada and the province of Ontario in water-powers situated in the province of Ontario.

Negotiations are in progress, but have not

yet been completed, looking to the settlement of the litigation. It would be impossible to give any information as to what agreement may be arrived at until the agreement itself is actually consummated.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no such agreement then?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No agreement has yet been consummated. As I said before, the negotiations seem to be progressing favourably.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to ask the Prime Minister about part 3 of the question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be impossible to answer that while negotiations are still pending.

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. What indebtedness was incurred to the Dominion Government by the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, for seed grain supplied to settlers on patented lands in these provinces in 1908?

2. What amount is still owing by each of these provinces in respect of these advances?

3. What was the amount of seed grain indebtedness by settlers on unpatented lands in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, for seed grain supplied in 1908, and what amounts are still owing in each province in respect of same?

4. What amount is now owing by settlers in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, for advances of seed grain prior to 1915?

5. What were the total advances for seed grain and fodder to settlers in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, in 1914 and 1915, and what amounts are still owing in each province in respect of same?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE:

1. Province of Saskatchewan...	$ 714,944 09
" Alberta..	150,914 30
2. Province of Saskatchewan...	301,687 65
" Alberta..	6,840 65
3. Province of Saskatchewan...	326,511 96
" Alberta.. ..	75,109 80
Still owing in Saskatchewan and Alberta..	8,765 50
4. Province of Saskatchewan...	
" Alberta..	219,610 24
5. Seed grain, Saskatchewan..	5,605,945 04
" " Alberta..	1,921,762 21
Fodder and relief, Western Canada	4,664,324 05
Received at Ottawa, to date, in repayment of 1914-15, seed grain, fodder and relief advances in Western Canada.	1,489,936 26

Subject to further revision. At present time these questions cannot be answered in exactly the form asked.

CAP A LA ROCHE CHANNEL.

Mr. McCREA:

1. How many dredges and their equipment have been employed in dredging or deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence River at what is known as Cap à La Roche, between Quebec and Three Rivers, during the years 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

2. How many yards of earth, and how many yards of rock, were removed each year?

3. What was the cost per yard, respectively?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 1911 and 1912, 4 dredges, 4 tugs, 9 scows, 1 rockcutter, 2 stonelifters, and 1 floating shop; in 1913, 1914 and 1915, 3 dredges, 3 tugs, 7 scows, 1 rockcutter, 2 stonelifters and 1 floating shop.

2. 1911, 398,100 cu. yds. shale rock cost $26.88 per cu. yd.; 156,950 cu. yds. hard-pan containing numerous embedded boulders, cost $25.74 per cu. yd; 1912, 256,423 cu. yds. shale rock cost $32.99 per cu. yd.; 92,260 cu. yds. hard-pan containing numerous embedded boulders, ost, $38.51 per cu. yd; 1913, 366,349 cu. yds. shale rock cost $35.28 per cu. yd.; 1914, 329,156 cu. yds. shade rock cost $42.41 per cu. yd; 1915, 174,063 cu. yds. shale rock; 6,733 cu. yds. hard-pan containing numerous embedded boulders. Note.—Cost per cu. yd. for 1915 cannot be given until after the end of fiscal year.

3. Answered by No. 2.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

For a return showing the different rural mail routes in the constituency of Qu'Appelle, their location and date of establishment, and all rural mail routes now being established or under consideration at the present time in the same constituency.—Mr. Thomson.

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions and documents of any kind, referring in any way to the application of Anes or Angus McKinnon, of Iron Mines or Orangedale, Inverness county, for the Fenian Raid bounty.—Mr. A. W. Chisholm.

For a return showing the number of persons of German or Austrian birth in the employ of the Post Office Department, their names, class of employment, and the remuneration paid to each of them?

SHELL INSPECTORS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. MACDONALD moved:

For a return showing the names of all shell inspectors employed in and about the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and the other factories producing shells at New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I have already pointed out, there is no information in the possession of the Government with regard to such matters. The only thing that could be done would be to transmit the hon. gentleman's question, or motion, to the committee, and I suppose he could do that himself directly. I assure my hon. friend that we have no information on the subject whatever.

Mr. MACDONALD: The question is one that could be handled more rapidly if my right hon. friend would undertake to transmit it to the committee, and I would very much prefer that that should be done.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will drop the motion I will undertake to transmit the question to the chairman of the committee with a request that it be attended to. In fact, I have already dictated a letter to him to that effect.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE MACE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before the House takes up notices of motions, might I ask its indulgence for the purpose of reading a telegram which I have received from Sir George Perley, the Acting High Commissioner. The telegram is dated London, February 14, and reads:

Prime Minister, Ottawa:

Have received following telegram from Lord Mayor, London: "Hearing that the Dominion Parliament lost its mace in the recent fire, the sheriffs of the city of London and myself will feel honoured if Canada allows us to replace it with, if possible, an exact replica of the one destroyed. Please cable what reply should be returned.

I am under the impression that arrangements have already been made here to provide a suitable mace, but I will consult with His Honour the Speaker, and with the officers of the House as to the answer to be sent.

PROCEDURE IN DIVORCE CASES.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the procedure under which divorces are granted by Parliament, and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof, are so unsatisfactory, besides being prohibitive to the great majority of the people of Canada, the same should be taken into immediate consideration by the Government during the present session, with a view to reform.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when, two years ago, I brought this same motion before the

House, I thought its wording was sufficiently clear to prevent any possible misunderstanding. There are two questions which can be raised with regard to divorce. The one is, as I have pointed out before, and as I may point out again, with regard to extending the grounds on which divorce should be granted, and I am sure that a casual reading of the motion will show that it in no way refers to that. The other ground is one which I would have thought conclusively and clearly set out: that the present procedure is not satisfactory, that it is unreasonably expensive, and that it is prohibitive to a great portion of the people of this country, and consequently fails to be effective. One would think, as I thought then, that there would have been no hesitation on the part of this House to remedy such an acknowledged evil. But to my surprise, when the House came to the discussion of this question on the last occasion, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) made a speech, eloquent, argumentative, perfectly sound and unanswerable as to the point at which it was directed, but it was a point that had not been raised by the resolution before the House. If my motion had been to extend the grounds on which divorces were granted I could have understood the pertinency of the hon. gentleman's remarks, but inasmuch as I carefully pointed out that I was not even remotely referring to that, I confess it seemed to me that his observations, however admirable, were not pertinent to the question before the House.

When the right hon. the Prime Minister came to discuss the question he, as a perusal of Hansard will show, entirely agreed with me, that the present procedure is not satisfactory. It is not only not satisfactory, but if one were speaking outside of the walls of Parliament one would say it was absolutely idiotic that men living in the twentieth century and claiming to be civilized should consent to have such an important matter carried on as it is carried on in the Dominion of Canada. When the right hon. gentleman had agreed with me that the procedure was unsatisfactory, as every member of this House must admit, a motion was made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) in these words:

A committee of seven members to be appointed to inquire into the existing procedure under which divorces are granted, and to report whether any and what more satisfactory procedure should be provided in such cases.

Personally, I had no objection to that motion, assuming it to be made in good

faith, and therefore I did not oppose it. Really the only difference between my motion and it was that my motion called upon the Government as a Government to take proper steps to do away with a distinct evil, while the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, without differing from mine in principle, merely asked that a committee of seven should be appointed. I had no objection to that, and I have no objection to it to-day, if the committee would honestly and practically proceed to do its work. But after several members of the House had joined in the discussion, the right hon. the leader of the House moved the adjournment of the debate, which everybody knows meant that my motion went to the foot of the Order Paper, and that was the last heard of it during that session. What has been done since? Last year I again placed the motion on the Order Paper, but that being a war session I did not wish to press it, and I was in hopes that the Government would take steps. I understood that some step was to be taken, and a step was taken.

In order to meet this evil, which no member of the House pretended to say did not exist, for the proceedings were ridiculously cumbersome, absurdly expensive and consequently prohibitory for the poor, the improvement that was made was that four gentlemen from the Private Bills Committee of this House were sent over to sit with the members of the Senate Divorce Committee so that they might personally hear the evidence which was given instead of being compelled to read it after it was printed. I submit to this House that if we claim to be a legislative body, if we claim to be representative of the people of this country, it is hardly dealing fairly—I might almost say sincerely—with an important question such as this to give it such a remedy as the appointment of four more members to seats on a committee that, I imagine, practically every member of the House admits never should have existed.

If we would consider the position we occupy as members of this House, it should not be very difficult to secure reform. We are very apt to speak of this member as being the member for this constituency and of that other member as being the member for that constituency, which is altogether contrary to the principle upon which we are elected to Parliament. I imagine there is no great difference of opinion as to the constitutional principle that theoretically every man in Canada has a part in the making of the laws, but that, inasmuch as practically it is impossible for every man to come to Ottawa, the country is divided into districts in which the electors assemble to elect representatives of all the people of Canada. Each member who sits in this House to-day from the province of Quebec is just as truly a representative of the province of Ontario, Alberta, or British Columbia, as any member from any one of these provinces. It may be that the member selected by the electors in a certain constituency would be expected to be better acquainted with the requirements of that constituency, but constitutionally, he is no more a representative of the people of that constituency than he is of any other people in any other constituency in Canada, for every member sitting in this House is the representative of all the people of Canada.

If that be the case, and the question is, I submit, beyond peradventure, and when it is shown that a grievance does exist, that some people in this country are put on a different footing from other people, is it not the duty of this House, and of each member of it, to see that whatever should be done is done in order to avoid such an unfortunate—I might almost say disastrous—result as having a line drawn, such as we have in the case of divorce, by which the rich in this country get divorces and the poor do not?

I well remember that in days gone by attempts have been made to remedy the law and that it has been found almost impossible. Many hon. members of the House remember that for a long time in England there were a couple of hundred offences punishable with death. Philanthropists and legislators endeavoured, year after year, to secure some change in the law from Parliament, but their efforts were hopeless. In those days a man was hanged for stealing five shillings. It was impossible to obtain a change in the law until it happened that a servant stole a crown piece from the mantel; he was seen stealing it, he was arrested, brought before a judge and jury, the evidence given was conclusive and the jury was compelled to find that the coin had been stolen, but, unwilling to have the blood of that unfortunate man upon their heads, they said that they found him guilty of stealing a coin of the value of 4s. 11½d. The finding of that jury produced a change in the law of England.

It is a well-known fact that the law of divorce for many long years had been in a very unsatisfactory condition in England.

Attempt after attempt was made to change the law, but the result was very much as it is here. Divorce could only be obtained by Act of Parliament, but in order to obtain an Act of Parliament it was necessary to obtain a divorce in the ecclesiastical courts a mensa et thoro, then sue for damages, and then come to Parliament and obtain your Bill. It had been found impossible to persuade the legislature to take any steps to remedy this most ridiculous procedure until subsequent to 1845, when, in the case of Queen vs. Hall, Mr. Justice Maule gave his famous judgment. In that case a man was brought before Mr. Justice Maule charged with bigamy. The evidence was perfectly clear that the wife had run away with another man, that she was then living with him, and that after this had continued for some time the prisoner had married again. The evidence being of this nature, the jury found the man guilty and Mr. Justice Maule proceeded to pass sentence. He told him first that he should have brought action for damages, that he should have then instituted a suit in the ecclesiastical courts for a divorce a mensa et thoro, and that he should then have obtained an act of Parliament dissolving his marriage. Then he told him that this would probably cost him a thousand pounds and that if he said he did not have that many pence it made no difference, because it was his duty to tell the prisoner that there was not one law for the rich and one for the poor, that as he had violated the law, he must be suitably punished, the punishment being imposed in these words:

> You will be imprisoned for one day. And as you have now been in gaol since the commencement of the assizes, your term is more than expired; you are free.

This sentence brought the legislature in the Old Country to its senses and in consequence of that pronouncement by Mr. Justice Maule that absurd law was changed. We know that it is only a little over a century ago since legislatures were willing to have witches burned, and acts of that kind done, and we must not think that because laws are as they are they are absolutely the best that can be made because changes have been made in such laws as these even within the last hundred years.

When we consider the position of Canada in regard to divorce, it seems to me that it does not require very much argument to induce the House to agree that something should be done. We are not the only civilized country in the world; we must admit, I suppose, that there are a few others. Yet, there are only two countries in the world, claiming to be civilized, which do not allow divorce—Italy and Spain. There is only one other country in which the divorce law is as it is in Canada and that is poor old Ireland. I can quite understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will hardly argue that the laws in force in Ireland for the last hundred years are so absolutely perfect that you cannot improve them.

Mr. DOHERTY: They do not make the laws in Ireland; that is the trouble.

Mr. NORTHRUP: But I am sure the Minister of Justice will say that, if they were able to make laws in Ireland, they would make a more satisfactory and Christian law than they have there at the present time on this subject. There are only these two countries, Italy and Spain, in which they have no law of divorce. Let me briefly run through the list of civilized countries as given in the report of the Matrimonial Divorce Commission (which sat in the Old Country for several years, presided over by Lord Gorrell) which have divorce courts. In Scotland divorce is granted not merely for adultery, but for desertion, and they have divorce courts in the following parts of the Empire: England, South Africa, Natal, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia, and India.

So there is not much doubt what the feeling of British subjects is with regard to this matter. Not only in the Motherland, but in every part of the Empire, divorces are obtained through the court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not in Newfoundland.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I was coming to that. Apparently, Newfoundland has no way of granting divorces, but I presume the same inherent right exists in their legislature as exists in ours, and that their legislature could grant a divorce. Divorces are granted by courts in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, and in the United States. With only two exceptions then, it is an understood thing among the civilized nations of the world that divorces can be granted. It is only in Ireland that the same system of granting divorces exists as obtains here.

Up to 1857 there was no divorce court in England, and divorces were granted there the same as here, by Act of Parliament, but in that year a divorce court was established —a step far beyond anything we have in this country. In 1909 the warrant was issued to the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Cases, and the House will pardon me if I read a couple of sentences of the warrant:

> We do hereby empower you to make an interim report with a view of enabling such steps as you may recommend to be taken for the redress of any hardship from which, in your opinion, the poorer classes may suffer under the existing law and administration.

The commission presented a minority and a majority report, but with the latter I have nothing to do, because it does not relate in any way to the motion before us to-day. I may say, however, that it recommends that the grounds upon which divorce is granted in England should be extended; to include, for instance, such cases as incurable insanity, imprisonment for life, and desertion, but I am not concerned with the majority report at all, for my motion does not seek to extend the grounds. The minority report, which is signed by the Primate of England (Cosmo Ebor), Sir William Anson, M.P., and Sir Lewis T. Dibbin, while differing from the majority recommendation that the grounds be extended, went as far as I am asking this House to go; that

4 p.m.

is, they recommend that steps should be taken in order to secure the possibility of divorces being granted to the poor as well as to the rich. Let me read a few words from page 189 of the minority report:

> We concur in the recommendation of your colleagues that local courts exercising the jurisdiction of the High Court should be established. We also agree that it will be convenient that these courts should be held at centres where there is already a District Registry of the High Court.

These three gentlemen, then, are willing to have the facilities for divorce, which are so much greater in England than here, extended still further.

I should like to call attention to the fact that in my motion there is not one word about a court. I am merely pointing out that the present system is not satisfactory, and I ask the Government and this House either to contradict me and say that it is satisfactory, or to agree that it is unsatisfactory, and then like men rise to the occasion and try to reform our present system. When I brought this motion before the House a couple of years ago, war had not broken out. I think the war has in many ways changed the position of many people in this country. I confess, Sir, I cannot understand how any one in this country can appeal to our young married men to fall in under the colours and fight for our country and Empire, and at the same time say to them, as we are practically saying to them to-day: If you are rich and happen to be wronged in your household while you are away, file your petition with the Senate, and the remedy will be provided. But if you are poor we can do nothing for you, because under our Canadian law a divorce cannot be granted except under these two conditions: first, the crime of the offending party, and second the wealth of the injured party. Only last week a most pitiful case appeared in the Toronto papers. It was that of a married man who had been among the first to enlist. While in Europe some scoundrel took advantage of his absence. Now, under our present law, we are compelled to say to that man: We can do nothing for you; if you lived in Montreal and were rich, we would have been quite prepared to grant a divorce, but as you live in Toronto and are poor there is no divorce for you in Canada. Does it not strike every member of this House as an injustice that makes his blood boil that we should ask these men to go to the front, and then crawl in behind them to protect ourselves at their expense, and then stand ready to give them a kick the moment the war is over. I appeal to this House whether that is the way to treat the men who are fighting for us, and are ready to give their lives for this country and the Empire. Let us either abolish divorce so that no man in Canada can have it, or adopt such procedure that the man who is fighting for his country, and risking his life for the Empire, has the same rights as his wealthier brothers.

If I may judge from the last debate on this subject in this House, there must have been a misunderstanding of the history of the subject. As my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) told us two years ago, we know that one great religious body, the Roman Catholic Church, is opposed to divorce. But nobody who knows anything about the subject would pretend to say that the Greek Church—another great branch of the Christian church—is opposed to divorce. They have always had it, and have it to-day. The Anglican Church has never been opposed to divorce, and is not opposed to it to-day. Let me refer for a

moment to Volume 3 of the findings of the Royal Commission, page 441.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does the Greek Church grant divorce through civil or ecclesiastical courts?

Mr. NORTHRUP: Through their consistorial courts. On page 441 of the commission's report, Sir Edward Clarke, one of the best known counsel in England, in giving his evidence before the commission says that there is a popular misunderstanding on the subject of divorce, and he quoted to show that even among the early Fathers of the Church there was a diversity of opinion. He referred to St. Augustine, St. Jerome and St. Ambrose,—none more famous—all of whom at one time had supported divorce and re-marriage. St. Augustine, it is true, changed his opinion later; but even he, toward the close of his life, declared that while his own opinion was against divorce, yet the subject was so uncertain that he would not blame any man who took a different view. Then Professor Denney, at page 264 of the same volume, quotes a number of cases from the Fathers—

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) say that the Catholic Church does not recognize any divorce today?

Mr. NORTHRUP: It does not. The Roman Catholic Church, ever since the Council of Trent in 1553, where it laid down the principle, has been absolutely against divorce and does not recognize divorce.

Mr. CARROLL: I can tell my hon. friend that he is wrong.

Mr. NORTHRUP: Does the hon. gentleman say that the Roman Catholic Church does recognize divorce?

Mr. CARROLL: For certain reasons.

Mr. NORTHRUP: Perhaps the hon. gentleman refers to the case of marriage with a heathen?

Mr. CARROLL: No.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I believe the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Like a good many others he has misunderstood the case. The Roman Catholic Church does not recognize divorce. It does recognize divorce a mensa et thoro, separating the parties in a manner the counterpart of our English judicial separation, but with no right in either of the parties to re-marry.

Mr. CARROLL: I beg to contradict the hon. gentleman again, for incompetency for instance, the Catholic Church does allow divorce and re-marriage.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I do not profess to know more of the doctrines of the hon. gentleman's church than he knows himself, but I think he is confusing nullification with divorce.

Mr. CARROLL: You go to the divorce courts to get it.

Mr. NORTHRUP: No. I have many authorities here, but as I do not wish to encumber Hansard with a number of theological opinions, I will merely give the pages of the report in order that those who wish to do so may read for themselves. At page 264 of Volume III of these reports, Professor Denney gives a list, quoting in one case Gregory II, who was in favour of divorce. At page 437 of the same volume, Sir Frederick Pollock, professor of law in Oxford University, recognized as one of the ablest writers on English law who ever lived, gives a list of authorities of the Fathers of the early days, who, he says, were in favour of divorce. The evidence before the committee was to the effect that in England there had never been a time when it was the law of the land, or even the final law of the church, that divorce could not be given. Away back in A.D. 686, Archbishop Theodore had a canon passed, a copy of which I have before me, in which he expressed himself as opposed to divorce and re-marriage; but the same archbishop, in his Penitentials, which he put in the hands of his clergy, authorized them, though counselling their parishioners to abstain from divorce and re-marriage, yet to allow them, if they insisted, to marry again.

My hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) has spoken about certain grounds on which the Roman Catholic Church does give divorce. As he has brought the matter up, I may be allowed to refer to it without incurring the charge of making an attack upon that Church. I would refer to the evidence of Mgr. Moyes, who attended this commission, as representative of the Archbishop of Westminster, for the purpose of stating what was the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject. I cannot be accused of attacking the Church if I read what he gave as being the doctrine of the Church:

The inpediments which are held by the Catholic church to be diriment or nullifying are the following: 1. Error, as to person. 2.

Condition (if A marries B, a slave, believing B to be free). 3. Solemn vow of chastity or entering religious order, made before consummation of marriage. 4. Consanguinity to third degree. 5. Crime (if A during a former marriage with B has committed adultery with C, with promise of marriage after death of B, and if A or C has attempted the life of B, the marriage of A and C is null). 6. Disparity of worship, viz: marriage of a Christian with a non-Christian. 7. Duress or violence affecting liberty of consort. 8. Holy order to which is attached obligation of chastity. 9. The bond of preceding marriage (if either party have a husband or wife still alive). 10. Public decorum (if one of the parties is solemnly or publicly betrothed to another person.) 11. Madness or amentia (viz, imbecility, precluding reasonable consent). 12. Affinity. 13. Clandestinity. 14. Impotency. 15. Rape.

So, the grounds he gives are those for nullification; not for a divorce a vinculo in our sense, with rights of the parties to re-marry. I am not finding fault with these rules of the Roman Catholic Church. There are many cases in which marriages were nullified by the church. There is one case so well known that every member of the House may be acquainted with it. There was a girl in England named Margaret Tudor, of very respectable family. Her father was Henry Tudor, better known as Henry VII, and her brother is more widely though less favourably known in history as Henry VIII. She married a Scotchman, known as James Stuart, afterwards James IV of Scotland. She was the sister-in-law of Louis XII of France, and so the double grandmother of Mary Queen of Scots, the direct descendant of whom sits on the throne of Great Britain to-day. So, you see, when we speak of Margaret Tudor, we are dealing with a very respectable family. When Margaret Tudor lost her husband James, she married—that is she went through the marriage ceremony with—the Earl of Angus. Some time later, being weary of Angus, she discovered that, while he had never been married before, he had had a betrothal to the daughter of the Earl of Bothwell. So, there was a nullification of that marriage. Then, she married Lord Methven. But, wearying of him, and there being no divorce, she discovered that he was related in the fourth degree to the Earl of Angus, and so her marriage to Lord Methven was nullified. Some people might have thought that as it had been decided that she had never been married to the Earl of Angus, the law declaring that his relationship with Lord Methven was a bar to her marriage with Methven was not sound. Still, that was the law as adjudged and as administered. So that when my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) speaks about divorce he should remember that it is not divorce that is given, but absolute nullification of marriage. I can quite understand that a gentleman belonging to the church of my hon. friend would have this objection to divorce, which, perhaps, is not well founded. The people affected by the nullification of marriage as it was practised in Europe for many centuries were not the lower classes or the poor—those for whom I am pleading to-day. At that time only the rich or the mighty were concerned either in divorce or in the nullification of marriage. Divorce, if provision had been made for it in those days, could have been comparatively simple and comparatively inexpensive; but those who desired to set aside the marriage tie—persons of nobility or crowned heads—could well afford to pay. If the grounds of application, therefore, were abstruse and difficult to prove, there would, to the ecclesiastical lawyers, be an advantage in nullification rather than in divorce. Take the case of a man who desired to be free from the marriage tie and wished to marry some one else. If he obtained a divorce, one day the eldest son would take his title or his crown, as the case might be, with all his estates; but if he stepped out free and unencumbered, he could offer to the lady of his heart for the time being all that he had to give—title, estate, position for her life and for her son after her. In the light of these facts, some people may be inclined to attach to divorce some objections that are not properly attachable to it, but that were properly attachable to nullification. In England or in any country where divorces are granted, the children of divorced persons are protected; they go forth as free as if the marriage had not been set aside at all, with their birthright preserved.

When the hon. member for Rouville was speaking on this subject two years ago, he called attention to the fact that in the Republic to the south of us there had been a great multiplication of divorces; that there was actually one divorce to every twelve marriages. My hon. friend mentioned this as an objection to the resolution I then had before the House. But I am afraid my hon. friend's figures were such as to lead to a wrong conclusion. Apart from census statistics, what a shocking state of affairs it would be if there was one divorce to every twelve marriages in Ottawa! Similarly, I am sure our friends to the south would

have risen in rebellion if there had been one divorce to every twelve marriages in their country. It struck me when I heard the figures that it would be astonishing if that condition should prevail in any city in a Christian land. My hon. friend was correct enough in his figures, but it is a fact that the census statistics in this respect are wholly unreliable. Before this commission to which I referred, a Mr. Barratt was examined, and, having reference to his evidence, the commission found as follows:

It has, however, been pointed out to us by Mr. J. Arthur Barratt that reliance cannot be placed on the figures, owing to the fact that, though the information with reference to the number of divorces rests on reliable bases, statistics as to the number of marriages are most uncertain. Figures as to marriages can only be got from States where marriages are registered, and up to 1906, in only 25 States of the Union, out of the whole number of 50 States, were there provisions of law for the state registration of marriage; and in only 8 States is there at the present time anything like a complete return of marriage statistics. In the case of immigrants who settle in the United States in such numbers, a large proportion were married in their native countries, and these marriages are not registered in the United States. Amongst these immigrants it is fairly certain that the percentages of divorce are high; and, therefore, though it may be true in a sense that the proportion above referred to is the proportion of divorces to registered marriages, it is not in fact a true proportion to the total number of marriages in the United States. It should also be observed that the census reports of the United States include judicial separations and nullity suits under the head of "divorce", thus largely adding to the statistics of divorce questions which do not come properly under the head of divorces a vinculo.

While the commission did not so find, I have the evidence under my hand, as given by Mr. Barratt, that a tremendous number of divorce cases in the southern States would have to be included in the list. In fact, between 80 and 90 per cent of the divorce cases throughout that part of the country were traceable to the coloured people of the southern States, who, perhaps, could hardly be considered as being average citizens of the United States. So that my hon. friend's figures of one divorce to twelve marriages should be considered in the light of the report which I have just read—a report based upon substantial evidence.

The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) last year gave some figures to show the result of the operation of a divorce court in that province. If I were sure that the hon. gentleman did intend to speak to-day I should not quote his figures, but for fear he may not take part in the discussion, I shall take the liberty of presenting them to the House. My hon. friend said:

I find in the province of New Brunswick, which lies just alongside of the State of Maine, a state in which I believe the question of granting divorces without law or reason has been carried to as great an extreme as it has been in the State of Nevada, a state in which divorces are granted simply for incompatibility of temperament, for any fanciful device which any man or woman may put forward in order to obtain a divorce—in the province of New Brunswick lying for one hundred miles along the border of the State of Maine, and in a province in which one would think that the people might to some extent be influenced by the social conditions existing among their neighbours across the boundary line, only 1·15 divorces have been granted since 1868, or in 44 years an average of about 2·6 divorces per year.

When I dealt with this subject two years ago the right hon. gentleman who leads the House agreed with me that the procedure in respect of the granting of divorces was unsatisfactory. When he put my resolution at the foot of the order paper, thus precluding the possibility of anything being done during the session, I wondered if he had lost confidence in the people of his own province. We have had divorce courts in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia, ever since Confederation. They have either worked satisfactorily, or worked unsatisfactorily. If they have not worked satisfactorily; if they have lowered the standard of the people of those provinces; if it is the view of the hon. gentlemen representing these provinces that the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta must not be dragged down to the level of the provinces in which divorce courts have operated, I shall have nothing more to say. But if the gentlemen representing the people of the provinces in which divorce courts are operated can say that their people are on the same plane as those of the less favoured provinces; if they can say that the men and women of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick where the privileges of the divorce courts have been enjoyed for half a century, are the moral and social equals of the people of Ontario and Quebec, then I ask why should the people of the other five provinces not be given the benefit of an improvement in the Parliamentary procedure in this respect? Heaven knows that that procedure is too monstrously absurd to be described anywhere outside of a vaudeville show. Two years ago I directed attention to one defect in the procedure of the Senate; nothing has since been done to

remedy it. I should think that the gentlemen at the head of the Government would feel it their duty to communicate with the Senate on this subject. I quite understand that they cannot control the Senate or compel the members of that body to do this or that, but I think that they should use their best endeavours to induce them to do what is right. The right hon. gentleman who leads the House himself admitted two years ago that nothing could be more preposterous than the system of compelling a man who wants a divorce to begin by advertising the fact in the Canada Gazette for six months. Could one imagine anything more ridiculous than a case like this: A man's wife has run away from him to the United States of America; is living there in sin with another man, and it is thought that the advertising of the fact that he is going to apply for a divorce six months ahead is going to furnish her with reading matter and keep her out of mischief! She has to be served and notice has to be given. Could anything be more absurd than thus asking to have money spent by those who cannot afford it? I am not speaking theoretically; I can speak of a case in my own practice since this session commenced, and I have had more than twenty cases during my legal experience in Canada. Since this session opened a young woman not more than 24 or 25 years of age, came to me and said she understood I was a member of Parliament. I pleaded guilty to the impeachment with an apology. She said: You give divorces in Ottawa, don't you? I said: Under certain circumstances we do. She said: I want one. I asked: What is your grievance? Her reply was: My husband kicked and pounded me so that I had to leave him three times. I said: My good woman, that is very improper conduct and I am satisfied that I can obtain relief for you from injury of that kind; but it will not be by divorce, because those are not grounds on which divorces are granted in Canada. She said: I know that, and I went back to him three times; but now he is living with another woman and I will not go back; I want a divorce. I said: Can you prove that he is living with another woman? She said she could, by one hundred witnesses. She was a woman in poor circumstances, in domestic service in Belleville. Think of it, There was a woman standing in my office with a hundred witnesses who could prove her case, and what could I say? I could only say: Unfortunately you live in one of five provinces where two things must be proved—the offence committed by the husband is very essential, but unless you can prove that you have money it is no use proving the other because Parliament will not listen to you. Does not one blush as a Canadian, as a member of Parliament, to have to tell a woman who comes with evidence of that kind frankly that if she was in possession of some hundreds of dollars she could be relieved from this burden; but because she was a poor woman, compelled to earn her own living, and happened to live in Ontario, there was no way under heaven in which she could be relieved?

Mr. PROULX: There have been cases where the fees have been remitted, have there not?

Mr. NORTHRUP: You can sue in forma pauperis, and, if you do, certain disbursements in the Senate are forgiven; but you have to do your advertising, to serve the respondent, to employ counsel, and to bring witnesses here. Suppose we take the extreme case of people from Alberta or Saskatchewan; apart from everything else, what would be the expense of bringing witness from one of those provinces to Ottawa?

I have been very careful not to advocate a court. I have been trying all the way through to confine myself to suggestions that are practicable with our existing system. I quite understand that if I said a word about a court different objections would be raised; but I can see ways in which a tremendous improvement could be made in the present procedure, a wonderful saving, even using the imperfect machinery we have. Therefore, I have been very careful not to suggest a court, although one cannot help seeing that to make our procedure conform with that of other civilized lands it would be necessary to have a court. But if we Canadians cannot rise to the plane of other peoples, if we do not possess the intelligence, if we do not possess the hearts of other peoples, let us at least do the best we can, and so arrange our divorce laws that as many as possible who are entitled to can avail themselves of the law. Let us not have it confined only to the few.

Mr. HAZEN: Has the hon. member made any estimate or can he submit any figures as to the actual difference in cost to a petitioner who applies for and obtains a divorce through Parliament, and a peti-

tioner who applies for and obtains a divorce through one of the courts, say in British Columbia, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I have not been able to do that, but my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) gave that information. I have been told that many cases in these provinces have gone through for $100 or so.

Mr. CARVELL: That is perfectly correct.

Mr. NORTHRUP: It is perfectly true you might have a case in British Columbia in which you would have to bring witnesses from England.

Mr. HAZEN: It would largely depend on where the witnesses come from.

Mr. NORTHRUP: Supposing you had a court like the judge of the Exchequer Court, who goes to Alberta, or Manitoba, or Saskatchewan, at certain times and holds court there. There is no one in Saskatchewan or Alberta so poor that he or she could not bring witnesses to that place. But it is a different thing to employ counsel there, to have that counsel employ counsel in Ottawa, to pay the expenses of advertising and the expenses of service, to bring your witnesses to Ottawa —and then on coming here perhaps find that the Senate had adjourned for the week and that you would have to keep the witnesses waiting to be heard. It makes all the difference whether you have one procedure or the other. As my hon. friend suggests the courts, let me recite to the House a case told me by one of the leading lawyers in British Columbia, formerly a member of this House. A lady from Ontario married a gentleman who was the manager of a bank in British Columbia. Her father was a wealthy man. The boom in real estate struck British Columbia. The bank manager was carried away by it and went deeply into it. He sent for his father-in-law, who went out to British Columbia, and then the bank manager inveigled the father-in-law into real estate. They went in deeper and deeper until one fine day the son-in-law disappeared and the father-in-law found he was a ruined man. The wife was left with three children and not a penny. She who had never supported herself in her life had to go out and support herself and her three small children, and she did it with difficulty. My informant, on hearing the story, was very much affected by it and desired to do what he could. On thinking it over he said: I believe that man who came from England probably went back. He employed a detective in London and found he was living in his own village in England very comfortably with a lady, supposedly his wife, who was introduced and recognized as his wife. At once my friend told the deserted wife: I will get you a divorce, and he was prepared to get it. But it happens that the law of British Columbia is the law of England which was in force at the time the court was established in British Columbia, and the law of England at that time was that while a husband could obtain a divorce for adultery, the wife was obliged to show adultery plus cruelty. Since then the law has been changed in England, so that now desertion for two years is taken as cruelty. But the British Columbia law is the old English law, and although this lady was entitled to apply to the court and could show that her husband was living in the Old Country with another woman, she could not prove cruelty, and therefore could not get a divorce in British Columbia. I said to the gentleman: Why do you not come to Ottawa? He said: Why didn't I? I was willing to put the case through for her at my own expense; I was willing to put up $500 or $1,000; but when I considered that it meant employing detectives in the Old Country, bringing them out here to give evidence, as there is no means of taking evidence under commission under our divorce proceedings, keeping them here for Heaven knows how long, and that it might then turn out that I would have to send somebody from here over there to identify the man there as being really the husband of the lady, the probable expense was so tremendous that I was obliged to abstain altogether. That is just an illustration of how, even where you have a court, if your laws are not satisfactory you may have hard cases. But if you have such a hard case as that where there is a court, as in British Columbia, it is not difficult to understand that there will be exceedingly hard cases under such circumstances as we have here.

There are a good many other things I intended to say and would have liked to say, but I feel I am trespassing on the indulgence of the House. Let me, in conclusion, merely repeat the points I would like to impress on the House—and I hope that nobody will answer what I have said to-day by presenting arguments against an extension of the grounds on which divorce

is granted, for I have not touched that at all. I hope that every member of this House will appreciate his position. Every man in this House is a representative of everybody in this country and is responsible for seeing that justice is done to everybody in this country. While I quite understand and appreciate the position of a member of a great church which is opposed to divorce who, when divorce Bills are brought before this House, does not vote on them, I think I, as a member of another faith, might well appeal to him and say: In this case, inasmuch as you and others of your church do not ask for divorces, as you are not affected by these divorces, it will in no way hurt you to support the changes I propose, if you find that in every civilized land but two outside of Canada there is a simpler way of obtaining divorces. If we desire to treat the poor as we treat the rich, we must do one of two things. Take the cases I mentioned where two men went across the sea, one from Montreal and one from Toronto, both apparently entitled to apply to Parliament for divorces if one can believe the papers, and one can apply because he has money and the other cannot apply because he has not, although the facts are there, his home is broken up, a little one not his is there to meet him on his return. It seems to me that any man who has one single drop of red blood in his veins must feel that, whatever we do, whether or not we can decide upon a complete remedy for these evils, we should at least be men enough to do the best we can, so that if only in such cases as the half dozen poor women to whom I referred a moment ago, we relieve them of the burden which is such a load upon them to-day, we could say that we had done something this session of which we would have reason to be proud until our dying day.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very great interest indeed to the masterly address delivered by my hon. friend the member for East Hastings. Let me at once commend his ability, his fairness, and his broad-mindedness. I say his broad-mindedness, because in the course of his speech he seemed to fear that his remarks might be taken as adverse to one church. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that he would be the last of all men in this House to use any arguments which could be taken as adverse to any of the great churches of this country. He is well known for his fairness, and he has approached the subject on this occasion, as he did on the last in a fair and broad-minded spirit. I may also tell him that it is not from a sectarian point of view that I rise to oppose his motion; I speak as a Canadian having in view the welfare of our country, and I shall try to demonstrate in as few words as possible that the position I take is in the best interests of Canada. I shall try to demonstrate in a few moments that though my hon. friend's motion apparently affects only the procedure of divorce, it would tend to create a substantive law of divorce in provinces where it does not exist at present. I repeat that I approach this question from a national point of view.

It so happens that the Catholic Church is not the only church opposed to divorce. In the course of his very able remarks, my hon. friend said that the Anglican Church was not opposed to divorce. I do not know the tenets of the Anglican Church in England, but I know that the Anglican Church of Canada is just as much opposed to divorce as the Roman Catholic Church is. On the last occasion, when I spoke on this question, I quoted a canon which had been unanimously adopted on the question of marriage and divorce at the sessions of the Anglican Synod, held in Montreal in 1905. That canon read as follows:

> No clergyman within the jurisdiction of the Church of England in Canada shall solemnize a marriage between persons either of whom shall have been divorced from one who is living at the time.

So, I brush aside any sectarian point of view. I do not wish to be dogmatic in the matter; I am speaking as a Canadian, feeling that if this Parliament should in any way whatsoever facilitate the procedure of divorce such a change would tend to create a much larger number of divorces before our courts and before this Parliament, and would be detrimental to the best interests of our common country. My view, therefore, is that we should not increase the facilities for obtaining divorce, which have been criticised by my hon. friend, but that, on the contrary—and this is where I join issue with him—we should restrict these facilities, or at least we should leave the procedure as it is, and as it was intended to be at the time our Divorce Committee was organized after Confederation.

The question is not new. The hon. member has brought it before the House on several occasions, the last time being in 1914, I think, but I doubt whether since that time, in spite of the very able address

of my hon. friend, there has been any demand in the country for the legislation which he is urging by his motion this afternoon. His address will be read with great interest from the historical point of view, as well as from the legal point of view. In fact, I am surprised that such an able gentleman as my hon. friend from Hastings does not adorn the benches of the Government, or the bench of the high courts of Ontario. Since his address in this House in 1914, I believe he has addressed two public institutions in this country, the Canadian Club and the Forum, but there has been no serious demand for the legislation which he urges this Parliament to enact. It is a very vexed question. By many people, possibly by the majority in this House, marriage is considered as only a civil contract, but to many others, certainly to a respectable minority in this country, embracing all races and all creeds, marriage is more than a civil contract; it is also a sacrament. Therefore Parliament should be careful about opening the gates to any legislation affecting marriage, the effect of which would be to assail and endanger the very foundations of Canadian society. In four provinces they have divorce courts, and as my hon. friend has stated, five others have no divorce courts. When the subject came up before Parliament in 1914, the question of our jurisdiction in this Dominion Parliament was well put by the Minister of Justice. He gave us the meaning and the extent of the power vested in the Dominion Parliament. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, let me read the very weighty words of the Minister of Justice, who we all know has, for many years, with conspicuous ability, sat on the bench, and who is a very eminent jurist. Speaking in the course of that debate, the Minister of Justice thus defined the powers of Parliament on this question. He said:

I understand perfectly that in those provinces—

That is to say, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia——

—which have divorce courts and which have also a substantive law which those courts can administer and supply, prescribing the causes giving the right to divorce, the principle of divorce is recognized by the law. But in the five provinces where those conditions do not exist, not only the courts have not jurisdiction to pronounce divorces but there is no law under which anybody is entitled to a divorce; and if this Parliament confined itself to giving jurisdiction to hear divorce cases to courts in those provinces, those courts would sit with no law to apply. You cannot, to any purpose, confide to the court the procedure—to use the word of the motion—by which divorces are to be obtained, until you have first made a substantive law to which that procedure is going to apply.

In other words, my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup), able as he is, has begun his agitation at the wrong end. He is agitating for a more pliable procedure. He should begin by advocating in these five provinces the enactment of substantive laws on divorce. He might have a pliable procedure, but he would have no law to apply the procedure to. To go on with the remarks by the Minister of Justice on that occasion:

This Parliament, to use the expression of the hon. member, grants divorce on a particular ground, passes one Act for one individual, and why does it do it? Because that individual has come to it and said: I want to be an exception to the general law. We talk about coming to Parliament to obtain divorces and we talk about the procedure by which divorces are granted but the whole operation is a legislative Act, and when a man comes to Parliament, on the face of his application he does not ask for a Bill to divorce anybody, but he asks for an Act for the relief of so and so; and relief from what? From an obligation that the general law imposes upon him. In those provinces where there is no divorce court their is equally no divorce law, and the general law of those provinces, I have no hesitation in saying, does not know divorce. Most assuredly in the province I come from the law does not know divorce, and it is because there is no law in force that persons, seeking it require special legislation. Let me speak of my own province—although I have no doubt I shall be borne out by lawyers from the other provinces—the man who comes here, say from the province of Quebec, and asks this Parliament for a divorce, is asking to be made an exception to the law. He comes here because, by law, he has no right to a divorce. If by law he had a right to a divorce, it would naturally follow that that would be a right enforceable in a court. The reason why people have to come here is not because the courts have not jurisdiction; it is because there is no law which the courts could administer if they had the amplest jurisdiction.

In these words the Minister of Justice has gone to the very crux of the question. This Parliament grants relief to so and so from living according to the general law in the province where he comes from; this Parliament does not grant divorce to so and so.

My hon. friend does not seem to attach much importance to statistics. First of all, let me tell him that the statistics which I used two years ago were taken from an address delivered by a very eminent member of the United States Congress. On that occasion I had applied to the Parlia-

mentary Library to get a special report which had been prepared by Mr. Carroll Wright in 1906. Unfortunately, that report was not on the shelves at that time, so I had to rely on what this address of the United States senator contained. I will, however, in a few moments, give the House the statistics from the official source. My hon. friend himself will be obliged to agree with me in saying that these statistics are simply appalling, and he will be obliged to say with me that divorce, as an institution in the United States, with the facilities which have been granted by the various legislatures of the Commonwealth, has become the greatest curse of the American Republic. But first of all, let me, Mr. Speaker, give the figures which affect our own case in Canada. As the result of a motion I made the other day, I obtained the following figures with regard to divorces granted by the Parliament of Canada from 1867 to 1915 inclusive. The total number granted was 285—to husbands 158, and to wives 127. By provinces the figures are as follows: Ontario 175, Quebec 42, Manitoba 25, Saskatchewan 8, Alberta 15, British Columbia 2, Northwest Territories 7, Prince Edward Island 1. So that, on the whole, although the number of divorces has been increasing of late, we may fairly claim that in Canada we have a clean sheet compared with that of other countries. But I repeat that if we should facilitate the procedure in the way advocated by my good friend from Hastings, it would tend, in my humble judgment, to make the matrimonial tie lax instead of binding. I say again that the statistics published by the United States Government are simply appalling, and that the example of the United States should be a warning to the Canadian legislator. There are many institutions in the United States which we admire and would willingly borrow, but I regret to say that the divorce statistics published by the United States should be a warning and a lesson to us. By virtue of an Act passed by Congress, two investigations have been held in the United States on the question of divorce. The first investigation covered the period from 1867 to 1886, and the second from 1887 to 1906; that is, each investigation covered a period of twenty years. Of course, one cannot draw up a bill of indictment against any one nation in particular, or against a whole people. I think my hon. friend in the course of his speech admitted the gravity of this question in the United States, and in this connection I should like to quote the words of a well known ex-President of the Republic—a man whose name is highly respected in his own country and abroad. I refer to ex-President Roosevelt. As a result of petitions presented to Congress, that the

5 p.m.

matter was of sufficient importance to warrant another investigation, President Roosevelt sent a special message to Congress creating a new commission. Before the commission set to work, he addressed its members in the following language:

> Bishop Doane and gentlemen:
>
> It is a very great pleasure to meet you here. There is a certain tendency to exalt the unessential in dealing with our public questions, and public men especially are apt to get their attention concentrated on questions that have an importance, but a wholly ephemeral importance, compared with the questions that go straight to the root of things. Questions like the tariff and the currency are of literally no consequence whatsoever compared with the vital question of having the unit of our social life, the home, preserved. It is impossible to overstate the importance of the cause you represent. If the average husband and wife fulfil their duties toward one another and toward their children as Christianity teaches them, then we may rest absolutely assured that the other problems will solve themselves. But if we have solved every other problem in the wisest possible way it shall profit us nothing if we have lost our own national soul, and we will have lost it if we do not have the question of the relations of the family put upon the proper basis.

I should like to call the attention of my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) to the sentence which follows. My hon. friend admitted that the matrimonial tie might be lax in the United States, but he suggested that that was only in the southern portion, amongst coloured people. President Roosevelt says:

> One of the most unpleasant and dangerous features of our American life is the diminishing birth rate, the loosening of the marital tie among the old native American families. It goes without saying that, for the race as for the individual, no material prosperity, no business growth, no artistic or scientific development will count if the race commits suicide. Therefore, Bishop, I count myself fortunate in having the chance to work with you in this matter of vital importance to the national welfare.

From the report of that commission, which President Roosevelt addressed in these ominous words, I have collated some statistics, and to me they are simply appalling. Sir, it is terrible to think that such a great and noble democracy as the neighbouring republic to the south has fallen to such a level in one of the most vital problems of its national life. The growth of divorce in the United States

under the general divorce laws has been unprecedented, and the divorce figures exceed in number those of any other modern nation excepting Japan. An analysis of the statistics prepared by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labour, in 1889, showed the total number of divorces for a period of twenty years, from 1867 to 1887, to be 328,716, an increase of 157 per cent, while the increase in population for the same period was 60 per cent. The Census Bulletin upon marriage and divorce in the United States, issued by the Department of Labour and Commerce under authority of an Act of Congress, in 1908, shows that the total number of divorces for the entire country from 1887 to 1906 inclusive was 945,625. For the earlier investigation covering the twenty years from 1867 to 1886 inclusive, the number reported was 328,716, or hardly more than one-third of the number reported in the second twenty years.

At the beginning of the forty-year period covered by the two investigations, divorces occurred at the rate of 10,000 a year. At the end of that period the annual number was about 66,000. This increase, however, must be considered in connection with the increase in population. An increase of 30 per cent in population between the years 1870 and 1880, was accompanied by an increase of 79 per cent in the number of divorces granted. In the next decade, 1880 to 1890, the population increased 25 per cent and divorces 70 per cent. In the following decade, 1890 to 1900, an increase of 21 per cent in population was accompanied by an increase of 66 per cent in the number of divorces. In the next six years, from 1900 to 1906, population, as estimated, increased 10·5 per cent, and divorces 29·3 per cent. It thus appears that at the end of the forty-year period divorces were increasing about three times as fast as the population, while in the first decade, 1870 to 1880, they increased only about two and two-thirds as fast.

The divorce rate per 100,000 population increased from 29 in 1870 to 82 in 1905. In the former year there was one divorce for every 3,441 persons and in the latter year one for every 1,218. The rate per 100,000 married population was 81 in the year 1870 and 200 in the year 1900. This comparison indicates that divorce is at present two and one-half times as common, compared with married population, as it was forty years ago. Divorce rates appear to be much higher in the United States than in any of the foreign countries for which statistics relating to this subject have been obtained. Two-thirds of the total number of divorces granted in the twenty-year period covered by this investigation were granted to the wife.

The most common single ground for divorce is desertion. This accounts for 38·9 per cent of all divorces granted in the period 1887 to 1906, 49·4 per cent or almost one-half those granted to the husband, and 33·5 per cent or one-third of those granted to the wife. The next most important ground of divorce is, for husbands, adultery, and for wives, cruelty. Of the divorces granted to husbands in the period from 1887 to 1906, 28·8 per cent were for adultery, and of those granted to wives 27·5 per cent were for cruelty. Only 10 per cent of the divorces granted to wives were for adultery of the husband, and 10·5 per cent of divorces granted to husbands were for cruelty on the part of the wife. Drunkenness was the ground for divorce in 5·3 per cent of the cases for which the wife brought suit, and in 1·4 per cent of the cases in which the suit was brought by the husband. Intemperance was reported as an indirect or contributory cause for divorce in 5 per cent of the divorces granted to the husband, and in 18 per cent of the divorces granted to the wife, and appeared as a direct or indirect cause in 19·5 per cent of all divorces, and 26·3 per cent of those granted to wives, and 6·1 per cent of those granted to husbands. Only 15 per cent of the divorces were returned as contested and probably in many of these cases the contesting was hardly more than a formality.

The average duration of marriages terminated by divorce is about ten years. Sixty per cent, or three-fifths, last less than ten years, and 40 per cent last longer. Of the divorced couples known to have been married in the United States, 88.5 per cent were married in the same state in which they were divorced. Of all the divorced couples known to have been married in foreign countries, 36·9 per cent were married in Canada, 12·7 per cent in England, 16·1 per cent in Germany, and 1·9 per cent in Ireland. Children were reported in 39·8 per cent of the total number of divorced cases. The proportion is much larger for divorces granted to the wife than for divorces granted to the husband; children being present in 46·8 per cent of the former class of divorces and 26 per cent of the latter. A reason suggested for this is that the children are usually assigned by the court to the mothers, and to her, therefore, divorce does not imply separation from her

children, while to the husband it involves a severance of the parental as well as the marital relation.

In England there were 284 divorces in 1902, as compared with 177 in 1901. In Germany, at the same time, there were about 10,000, annually, and in France 21,939, with a tendency towards a rapid increase. Among the Japanese there are about 100,000 divorces per annum. It is estimated that about fifty per cent of divorced couples have children, and it is urged "that consideration for the children of divorced people should be a first concern in stimulating restrictive legislation." It has been stated that three-quarters of the boys in two reformatories, one in Ohio and one in Illinois, come from families broken up by death or divorce, "mainly by divorce."

Now, these are the statistics that I have collected; I trust I have not wearied the House in reading them. I would ask any fair-minded member of this House if such a statement as I have given is not most significant. Are not these statistics the most palpable evidence that there is, to use the classical expression, "something rotten in the state of Denmark"? Sir, we are engaged in building up to the best of our ability this young country of ours. Canada takes her ideals from Great Britain, from France, from the United States. Is it not our duty to see to it that the moral foundations of our young country be made secure? And how can we make these foundations secure, nay, eternal, if not by first preserving the home and the sanctity of marriage?

Notwithstanding what has been said by some hon. members, I am optimistic as to the conditions that will face this country after the war. I believe that we shall receive millions of immigrants from the various countries of the world. We shall receive many from the Western States of America; we shall receive, and will welcome, many from the British Islands. Many will come from other parts of Europe, and I regret to say that among these will be some from those countries, enumerated by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), where divorce procedure is facilitated.

I freely grant that we can profit largely by the experiences of the countries of origin of our coming immigrants; permit me to say that we may benefit also by the gross errors of those countries. The compiler of this bulletin says, speaking of the United States:

> Apparently the divorce rate, like the velocity of a falling body, is constantly increasing, and it is impossible to determine statistically from available data just what the results would be if the rate reached at any particular time remained constant. In other words, no statistics bearing on this question of the duration of marriages terminated by divorce have been obtained that accurately represent present conditions or conditions at any particular period; for the conditions are not static, but dynamic.

If the velocity of the divorce race is constantly increasing in the United States, I say it is our duty as Canadian legislators not to imitate the legislation under which the immigrants coming to our country from the United States have lived; it is our duty not to provide that these immigrants shall find in Canada statutory provisions in this respect similar to those in force in the Western States. If ever the adage " let well enough alone " was true, it is in regard to this matter. If you facilitate the procedure—and the motion of my hon. friend aims to facilitate it—you facilitate the causes. I say again that the greater facilities for divorce, the larger the number of divorces; more homes will be broken up, and the continuity of parental authority will be shattered. The welfare of the nation depends on the home; if you loosen the home ties, the welfare of the nation will be enormously affected.

The civil law of some provinces allows divorce a vinculo, as was stated by my hon. friend. The church law, on the contrary—when I say " church law " I do not refer to the law of one particular church; it is the law of the Anglican Church as well—allows divorce a mensa et thoro, which is the old term for separation. As I stated a moment ago, I do not wish to be dogmatic in this matter, but I say that I prefer the law of the church, whether it be the Roman Catholic Church or the Anglican Church; whether it be the law extolled by the best minds in the Protestant as well as in the Catholic world; I accept the view which condemns divorce as a violation of natural law. Husband and wife are parents of the same child, and the natural relationship of each to the child inevitably produces, as between husband and wife, a natural relationship one to the other. No decree of a court or no Act of Parliament can undo that relationship. If marriage is temporary and ephemeral, parentship is temporary and ephemeral. If the child is educated to regard parentship as a thing which can be set aside with the help of certain legal formalities, the whole structure on which our society rests will be undermined; if we

facilitate the procedure for obtaining divorce in any of the provinces or in this Parliament, the fundamental element of citizenship will be gone. Marriage does not become invalid because of unhappiness. The plea that incompatibility of temperament and consequent misery should justify divorce is a delusion. On that principle, Mr. Speaker, children who are gravely unsatisfactory in some way or another would not be regarded as the children of their parents. The parties to a marriage possess free will, and cannot rid themselves of the responsibility of that power. Divorce at best is an appeal to sentiment rather than to reason.

My hon. friend spoke of the hard cases. Well, I admit that there are hard cases which excite our sympathy. But do we legalize theft because we have sympathy for the man who steals a loaf of bread to feed his famished family. If we did, Mr. Speaker, we would seriously affect the whole standard of morality and produce greater unhappiness than that produced by the original causes. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that the most enlightened, the most civilized countries had made laws on divorce. I will not speak of the countries which form part of our Empire, but I may take the case of France. In France, until the French revolution, the question of marriage was treated as it was treated in England before the Reformation; that is to say, it was left entirely to the ecclesiastical courts. At the time of the French revolution divorce was made permissible by any courts of the land. Soon afterwards the French people, sobered by what is known in history as the Great Terror, reverted to the old ecclesiastical law, and under the Restoration, under the Second Empire, and under the Third Republic, although there was a gulf between the old state church and the new regime, the only remedy given under the civil code as against cruelty, and adultery, was the separation a mensa et thoro; divorce was not permissible by the courts of the land. In 1884 Senator Naquet introduced his divorce law and it was passed. But, Sir, since 1884 the divorces so frequently and so lavishly decreed by the courts in France have been viewed with alarm and apprehension not only by the church people but by the Protestants—because there are a large number of Protestants in France—and by the larger number of free thinkers. And in view of the fact that there has been a falling off in the birth rate of France, owing, no doubt, to the facilities for obtaining divorces, I would not be surprised if, when the war is over, the France of to-day reverted to the old system and authorized the courts to grant only the separation a mensa et thoro, and not the breaking of the matrimonial tie. Not alone the Catholics in France, but the Protestants and the free thinkers are of the opinion that this should be done. But that is true not of France alone. Let me take the evidence given by the great writer Lecky in his admirable book on Liberty and Democracy, vol. 2, page 158. Lecky, who was not a Catholic, but a free thinker, as I gather from his writings, said:

> The stability of the family is more essential than any other single element to the moral, social, and even political well-being of a nation. It is of vital importance to the education of the young. It is the special seed plot and condition of the best virtues of the community; the foundation stone on which the whole social system must rest. Few greater misfortunes can happen to a nation than that the domestic virtues should have ceased to be prized; that family life, with all its momentous interests, should become the sport of passion and of caprice.

That was the view held by one of the foremost writers of the last century. But, Sir, free thinkers and churchmen unite in denouncing the abuses brought about by divorce. Gladstone was a great churchman I shall be pardoned if, after having quoted from Lecky, I give the opinion of Gladstone. In 1857, when the Divorce Act was being considered by the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone used the following language:

> A time may come when society cannot bear the strictness of the Christian law, and will reject the drill that is necessary to make the soldier. It will then doubtless largely fall back upon that lower conception of marriage, which treats it as a purely civil contract between individuals. If we are not strong enough to hold the lower portion of society up to Christianity let us not be mad enough to drag the very rites of Christianity down to the lowered and lowering level of society. Let the salt of the earth still keep its savour, and the darkness of the body be illumined, as far as it may, by the eye that still wakes within it.

I could multiply quotations from the most distinguished churchmen of the Protestant churches on this same question, but it would be simply taking up the time of the House. In conclusion I say that it is not from a sectarian point of view that I rise this afternoon to oppose the motion so ably presented by my hon. friend from East Hastings. It is not from a sectarian point of view but from

a Canadian and a national point of view. If the procedure to obtain divorce were facilitated as it is the aim of this motion that it should be, the number of divorces would increase as it has increased in the neighbouring republic where, unfortunately, the matrimonial tie has become a mockery. The number of divorces would increase and the very foundations of our society would be shattered. In this country, where immigrants will be coming in large numbers after the close of the war, it would be bad policy to advertise ourselves as being ready to afford the facilities which unfortunately many of these immigrants have enjoyed in their country of origin.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker I am one of those who believe that divorce as administered in the United States has been a great curse to both the domestic and social life of that country. I have been very much impressed by the speech just delivered by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Whether I act from conscientious scruples or from the views which my church takes on divorce, whether I am against divorce or not, we meet with the condition in this country that divorce is granted, and so I, under our civil laws, come to the same conclusion as my hon. friend from Hastings: that some reform is necessary in this country in the manner of divorce procedure. I do not, however, reach that conclusion on the same premises or on the same grounds as does my hon. friend.

I reach that conclusion not because the present facilities for obtaining divorce in this country are cumbersome, nor because they are expensive; I reach that conclusion, and in this I agree with my hon. friend from Hastings, because the procedure towards obtaining divorce is absurd. My hon. friend from Hastings has pictured the facility with which rich men in this country can obtain divorce, as compared with the outlawing, so to speak, of the poor man or poor woman who has proper grounds for obtaining divorce, but who has not the money. Of course, we meet with these conditions in every walk of life; we meet with them in our courts. How often do we meet persons in this country who have good cases to take before the courts and who could legally establish their rights, but who have not the money to fee counsel to argue their cases in the courts. From that point of view, I do not think that my hon. friend from Hastings has made a very strong case.

But, Sir, let us look for a moment at the methods by which divorces are obtained—apart from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, in the provinces whose inhabitants must come to this Parliament to obtain divorce. They go to the Senate; they make application by advertising in the Royal Gazette for six months, which is absurd; a Bill is introduced in the Senate, it is referred to a small Committee of the Senate which takes the evidence. I am not finding fault with the ability of the members of the Senate Committee to deal with any cause, and, I may say that, in my opinion, the chairman of that committee is one of the very ablest lawyers in Canada; a man well qualified to judge of what is, and what is not evidence. This small Committee of the Senate hears the evidence, passes it up to the Senate, and the evidence is printed. The Senate passes upon it, and then the evidence comes here. How many hon. members of this House ever take the trouble to read that evidence, to see whether or not, in their estimation, as lawyers, or as citizens not of that avocation, the evidence is sufficient to justify the granting of divorce? I say the proceeding is absurd. We vote on divorces in this House without knowing what we are voting on, and I believe that apart from the Senate Committee which hears the evidence, the Upper House is in the same position as we are.

I may point out that in the session of 1912 I took the trouble to read over the evidence in a divorce case which came from the Senate. I am a lawyer, and know something about the rules of evidence; I can distinguish fairly well what is and what is not evidence, and I came to the conclusion that, on the understanding that there was only one reason for which this Parliament can grant divorce, there was absolutely no evidence in that case which would entitle the applicant to divorce. I took the matter up in Committee of the Whole, and I got such support from the other members of this House that the Bill was thrown out. One would think that the counsel who had charge of that case, and who was paid for looking after it in the Senate would have undertaken to get all the evidence necessary to prove his case before the Senate Committee, but in the opinion of this House he did not do so. The following year he came back with an overwhelming

abundance of evidence; the application was not opposed, and I am given to understand that there was a mutual understanding between the parties that there should be no effort to oppose the divorce. That is only one instance, and I believe that Bills of divorce, or of relief, or whatever you care to call them, pass through this Parliament, and are granted by this Parliament every session where there is no evidence to support. That is the reason I agree with my hon. friend from Hastings that there should be some reform.

I believe, Sir, that this Parliament is not a proper tribunal to try divorce cases, for the reason that only a very small proportion of the members of this Parliament comes face to face, or in direct communication with the persons who seek divorce, and give their evidence. I take the ground that a judge who hears the evidence is the person qualified to grant the application or not as he deems fit. I take the stand that only one tribunal in this country is capable—I will use the word capable—of hearing and passing upon divorce cases, and that tribunal is to be found in our courts. I believe that in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we have the very best tribunals in Canada for hearing and trying divorce cases. This Parliament is composed of men of different walks of life. It is composed, it is true, of some lawyers, and it is no reflection on the other members of the House, or of Parliament, to say that a lawyer is trained to understand what is evidence, and that the other members of Parliament are not so trained. While they have other merits far superior to those possessed by the lawyers in this Chamber or in the Senate, they have not the merit which enables them to pass upon such matters. In the province of Nova Scotia we have a divorce court, and it does not, as my hon. friend from Rouville seemed to think, if I understood him rightly, furnish a greater facility for obtaining divorce than does this Parliament. I think, perhaps, it has the contrary effect, because I believe there are divorces granted by this Parliament which no judge in the country would grant if the cases came before him. So I say that, if this Parliament did undertake to reform the procedure of divorce, by handing over to the courts of Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the jurisdiction for granting divorce, it would not be giving easier facilities for obtaining divorce, but it would be safeguarding the marriage tie in this country to a very great extent indeed. That is my personal view. While, from conscientious scruples I am opposed to divorce, we have a condition in this country to deal with, and to meet that condition we should hand over the jurisdiction of trying divorce cases to the tribunals which are competent to handle them. I am not going to develop this argument any further, but I do say that I disagree with my hon. friend from Rouville when he says that the effect of reform in the way of giving jurisdiction to the courts would be to create easier facilities for obtaining divorce. My hon. friend from Rouville says that it might enlarge the grounds on which divorce is granted, but I do not understand the motion of the hon. member for Hastings to contemplate any such enlargement; I do not understand him to ask that other grounds for divorce should be added.

I do not so understand it and I listened to him very carefully. So, I think this House will be well advised, if it does take into consideration the motion of my hon. friend from East Hastings, if it does take away jurisdiction from this Parliament to hear evidence and pass upon divorce, and if it hands that jurisdiction over to the courts of those provinces which at present have not that jurisdiction.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty, as the representative of a constituency in Quebec, to declare that it is creditable that every Roman Catholic member and senator since Confederation has had to vote, on principle, against divorce. No divorce Bill has ever passed this House, or the Senate, except "on division," and when I had the honour of occupying your Chair, Mr. Speaker, it was always my duty to declare that a divorce Bill passed "on division." Fifty members of this House are therefore debarred from voting on the merits of any of these petitions for divorce coming before it, and we are often asked not to oppose a divorce, or not to go to the committee, and allow a petition to go through. Therefore, one-quarter of this Parliament is debarred from dealing with this question at all.

I do not want to enter into the merits of this question of divorce. I am opposed to divorce on principle. I think that, far from extending the facilities for granting divorces, we should do everything to keep the divorce evil out of Canada. At Confederation, if divorce was recognized at all by the Dominion Parliament, it was prob-

ably because divorce courts were then in existence in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. They were not then in existence in Ontario, and they never will be in Quebec. But, whether they shall continue to exist or not, here or there, why we should grant greater facilities is something I cannot understand. There is no practical need of keeping up the custom of granting divorces. As far as Quebec is concerned, I do not believe any man or woman of my faith has ever applied to the Dominion Parliament for a divorce. The Roman Catholic church would not sanction it, and any person making application would be beyond the pale of the church.

I remember the late member for Niagara (Mr. Lancaster), an Anglican, making a very forcible speech in this House against divorce. Divorce appears to be one of the greatest curses in the United States to-day. Cardinal Gibbons, and a great many of the leading men in the United States, have declared against divorce. The fact that the principle has extended throughout the world is no argument in its favour. If Italy and Spain have been able to debar divorce it is to their credit. If you attack the home, you weaken the family tie, and you undermine the foundation of the state. The one great basic institution in this country is the home, and once the home is destroyed the state is of little account. I have heard distinguished lawyers in this House say that divorces have been granted on evidence on which a cat would not be hanged, and the way in which some divorce cases which I do not care to mention—have been dealt with, and are dealt with year after year, is almost a parody on justice. If the courts were to try causes as this Parliament has handled divorce cases, it would be nothing more nor less than a parody on justice. I have never given a vote for divorce, and I hope, so long as I am a member of this House, that I will do all I can to make divorce as difficult as possible to obtain. I believe that in so doing I am fulfilling the most sacred duty that a representative of the people has imposed upon him, and that is to do what he can to protect the home against an encroachment of this kind.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made in the House that Prince Edward Island has a divorce court. We have a statute in Prince Edward Island which provides that any person who wants a divorce must petition the Lieutenant-Governor. The expression " lieutenant-governor " has been interpreted to mean the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has never authorized a court to hear divorce cases. As far as I know there has never been a divorce granted in Prince Edward Island, although the statute there provides that the lieutenant-governor may grant a fiat to the chief justice of the Supreme Court to try a divorce case. The lieutenant-governors of Prince Edward Island have always refused to grant a fiat so that in Prince Edward Island we have practically no divorce court. I do not know whether the same condition prevails in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and British Columbia, but, in Prince Edward Island that statute has never been availed of and we have never had any divorces in that province. Any person who has sought a divorce, and I believe there has only been one, has had to come before the Senate Committee at great expense. The expense of a divorce to an applicant from that province would, I believe, be something like $600 or $1,000. I believe that my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) is trying to remedy that condition and to cut down the expense. The Senate is simply a court for the rich man, and the poor man has no show. If the principle of divorce is one which should prevail in this country there should be the same remedy given to all classes. I am not going to express any opinion as to the right of any person to go before any court to get a divorce, but as we have the law, surely something should be done to simplify it, and to give equal rights all our citizens.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM THOBURN (North Lanark): Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the discussion which took place this afternoon on divorce, particularly as I am one of the sub-committee of the Commons that was appointed to attend the Senate Committee meetings on divorce. I am not quite sure whether the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) approves of it or not. Personally, I think it was a step in the right direction. Before the sub-committee was appointed, the usual procedure was for the evidence to be taken before the Senate Committee; it was then printed, and circulated amongst the members of the Private Bills Committee and

the members of the House of Commons. Very few of these gentlemen took the pains to read the evidence, and the consequence was that when the Bill came up little attention was paid to it. For that reason, I think the appointing of the sub-committee was a step in the right direction.

I heartily agree with the hon. member for East Hastings that there should be some improvement in our system of divorce. But how to go about it is a problem; and as far as I could learn, the hon. member himself did not offer any solution. I would have wished that he had gone a little further in his elucidation of the subject. From my experience I have no hesitation in saying that the power of granting divorces should be removed altogether from the Parliament of Canada, and placed in the law courts. To that extent, I agree with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). A very, very delicate question was touched on this afternoon in connection with church denominations. I confess, as a member of the sub-committee, that I was somewhat surprised when I was told that gentlemen of a certain religious persuasion were entirely opposed to granting divorce, on account of the rules of their church. It has been stated here this afternoon that more than one denomination is opposed to divorce, and that seems to me to open up a very serious question. If I understand the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) aright, I think his statement was to the effect that in certain cases he would rather obey the laws of his church than the laws of Canada. If I have misquoted him, perhaps he will correct me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I said that on the question of divorce I preferred to follow the judgments of the ecclesiastical courts rather than the judgments of the civil courts.

Mr. THOBURN: If that practice became general, where would it land the people of this country? If one denomination has a right to make laws for its members, so has every denomination in the Dominion, and if the members of these different denominations should prefer to obey the laws of their own church rather than the laws of Canada, a very serious state of affairs would develop. That is a question that might be debated in this House for several weeks, and it is one which might cause a tremendous upheaval. It does seem to me that the laws of Canada should have precedence over the laws of any church.

I wish to give some reasons why I think the power of granting divorces should be taken from Parliament and vested in the law courts of Canada. As the hon. member for Cape Breton said, there are very few members of this House who know the procedure of a divorce suit in Parliament. And let me tell the hon. member for East Hastings that it is not so much a question of cost. Let him reduce the expense of divorce proceedings here to almost any price he pleases, and still there will be danger of injustice as the court is constituted. Here is the procedure, as well as I can remember it. The case goes before the Senate Chamber and it is then relegated to the Senate Committee on Divorce. The hon. member for Cape Breton did not agree with the verdicts given by that committee. That committee is composed of eleven members, if I recollect aright, and among these are some of the brightest minds of the Senate, including some of the ablest lawyers to be found in this country. And, from my experience, I would go so far as to make this suggestion which the hon. member for East Hastings may think it worth while to consider: If divorce is to remain with this Parliament, then let the proceedings end with the Senate Divorce Committee. When the divorce Bill is brought before this House it is relegated to the Private Bills Committee, and before the subcommittee was appointed, the Private Bills Committee took the evidence in these cases as read, and the same might almost be said when the matter came before the House of Commons. I would like to know how many members of this House ever read the evidence in divorce cases before giving their vote, if they were called upon to vote. I have a vivid and enduring recollection of one case that came before this House last session, and which had passed the Senate Committee unanimously. Let me tell hon. members that for a divorce Bill to pass that committee the evidence has to be conclusive beyond the shadow of a doubt. This case came before the Private Bills Committee of this House and was there argued pro and con to the best of the ability of those who took part, with the result that the Bill was defeated by a majority of one. The evidence was printed, and the case was considered such a miscarriage of justice that, if I remember well, it was submitted to the Prime Minister, and he voted with others to refer it back to the Private

Bills Committee. Here is where comes in the nefarious work of which I complain, and that is a strong word, but the occasion requires strong words. When it was found that the case had to go back to the Private Bills Committee outside influence was brought in and wire-pulling engaged in. If the case had been before a bench of judges the parties would never have dared to act as they did on that occasion. I stood at the door of the corridor leading to room 16, and saw an individual standing outside that door, button-holing the members as they came out, and using his influence to get them to vote against the applicant for divorce, and this was an individual whose name was actually mentioned as one of the parties implicated. That is why I say it was a nefarious transaction. The result was that when the Bill was sent back to the Private Bills Committee, owing to the influence that had been brought to bear on some of the members, and because they had heard only one side of the question, the Bill was defeated. There were only a certain few members who were familiar with the evidence in the case, but as a result of the canvassing that was done by that individual the Bill was lost. Were the printed evidence submitted to any court of justice in Canada that decision would be reversed.

Reference was made here this afternoon to the law courts and divorce laws of the United States. It does not follow that because divorce procedure in the United States is lax that it should be lax in Canada. We know that there are many laws of the United States the enforcement of which seems to us to be lax. I have too much faith in the judiciary of Canada to be in the least afraid of the results of their decisions if suits for divorce were referred to them. There would be no chance in the world that resort would be had to such tactics as I have spoken of here to-night.

I have given, as plainly as I possibly could, my reasons, based upon personal experience, for holding that divorce cases should be removed from the Parliament of Canada and delegated to the law courts, presided over by at least three judges. I feel satisfied that if this plan were adopted, justice would be done to all persons concerned, and the expense would be small compared with what it is at the present time.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): We certainly have to thank the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) for having given occasion to the very interesting debate which we have been privileged to listen to this afternoon and evening. In the very eloquent speech with which he supported his resolution, the hon. gentleman evinced a very strong desire to make quite clear the things that he was not asking for, and he insisted that he was not asking for any addition to what he described as the existing causes for divorce. I do not think it could be suggested that his resolution looked to legislation increasing the existing causes of divorce that the law may now know, or creating any causes for divorce if the law now knows none. By his motion he further insisted that he did not ask for a transference to the courts of this country of the jurisdiction over questions of divorce, or the creation of courts for the purpose of hearing such cases. His motion did not look to the termination of the present procedure under which divorces are granted by Parliament. Let us look at the words of the motion:

> The procedure under which divorces are granted by Parliament, and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof, are so unsatisfactory, besides being prohibitive to the great majority of the people of Canada, that the same should be taken into immediate consideration by the Government during the present session, with a view to reform.

I am quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's interpretation of his resolution, but I do submit that I may be excused for understanding it as calling for the substitution of some other procedure for that under which divorces are granted by Parliament, and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof. There are two things which he declared to be unsatisfactory, and I read them as meaning that the procedure by means of Acts of Parliament, and the expense that it entails, are so unsatisfactory that some remedy ought to be applied. I take from what he has said that what is intended to be conveyed by the motion is that it is the manner in which the procedure is carried out that he finds unsatisfactory. If in that regard I do not quite grasp my hon. friend's meaning, I should be glad to be corrected, because I have no doubt that he will give me credit for desiring to be perfectly fair, and desiring to understand his motion as he intended it to be understood.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I certainly thought I had so worded my resolution as to convey the meaning that any improvement that could be made upon the present system would be desirable. That improvement

might be effected by proedure somewhat similar to the existing procedure, or by referring the matter to the courts of the provinces, or by establishing a special court for the purpose

Mr. DOHERTY: Then I may conclude that I was at least half right in my understanding. I think it is important that we should start out with a clear understanding of what is covered by the motion and what is sought to be obtained by it; because very much turns upon that. I understand now that the hon gentleman is looking for a remedy that may consist in doing away entirely with the system of the granting of divorces by a legislative Act of this Parliament, and in the establishment of courts that shall have jurisdiction to grant those divorces Failing that, he would have some improvement in the manner in which the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada carry on their procedure in connection with such Acts as may be passed granting relief to persons who seek to be released from their marital obligations. Very much of the argument of the hon. gentleman, as I apprehended it,—this view was subsequently expressed by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) and strongly supported by the hon. gentleman who sits to my right (Mr. Thoburn)—would lead to the conclusion that the proper action was the substitution of the courts of the country for Parliament, whether existing courts, or courts created for the purpose, I do not understand that he made any distinction in that regard. He pointed out, also, as constituting grievances or giving rise to injustices, certain rules of the Senate laying down requirements from persons applying for acts granting them release from their marital obligations. As I understand it, the hon. gentleman did not desire to discuss the matter of divorce as an abstract question; he proceeded upon the assumption that there already existed a system under which divorces were granted, and, starting from that assumption, he limited himself to a consideration of the question of how the method by which that was done might be improved

In dealing with the subject the hon. gentleman covered a very wide field; a field wider, perhaps than was absolutely necessary to his purpose, which consisted simply in pointing out the defects in the method of procedure now followed by the Houses of this Parliament. I am not disposed to complain of that, however, because it gave us the advantage of listening to a very learned, a very interesting, a very eloquently, and at the same time a fairly and moderately set forth exposition of the views that have been entertained and the doctrines laid down by different churches at different periods. I do not understand that that has any very direct bearing upon this question of procedure. It was, as I have said, most interesting, and it certainly has a bearing on the wider question that may be said to lie behind this question of procedure, namely, the great wide question as to whether we ought to have legislation providing for divorce, and what, if we had such legislation, should be the causes that would justify divorce, and, how such legislation should be administered; how the laws in which that legislation might be embodied should be enforced. In dealing with that subject the hon. member referred to what had been in particular the teaching of the Catholic Church as it was prior to the Reformation, and as I think it has been since; and he made very clear the distinction between certain procedures which, in accordance with the doctrines of that church, were and are recognized as leading to what he described as the nullification of marriages, and what we know as divorce.

I think the hon. gentleman made fairly clear to us that, under the teaching of the Catholic Church, the possibility of divorce—which I understand to be the dissolution of a validly contracted marriage, dissolution so complete as to destroy any link binding the two consorts and leave them both thereafter as perfectly free to marry as if they had never contracted a previous marriage—was denied. He went on to point out, in answer, I think, to an observation made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), that, on the other hand, there were causes which gave rise to what he called the nullification of marriage; that is to say, causes which constituted impediments to the valid contracting of a marriage and which, though they existed were ascertained only after the celebration of the marriage, led to a decree of nullity of such marriage. He spoke of it as the nullification of those marriages. I think it would be more correct to describe it as a declaration that such marriages had always been null. The distinction between the divorce and the declaration of nullity being, that the divorce deals with a recognized

validly existing marriage and dissolves it, whereas the declaration of nullity rests upon different causes which were enumerated, and simply establish the fact that at the time of the entering into the marriage a cause existed which prevented its being validly entered into and, therefore, that there had been no marriage. In this connection the hon. gentleman referred to one case in particular that he thought afforded an extraordinary illustration of how that might work out; and he also gave us to understand that in the administration of that system there was liable to result, and in fact did result, the same wrong or injustice which he claims exists under the present system, whereby the rich were enabled to have a remedy and the poor were deprived of it. I am not familiar with the particular case which he cites, and, of course, I presume that no one would undertake to deny that in the determination of the numerous cases which arose in the application of that law, there may have been instances of very erroneous decisions of which the case to which the hon. member refers may possibly have been one. I am not interested to contend here that there never were any incorrect decisions, nor, indeed, am I in a position to say that that particular decision was not in itself correct, because, if I followed his statement of the facts, it might be a perfectly correct decision if it were considered, as I believe at certain times it was considered, that even the illegitimate connection between two people created or gave rise to an affiinity, and it might be that that affinity constituted an impediment. However, I am not interested to go into that question. It may be perhaps assumed that there was a very erroneous decision or, if it were in accordance with the law, that that law worked out to very undesirable results and that a question of expense might arise under that system, the rich man having opportunity and the poor man not. I am not in a position to speak as to circumstances in those very far distant days, but I might point out that so far as those actions of nullity are concerned, they still continue to the present day, and we have them in our province of Quebec under the provisions of our civil code. I am not aware that there is any special or particular expense attached to such an action. My personal experience is that the few cases I happen to know of that kind were between very poor people, and they found no greater obstacle in their way in having that law applied than in having any other law applied. I make these observations because I thought it desirable to,—I would not say to correct, but to make perfectly clear some things in connection with that system, which perhaps did not come out as clearly as they might from the statement of the hon. member. In saying that I do not wish at all to suggest that he was not intending to give us a perfectly fair statement, or that his statement was not perfectly fair in every respect.

I come to this motion in so far as it may be said to involve a motion calling for action looking to the substitution of the courts of justice in the exercise of their judicial functions, for this Parliament in the exercise of its legislative powers, in dealing with applications, or petitions, of persons who desire to be relieved from their marital obligations. When this matter was before the House some few years ago on the motion of the hon. gentleman, I took occasion then to express my views on the abstract question of whether we should have divorce legislation or not, and I do not purpose to repeat them now. No good purpose would be served by my doing so; for what they are worth they are on record. Nor do I understand that the question arises here, or calls for decision upon this present motion, whether or not we ought to have such substantive legislation. The hon. member limits himself to the question of procedure. My hon. friend said in support of his position, that as a matter of procedure a court could be better trusted to deal with petitions for divorce than can be these Houses of Parliament. One thing, however, I think, must be conceded.

That is, that before any court can deal with a divorce proceeding there must be in existence a law recognizing divorce, and providing causes of divorce, a law which that court can administer and enforce. It cannot be denied that if it be true that in any part of this country there is no law giving to a party the right of divorce for any cause whatsoever, it would be a vain proceeding merely to create a court, or to give to an existing court in each part of the country jurisdiction to decide upon questions of divorce, because the court to which that jurisdiction would be given, or the court that might be so created, would find itself face to face with no law which it could administer. There would be no ground on which a party could come before that court saying: under the law I am entitled to this remedy.

I do not think it can be denied that in all the provinces of this country, save those

which had a divorce law and divorce courts when they came into Confederation, there is no substantive law providing for divorce. The law in these provinces does not know divorce, and if to-morrow we should pass a law saying that the courts in these provinces should have jurisdiction in divorce cases, we would be no further advanced than we are at this moment in the direction in which we are asked to go. Take for instance the province of Quebec, where the whole law on the subject consists in the one statement of the Code: that marriage is indissoluble except by death. Give jurisdiction to the courts there to hear divorce cases, and what could they do but say that there can be no divorce, because the law is that marriage is indissoluble except by death.

Mr. PROULX: Would not the law be passed by this Parliament?

Mr. DOHERTY: What I am pointing out is that if we limited ourselves to saying that the courts should have jurisdiction in divorce cases, we would not produce any result. It would be necessary for us to go further and pass a law establishing divorce in those provinces in which such a law is unknown at present.

Mr. NORTHRUP: Does the hon. minister mean to say, that if this House were to pass a law conferring jurisdiction in regard to divorce, say on the Supreme Court of the province of Ontario, the judges of that court could not give a decree of divorce whenever they saw fit.

Mr. DOHERTY: If we limit ourselves to saying that the courts of the province of Ontario should have jurisdiction in divorce cases, the duty of the judges would be to exercise their jurisdiction in accordance with the law in force in the province, determining when a man was entitled to divorce. I would ask the hon. gentleman if there is any law in force in Ontario to-day determining when a man is entitled to divorce.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I would not venture to place my opinion against that of the learned Minister of Justice, but Lord Campbell when Chancellor of England said most distinctly that there was such a law. I will quote his statement later.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am surprised at the statement that Lord Campbell said so. I would be interested to know under what circumstances and conditions the question came before Lord Campbell. Will the hon. member be good enough to quote me Lord Campbell's opinion now?

Mr. NORTHRUP: Certainly. The point is this: in England, up to the year 1857, the law was exactly the same as it is to-day in Canada. In order to obtain divorce one had to go to Parliament, just as in Canada the parties have to go to Parliament. That procedure was described by Lord Campbell, when the report was brought in to change it and to give jurisdiction to the courts instead of to Parliament——

Mr. MURPHY: What year was that.

Mr. NORTHRUP: 1850. Lord Campbell said:

> By these means the right to obtain a divorce à vinculo was definitely established. It was established, however, in the rudest—

that was by Parliament, as we have it to-day.

> —and most inconvenient manner; for the proceeding was a judicial one by a legislative process, and it had all the inconveniences which necessarily result from the discussion of such a question in a mixed and popular assembly.

In England then the practice, or procedure was as we have it here. A commission was appointed to consider the matter, and the jurisdiction was transferred to the courts. On page 13 of the report of that Commission I find:

> Lord Campbell who was chairman of the Commission of 1850, stated in the House of Lords that the object of the Commissioners was not to alter the law—

So there was a law.

> —but the procedure by which the law was carried into effect.

For fifty years we have had the Senate making general rules by which, if you wish divorce, you must advertise, pay your money, and bring your witnesses to the Senate Committee. We have that law in Ontario, just as in England they used to get divorce at Westminster.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the actual practice as regards divorce before the courts of Ontario?

Mr. NORTHRUP: No court in Ontario has jurisdiction in regard to divorce, but suppose this House were to give the Supreme Court of Ontario such jurisdiction, I submit that it would have jurisdiction to grant divorce. Although it is the practice and custom to-day to grant divorce only on the ground of adultery, we have just as much right, if we cared to exercise it, to pass a law providing that a woman who did

not like the colour of her husband's hair should be entitled to divorce.

Mr. PROULX: By the British North America Act, jurisdiction in regard to marriage and divorce is delegated to this Parliament.

Mr. DOHERTY: The first statement as cited by my hon. friend is:

> From the end of the 17th century, Acts of Parliament dissolving marriage became frequent.
>
> The Commissioners appointed to inquire into the law of divorce in 1850, in the 26th paragraph of their report state as follows:—By these means—

That is, by Acts of Parliament, legislative enactments, in each particular case.

> —the right to obtain a divorce a vinculo was definitely established.

I never disputed that. But each Act of Parliament is a law for each case and for no other, and the right to obtain a divorce a vinculo was definitely established by means of such Acts.

Mr. MURPHY: Just as it is here now.

Mr. DOHERTY: Just as it is here now. He says:

> It was established, however, in the rudest and most inconvenient manner; for the proceeding was a judicial one by a legislative process, and it had all the inconveniences which necessarily result from the discussion of such a question in a mixed and popular assembly.

That I do not dispute at all, but why, in England, did they then need for each particular person a legislative enactment? It was because by the general law this person had no right to a divorce. Parliament established for itself, I presume, as we have done here, a certain practice whereby, if persons established certain facts, it would enact a special law for those particular persons.

> Lord Campbell, who was chairman of the commission in 1850, stated in the House of Lords that the object of the commissioners was not to alter the law but the procedure, by which the law was carried into effect.

Mr. NORTHRUP: There was "the law."

Mr. DOHERTY: No doubt Lord Campbell used the words "the law," but when they came to carry into effect what Lord Campbell said, what did they do? They did not say that a court of justice shall have jurisdiction to hear divorce cases, and then stop there; they realized what I am contending for, that they must enact a substantive law, and they did it in that very Act of 1858. The Act does not simply say to the courts: You shall have jurisdiction in divorce cases, but the Act goes on to say: Adultery by the wife—I am not undertaking to give the exact words, but the effect—shall be a sufficient cause; adultery by the husband, accompanied by cruelty, shall be a sufficient cause, and it goes on further to say to these courts that, even if adultery is proved, you shall not, in particular cases where there is guilt on the part of the complainant, grant a decree. Lord Campbell says, we do not want to change the law. But, when Lord Campbell said that, it is perfectly plain that he did not make the law of England. Lord Campbell, in speaking about the report of the committee, said that they did not want to change the law but the manner in which it was applied. It might as well be argued that because my hon. friend is saying to-day that he does not want to change the law, but only the procedure, he thereby establishes that there was a substantive law in this country. There was the established practice of Parliament to recognize the right to a divorce in particular cases, and to legislatively enact when certain things were proved granting this right to the persons proving them. That is the thing that the commissioners describe. I do not quite understand whether Lord Campbell is responsible for the language, but he did set forth in his report the means by which the right was established; that is to say, by a legislative enactment in each particular case. I have only to say, with all respect, that I have yet to learn that the expression of a lawyer, no matter how great his distinction may be, in Parliament or in a report such as we are dealing with, makes the law.

9 p.m.

I confess that it is a matter of some surprise—and I have read a good many books on this subject—to have it suggested to me that prior to 1857 there was a law in England establishing a right to divorce, and fixing the causes for which it might be determined. I have not before me the books, but I have taken occasion, within the last few days, to read several of the leading authors on the subject. I have a quotation here from Mr. Gemmill, who was a very distinguished lawyer in this province, and who had a very large practice in connection with divorce proceedings. He states in his work on the subject:

> As regards divorces which rescinded the marriage contract, namely, divorces a vinculo, strictly speaking they were unknown in England. By the law of England that contract was indissoluble, and when once it had been constituted in a legal manner there were no means of putting an end to it in any of the courts, and in order to have the marriage dis-

solved Parliament stepped in to provide a special remedy by passing a particular law in favour of those who could make out a case which would warrant its interference.

Again, at page 13, it is declared:

Divorce a vinculo, or a dissolution of a lawful marriage was not, down to 1858, obtainable in any court of law, but only by a special Act of the Legislature.

At page 12 he refers to the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts. With all deference, I cannot accept the proposition that because Lord Campbell used the words "the law," read with the context it establishes that a law existed in England.

We all know how laws are made. I understand that my hon. friend does not dispute that, by the common law and up to the statute of 1858, marriage was indissoluble in England. Until the statute of 1858 you have no substantive law determining under the general law the right of divorce, and prescribing causes that give rise to that right. I venture to say that in the province of Ontario, neither under the common law as it existed in 1792, nor under any statute subsequently enacted by the original province of Upper Canada, or the old province of Canada—and, of course, there could be none by the province of Ontario—notwithstanding the citation which has been made to me—is there any law which a divorce court, if you merely gave it jurisdiction, could proceed to enforce.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the hon. gentleman object if I ask him to return to an earlier observation? The minister was proceeding, in speaking of a hypothetical case, to say what the effect would be in the province of Quebec when he was interrupted. Was he about to proceed to say that you would have to establish the law in order to empower the court?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, I think you would have to establish the law and determine the court which would apply it. Certainly, whatever room for discussion there may be in regard to Ontario—and I feel fairly confident as to the ground upon which I stand even in that province—unquestionably, in the province of Quebec, if you did give jurisdiction, say, to the Superior Court of that province, to sit in divorce cases, they would sit there absolutely powerless in the face of the law which says that marriage is indissoluble, unless this House went further and enacted a substantive law of divorce. Then if I am right about Ontario I do not think it will be disputed that in the other provinces which have since become part of the Dominion having at the time no divorce courts the condition is the same—and there is no one of the five provinces not now having such courts in which such substantive law can be found, and where you would not have the same result.

I am not now arguing for or against a divorce court. I simply wish to point out what is involved in the proposition of referring these cases to a court. If it is to be of any use at all, this proposition involves the enactment of a substantive law. That being so, before we can determine whether to alter the procedure in the direction of transferring the jurisdiction to the courts, this House and this Parliament must make up its mind whether it is prepared to pass the legislation necessary to establish divorce in those provinces in which it is unknown to the existing law, and to determine the conditions on which it may be granted. I simply wish to point out what would have to be done to meet this motion, in so far as its purpose may be to bring about action transferring the determination of divorce cases to the courts. If I am right, then we can only get a practical result from that by enacting a substantive divorce law. If I am not right, the result of our enacting legislation conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts, the effect whereof would be to bring into active operation some divorce law—such as the hon. member contends exists, for instance, in the province of Ontario—which had been dormant and inoperative up to the present. Whether we should or should not do that involves the determination by this House of the attitude it desires to take, and the action which it is prepared to adopt in the way of divorce legislation, creating, in my view, the right to a divorce in provinces where it does not exist—that will certainly be necessary for Quebec—and making operative any such law that may exist in a dormant condition in any other province.

Having, as I think, made that clear, I desire simply to point out that in so far as this motion calls for the transference of the jurisdiction to the courts, it is calling for legislation—and it is calling for legislation this session—upon this matter of divorce, which will either introduce divorce in provinces where it is unknown to the law, or have the effect of rousing up and making operative some dormant law that may be in any of these provinces. After the evidence we have had during the

present discussion, and during the discussion of two years ago of the strong differences of opinion as to the desirability of creating or extending legislation of this kind, as well as by reason of what is known to all of us is a matter of public notoriety, it will, I think, be conceded there is a divided public opinion in Canada as to whether we should have divorce legislation of this kind.

Mr. THOBURN: What law governs the Senate Committee to-day in regard to divorce? Could not the same law apply to a court?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Senate Committee is governed by the rules it has laid down for itself, and it could revoke those rules to-morrow.

Mr. THOBURN: What gives them the exclusive jurisdiction over divorce?

Mr. DOHERTY: They have not the exclusive jursidiction. As I understand it, an Act that grants a divorce is a private Act, like any other private Act. The House as well as the Senate must enact it. The parties come here asking for it, just as they come with other private Bills when they want to get something that the general law of the country does not give them. And it is precisely because the general law of the country says: once you are married you can never marry again while your consort is alive, that when one wants to be relieved of the operation of that general law, he comes to the Parliament of Canada and asks for a law for himself; and each one of these petitioners goes away, where he succeeds, carrying with him a law that is a law for him—a law that takes him out of the operation of the general law. I am not here defending the granting of private legislation of that kind; I think the objections to it are perfectly obvious. But, it is well to understand what it is. It is a law for John Smith. I am not discussing whether there may or may not be reasons for doing that, but let us clearly grasp what it is that is being done. It is the exercise of the legisllative power, that is all. Parliament decides in each particular case. It will say to a particular individual: Yes, in view of what you have laid before us, we will give you a law for yourself; your marriage is dissolved. But marriage in general remains indissoluble, in all those provinces in which marriage is indissoluble, just as if that Act had never passed.

Mr. MARCIL Could the Dominion Parliament over-ride the Parliament of Quebec in that matter?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think so. The hon. gentleman will understand, however, that in giving opinions offhand in this way, one does so with a reservation as to further consideration of the matter. But I do not think there can be any doubt that this Parliament of Canada, having legislative authority to legislate as regards marriage and divorce—I am not talking now about the solemnization of marriage—I am not talking now about the formalities or ceremonies of marriage but marriage and divorce generally—can repeal pro tanto the legislation on that subject that may at present be in force in any particular province. The legislation in force in Quebec to-day, governing this subject of marriage, is the legislation of the old province of Canada, which had the plenitude of the legislative power, and at that time we did not have to consider any question of division of legislative power. Where there is question of repealing some previously existing law in the province of Quebec with regard to marriage and divorce—and I am here again eliminating the question of formalities and ceremonies or solemnization of marriage—I do not think it is disputable that this Parliament would have the jurisdiction to repeal that law.

Mr. MURPHY: What will be the consequence of the passing of such an Act here?

Mr. DOHERTY: For instance, when this Parliament passes an Act dissolving the marriage of a person domiciled in the province of Quebec, that Act is in contravention of the provision of the civil code of Quebec, which says that the marriage is dissoluble only by death. But this Parliament has power to legislate about that, and its legislation is effective in the province of Quebec as well as anywhere else, and it overrides for the particular individual the general disposition of the provincial law.

I have pointed these things out for the purpose of making it perfectly clear that in so far as the hon. member's motion covers—and I understand it does cover but not necessarily call for—the transference of the jurisdiction to the courts, it means that he is asking the Government to give consideration, with a view to action at this session, to the suggestion that we should now legislate to alter the general law with regard to divorce in five of the provinces of this

Dominion. I am not now concerned with arguing whether that is desirable legislation or not; but the hon. member himself, and all members of this House, will see that it is most important legislation, and legislation with regard to the desirability of which there does exist very marked divergence of opinion among the people of this country; and further, I may perhaps add, legislation for which we have had no demand, no pressing demand at all events, coming from any large body of the population of this country, looking to action at this time. That being so, and it being a matter of common consent that the work of this particular session should be limited, as far as possible, to such legislation as is necessitated by the conditions created by the present lamentable war, I think it will be readily understood why the Government should feel that in these circumstances it would not be acting in accordance with the common understanding if it took up for consideration and for action at this moment legislation of such gravity, involving so great a change with regard to a matter of such very great importance as this. And I venture to think that even the hon. member himself would not expect us to go that far. I gather that it is in that view that he was at pains to point out, as I understood him, that his motion did not call for that at all. As I understand him now—and, of course, I accept perfectly his interpretation of the motion. I am not questioning it in the slightest—he points out that his motion does not necessarily call for that action. I do think that in so far as it may cover the suggestion of action of that kind the reasons I have given should prove acceptable to every hon. member, and to the hon. member himself, why the Government should not undertake to deal with a matter of such importance at this particular time.

But the hon. gentleman says: my motion looks, at all events, to your doing something; it looks to some improvement in the procedure by which these Acts are passed, assuming that they are still to be passed by this Parliament. And he says, at one part of his argument, that he would rather see the whole thing stopped and no divorce granted by Act of Parliament than to have the present system and the present procedure continued. I am not going to dispute that he may be absolutely justified in his preference for a stopping of the whole system. But, of course, I do not need to point out to a lawyer of my hon. friend's undoubted competence that there is no power in this world—at all events, there is no power in this Parliament—to stop divorce being granted by Act of Parliament in future Parliaments. This Parliament, if it chooses, when people come to it with petitions for divorce, may say to them: we will not grant any divorce; but, suppose that we were to legislate, even in the most formal manner possible, that hereafter there should be no divorce granted by Act of Parliament, the very next day Parliament could repeal what it had done, and could grant divorces as before. The hon. gentleman says he would rather see the whole system stopped, and perhaps I would too. I am prepared to say I would be glad to see it stopped, but there is no method by which this Parliament can, by legislation or resolution, abolish the system. So, we have not that alternative.

But eliminating the transfer of jurisdiction to the courts, the hon. gentleman's resolution calls upon the Government to take the matter into serious consideration with a view to reform. What is complained of in connection with the manner in which the granting of divorce by Parliament is carried on, is the effect of certain rules of the Senate, and the Government is asked to take this into consideration with a view to reform. As the hon. gentleman himself pointed out, he quite recognizes that neither the Government nor this House can reform the rules of the Senate. I understood him to concede that there is no power in this Government to compel the Senate to change its rules, but he thinks we might, by some communication to the Senate, intimate that objections were found to their rules, with a view to action being taken. Of course, that reduces what the Government is asked by this motion to do to something very small indeed. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman that if his motion be reduced down to that, its adoption would be in effect a condemnation by this House of the rules of the Senate, and a calling upon this Government to intervene with the Senate to bring about an alteration and improvement of these rules. I think we all realize how jealous each House is of its right to make, control, and amend, its own rules; and I think upon reflection it will be recognized what an unbecoming thing it would be for this House to pass a resolution to condemn the rules of the other House. Equally, what an unbecoming thing it would be for this Government, either as the mandatary of the House of Commons

[Mr. Doherty.]

or on its own authority, to approach the Senate and represent to them that they ought to improve their rules. I have great sympathy with some of the criticisms that have been made of the results of the operations of some of the rules, and I have an abiding confidence that, properly approached, the hon. gentlemen of the Senate would be open to conviction as to the improvements that might be made in those rules. But I do not think it would be a proper method of getting at the result, or that it would be a desirable or a becoming thing, that this House should pass a resolution declaring the rules of the Senate to be unsatisfactory; and that this Government, acting on a resolution of that kind, should approach the Senate to make representations to it with regard to those suggested improvements. I have no doubt that what has been said here by the mover of the resolution and by other hon. gentlemen who have supported the motion, will get before the Senate. For my own part, I would have no objection, if any purpose would be served thereby, to transmitting it to the Senate, who, no doubt, will be impressed by the different arguments that have been advanced, and will give consideration to such improvements as their rules may call for. Personally, I have great sympathy with the argument of the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), who was disposed to support this motion because he believed that the adoption of it would operate restrictively upon divorce. He reached, therefore, a conclusion similar to that of the hon. member for Hastings, though his premises were different. I think that those rules might be very much improved in the way of assuring most careful investigation on the part of those who are responsible for the passing of acts of this kind before they finally adopt them. I do not desire to take it upon myself to say that those rules are not sufficient for the purpose if properly carried out, but I should be glad to see anything done that could be done to make them more effective. I have no doubt that anything which might be pointed out to the Senate itself as tending to produce that result, they would be glad to carry out.

So far, therefore, as this motion looks to expediting or increasing the facilities for divorce, and toward changing the jurisdiction over divorce, I think without going into the question whether such action is in itself desirable or not, that it is quite clear that it calls for legislation which, in view of the circumstances under which we find ourselves, this Parliament should not be called upon to deal with at the present session. In so far as the motion looks merely to some improvement in the rules governing the method by which Acts of Parliament granting divorces are now passed, the adoption of this resolution would not be a proper method by which to seek to arrive at their improvement or amendment. Further, that course might leave this House open to the suggestion that it had done something that was not becoming on its part; and if the Government, acting upon this resolution, should approach the Senate in the manner suggested by the honorable member it would expose itself to be met with the suggestion that in so doing it was over-stepping the bounds of its proper sphere of action. For these reasons, I cannot look favourably upon the motion of the hon. gentleman, and I am not disposed to support it.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very clear and logical address of the Minister of Justice, in which he dealt with the history of the law of divorce, both in England and in this country.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation of 1858 was merely a codification of what was really the common law of England on the subject of divorce. I do not think it will be questioned that the different Acts that were passed by the Imperial Parliament granting divorces to different persons were along even lines: that is, the same principle was recognized throughout in granting these divorces. The Minister of Justice was right when he said that the common law as it was then was not out and out a law, but a custom which was crystallized into a statute in 1858; and the hon. minister did not tell us that in the Statute of 1858 there was anything that was not really the law previous to that year. When the power to enforce the provision, which was put into the form of a statute in 1858, was transferred from the legislature to the courts of the country, I do not think that the law was changed, or that the conditions were changed so far as remedy goes; the rule or custom was simply put in the form of a statute, and its administration was entrusted to the courts instead of the legislature. There is no doubt that a court properly constituted and presided over by one or more learned jurists is more capable of properly administering the law than a mixed assembly of men, some of whom are learned in law and some of whom are not.

I think that no member of this House will say that the Senate of Canada acts upon any premises except the common law of England and Canada on the subject of divorce. You will find that they take care to ascertain that they are right as to the question of domicile, and as to the grounds of adultery, infidelity or cruelty. In Nova Scotia, where we have a divorce court, the statute governing divorce is a very old one; I presume it is a re-enactment of the statute of 1858. In any case, the law is based upon the law as it was in England, and is similar to that which prevails in other provinces of the Dominion where divorce cases are dealt with in this manner. We in Canada to-day are in the same position as they were in England prior to 1858. If a man wanted a divorce in England before 1858 he could go to Parliament and, subject to proving the universal conditions which he had to prove, he could get a divorce. That is the condition here to-day, subject to certain limitations; one who can prove infidelity and cruelty, possibly desertion, before the Senate can get a divorce. That is really the law all over Canada. A citizen of Nova Scotia, although we have a court there, is not prohibited from coming to the Senate; and although there is no law in respect to divorce in Quebec, there is nothing to prevent a person from Quebec coming to the Senate and getting a divorce on the grounds which I have already suggested. That being the condition of things and that being really the law—for although it is not yet crystallized into a statute it is the recognized law all over this country—the universal court is the Senate and the Senate simply attempts, in the best way it can with the machinery under its control, to administer the common law of England as it exists in this country. If that be the case, what can be the objection, morally or otherwise, to make the administration of that law as convenient as possible. If it be the law in Canada, as it is, any man who tries to protect himself by saying we have no divorce law in this country, is deceiving himself like the ostrich who hides his head in the sand. We have a divorce law in this country; divorces may be had or given. It is a recognized principle existing in this country, and we might as well accept it. There may be people who conscientiously oppose this to-day; but they live in this country, they propose to live in this country and they have to get along the best way they can and let those who seek divorces and who are getting them from day to day continue to do so. But it is surely better that the law under which they are granted should be made as perfect as possible. What is now somewhat clumsily done by the Senate might be better done by courts properly constituted for that purpose. I do not see any great difficulty in putting in the shape of a statute what the common law of England on divorce is to-day. Improve it if you please, but it is within a very narrow compass, it would not be a long statute. As I remember the statute on Divorce in Nova Scotia, it consists of only two short paragraphs and it has been serving the purpose in that province for seventy years or longer. It embodies in those two short paragraphs what is really the common law of England on that subject. My own idea would be that the Superior courts in the different provinces of Canada should have conferred upon them, by such legislation as the minister is well capable of drafting, the jurisdiction that is now being exercised by the Senate, and that proper procedure should be provided for that purpose. If the minister does not think it proper to divide the jurisdiction among different courts, it is quite competent for Parliament to vest that jurisdiction in the Exchequer Court of Canada, and that court, with its universal jurisdiction, could go on circuit to try these cases and could try them as conveniently as it now tries other cases in the different provinces. I may be mistaken in saying that could be done, but I do not see any objection to it. As I understand the motion of my hon. friend from Hastings, it is simply to bring this matter before the House, not in any concrete, specific, remedial form but for the purpose of dealing with it broadly and openly with a view to reaching the best conclusion that can be reached. My own opinion, for whatever it is worth, is that we have this law all over the Dominion now whether or not we recognize it as an absolute law which can be enforced by the different courts. It is in existence and is being enforced. I think it would be better to have it in the shape of a statute and to have courts in the different provinces where the cases can be fought out like any other cases with the least possible expense and in such a way that the poorest person can take advantage of the remedy, just as in any other matter of litigation. The minister says it might be a work of supererogation or inutility for us to have an Act taking away the jurisdiction of the Senate and

vest it elsewhere, that possibly Parliament should go on dealing with this subject as we are doing now. The precedents are against that. At one time election cases and controversial matters in reference to the status of members of Parliament were tried in Parliament. Parliament thought that this was not the proper place to try them, and jurisdiction was delegated to the courts. No person has ever dared to suggest that once jurisdiction was vested in the proper place, in the courts, we should legislate to re-vest that jurisdiction in this Parliament. I am sure that once this country realized that jurisdiction in cases of divorce was properly vested in the courts and proper machinery was established for these cases in the different parts of the country, no person would again want to bring a divorce case to this very expensive tribunal, with the very clumsy procedure under which Parliament now deals with cases of divorce. If the passing of this motion will bring about a better condition of things and a vesting in proper courts of jurisdiction to administer this law I shall vote in favour of this motion.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I feel that I owe an apology to the House for my failure to express the ideas that were in my mind when I drafted this resolution and when I addressed the House this afternoon. Let me assure you, Sir, that it was not owing to any intentional disrespect, but to my ignorance and to the limitations of my vocabulary. I would have thought, in my innocence and ignorance, that this resolution was reasonably clear and such that a wayfaring man, though a fool, could not err very much in reading it. I hope the House will pardon me if I take the opportunity of reading it now in the hope that some person, perhaps, may be as ignorant and blind as myself, and may also think that it is a reasonably clear resolution. It is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the procedure under which divorces are granted by Parliament—

—not by the Senate, but by Parliament.

—and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof, are so unsatisfactory, besides being prohibitive to the great majority of the people of Canada, the same should be taken into immediate consideration by the Government during the present session, with a view to reform.

The expense and the procedure at present are so unreasonable that the Government this session should take the matter into consideration with a view to reform. That is the whole thing. One hon. gentleman argues from that, that because divorces in the United States have multiplied to a great extent, therefore the same result would follow if there were a reform of our procedure, although everybody knows that in the United States divorces are granted on almost every ground under the sun, and that an enormous negro population greatly increases the percentage of divorces. Another hon. gentleman argued that if my motion were passed it would be an insult to the Senate because, he said, we have no right to arrogate to ourselves the power of reforming their rules. Is there a word about the Senate in this resolution? I thought that every member of this House knew that no Bill became law unless it passed both this House and the Senate. It might be that, if a Committee were appointed and sat, it would find that all the defects existing at the present time were in the procedure of this House, and not in that of the other branch of Parliament. But inasmuch as every member of the House who has spoken has admitted that the procedure is defective, it seems to me a most extraordinary state of affairs that the Minister of Justice, speaking for the Government, should object to doing something to correct what he admits to be wrong for fear that the resolution now before the House would be a reflection on the Senate, when there is not even mention of the Senate in the resolution.

Then the Minister of Justice argued—he harped upon it again and again—that my motion must establish a court. Is there a word in the motion about a court? Is it not perfectly possible, that a committee might be formed of members of this House and of the Senate who would effect a wonderful improvement of the procedure as it exists at the present time, and that still divorce might be granted by Act of Parliament? I do not say that that is the best way of correcting the evil; I am not committing myself to that; I am not concerned in that question. But I am trying to persuade the Government, which admits that the procedure is wrong, to do something to rectify it. The appointment of a committee by this House might be ignored by the Senate, and that is the reason why I ask the Government to take the matter in hand. The Government is supposed to have its representatives in the Senate; it is supposed to pass Bills through the Senate and if my resolution is passed, would it be impossible, to have a joint

committee appointed, which would consider whether or not it is necessary for applicants seeking divorce to advertise for six months in the Canada Gazette, or whether witness should not be brought here at a fixed time so as to avoid their being detained for weeks, as has happened again and again because the Senate did not happen to be in session. It would be quite possible, I think, for such a joint committee to effect a reduction in the expense of obtaining divorce in the Senate, and quite possible also to put a stop to the disgraceful lobbying to which every member of this House is subjected. There is not a member of the Government who does not know it, of the lobbying that goes on, and yet the Government are unwilling to raise a hand to put a stop to it. The hon. member to my right (Mr. Thoburn) gave an illustration of what happened last session. I remember going over to the Senate a year or two ago when a famous divorce case was being heard. There was considerable doubt as to how the case would end. As it happened the lady won her case by a majority of one, and she held a levee in front of the Senate Chamber, when senator after senator came up, shook her by the hand, and said that if such and such a senator had not been kept away the result would have been different. That is what our divorce judges do. Let us not forget that every member of this House is a judge when he considers a Senate Bill. He may be a member of the Private Bills Committee, or he may not, but he is

10 p.m.

a judge, and he is a traitor if he does not do his duty. There may be traitors, Sir, other than those who betray their comrades in the trenches; those who betray the people at home are just as much traitors as those abroad. The member of Parliament who wilfully and deliberately fails to do his duty to the people whom he represents here is in my humble judgment a traitor. If matters are not proceeding as they should, is it any answer to say I object to a court, or I object to this or that? Is it any reply to say that there is no law of divorce in Ontario? Is there any man here who does not know that the law in Ontario to-day is that you can get divorce if you go to the Senate, and have the money to pay for it. But you may go there with all the evidence in the world, and unless you have the money you cannot obtain relief. If that procedure is considered satisfactory, I have nothing more to say. I have mentioned three or four ways in which, in my humble judgment, a joint committee of both Houses might improve the procedure. If it should find other and better ways, by all means let it adopt these other and better ways; by reforming the procedure in any respect it would be doing its duty. If the members of this House think that the procedure at present is satisfactory, they will be justified in making no effort to reform it. But if there is any member of this House who believes that the procedure of granting divorce is not perfect, he will not be doing his duty by the people of Canada if he does not do his best to reform that procedure.

Only one word more in answer to what was said about the expense of obtaining divorce. It was said that the same difficulty arose in every law suit. Not at all. My hon. friend must be aware that in an ordinary law suit, the party who goes to a lawyer is either after some cash, or he has some cash to defend. There is no trouble in either case in getting a lawyer to take up the case, if it is worth taking up; but when you come to a case of divorce it is different. Take the case of a poor woman who has perhaps two or three little children, who has a brutal husband who assaults her, and is hardly able to keep body and soul together. Will any one say that there is any money in that case for a lawyer? I do not think the cases are on the same level at all, and it is a thousand times more important that something should be done in that case of divorce than in the other cases.

All I would say in conclusion, as I said two years ago, is that I am sorry for the people who are obliged to come here for divorce, but I am a thousand times more sorry for the unfortunate children whose lives are apt to be blighted because of faults not their own. In thousands of cases in the reports in the Motherland, a husband deserts his wife, leaving her with two or three children which she cannot support, and she takes up with another man and lives with him. There are thousands of such cases in which the parties would marry again if they could, and bring up their family honestly. But even in England, where the expense of obtaining divorce is far less than it is here, many such people are too poor to obtain relief, and that was the reason why the Primate of England, the Archbishop of York, Sir Lewis Dibdin and Sir William Anson, M.P. for Oxford, while they differed in toto from the suggestions of the majority of the com-

mittee as to the grounds on which divorce should be granted, agreed to simplify the procedure and to reduce the expense so that the poor might have the same rights as the rich.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Northrup:

Yeas:

Messieurs

Best,	Morphy,
Bickerdike,	Morrison,
Buchanan,	Nickle,
Carvell,	Northrup,
Copp,	Oliver,
Edwards,	Pardee,
Graham,	Porter,
Kay,	Pugsley,
Macdonald,	Thoburn,
MacNutt,	Turriff,
McCraney,	White
McKenzie,	(Victoria, Alta.).—24.
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.).	

Nays:

Messieurs

Ball,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Bennnett (Simcoe),	Marcile (Bagot),
Boivin,	Meighen,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Michaud,
Cochrane,	Munson,
Crothers,	Murphy,
Delisle,	Nicholson,
Doherty,	Papineau,
Fortier,	Patenaude,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
Gray,	Reid,
Green,	Rogers,
Hazen,	Sexsmith,
Henderson,	Shepherd,
Kemp,	Steele,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Lemieux,	Sutherland,
Macdonell,	Webster,
McMillan,	Wilcox,
	Wright.—39.

Motion negatived.

FREE WHEAT.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in order to secure to the farmers and people of Canada the advantages of the American market for wheat, wheat products and potatoes, steps should be taken at once to put these articles on the free list in the Canadian Tariff.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is of such paramount importance that I feel I should not be doing my duty to my constituents, and to my province, if I did not bring the subject up once more for debate in this House. This question of securing the American market for the western farmer is one that will not down. My hon. friends on the Government benches may try as hard as they like, but they cannot get rid of this question until a proper solution of it has been found. I remember that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, at a bye-election in the constituency of Macdonald, a few years ago, practically promised the farmers that they would get free wheat if it was in the interests of the country. Three years have passed by since that day, and, so far as we can judge, the farmers are no nearer free wheat than they were at that time. But we have kept up the agitation, and we will keep it up until we get what we are after. In order, Mr. Speaker, that you may have a just idea of what we are talking about, I want to read to the House definitions of the different grades of Manitoba and Minneapolis wheat, and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to pay particular attention to this, so that they will see that when they quote Number 2 Manitoba Northern against Minneapolis Number 2, they are quoting Manitoba wheat that is always two grades, and sometimes more than two grades, higher than the so-called corresponding wheat at Minneapolis. For instance, Number 3 Manitoba Northern is a much better wheat than Number 2 Minneapolis Northern. Let me read the definitions:

Manitoba Grades Spring Wheat.

No. 1 Manitoba Hard wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least seventy-five per cent of hard Red Fife wheat.

No. 1 Hard White Fife wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of not less than sixty per cent of hard White Fife wheat and shall not contain more than twenty-five per cent of soft wheat.

No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than sixty pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least sixty per cent of hard Red Fife wheat.

No. 2 Manitoba Northern wheat, shall be sound and reasonably clean, of good milling qualities and fit for warehousing, weighing not less than 58 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least forty-five per cent of hard Red Fife wheat.

Any wheat not good enough to be graded as No. 2 Manitoba Northern shall be graded as No. 3 Manitoba Northern in the discretion of the inspector.

Minnesota Grades, Northern Spring Wheat.

No. 1 Hard Spring wheat shall be sound, bright, sweet and clean, and consist of over fifty per cent of the hard varieties, and weigh not less than 58 pounds to the measured bushel.

No. 1 Northern Spring wheat shall be sound, sweet and clean, and consist of the hard and soft varieties of spring wheat, and weigh not less than 57 pounds to the measured bushel.

No. 2. Northern Spring wheat shall be spring wheat not clean enough nor sound enough for No. 1, but of good milling quality, and may

consist of the bearded varieties, and must not weigh less than 56 pounds to the measured bushel.

No. 3 Northern Spring wheat shall be composed of shrunken, inferior spring wheat, and weigh not less than 54 pounds to the measured bushel.

No. 4 Northern Spring wheat shall include all inferior spring wheat that is badly shrunken or damaged, and weigh not less than 49 pounds to the measured bushel.

Rejected Spring wheat shall include all varieties of Spring wheat, sprouted, badly bleached, or for any other cause unfit for No. 4.

So there is quite a difference between the Minneapolis and Manitoba grades. No. 2 Manitoba Northern must be good milling wheat weighing not less than fifty-eight pounds to the bushel, and must be composed of at least forty-five per cent Red Fife wheat. Any of our wheat that had a less percentage of Red Fife in it than that would be graded as No. 3. Again, American No. 2 Northern has to weigh only fifty-six pounds to the bushel, whereas our so-called corresponding grade has to weigh fifty-eight. American No. 2 Northern need not have any hard wheat at all, while the Manitoba No. 2 must have at least forty-five per cent. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will now see that in quoting No. 2 Manitoba Northern against No. 2 Minneapolis they are comparing absolutely different grades. For instance, our No. 3 Northern is a far better milling wheat than No. 1 Minneapolis, and I say without a possible chance of successful contradiction that in many cases our No. 3 is a much better milling wheat than No. 1 Minneapolis. It is therefore absolutely unfair to compare No. 3 Manitoba Northern with No. 3 Minneapolis. Our grades are practically confined to 1, 2 and 3 Northern. The grades at Minneapolis are altogether different. Taking into account the difference in the grades and the difference in the price, I make this statement on my responsibility as a member of this House, that for the last twenty years there has not been a single year in which the farmers of Assiniboia could not, during ten or eleven months out of the year, take their wheat across the line, if it were not for the duty, and get ten to sixteen cents a bushel more for it than they could get at home. I do not say that they could do that every day in the year, or every week in the year, but, practically speaking, they could do it for ten or eleven months out of the year.

There is another point. In the months of September, October, and November last there was a spread of seven or eight cents a bushel between the Winnipeg and the American price, not taking into consideration the difference in grades. But what do we find when the wheat got to Liverpool? Instead of the Manitoba wheat selling for seven or eight cents less a bushel than the American wheat it sold to the Liverpool merchant at from six to eight cents a bushel more than the American wheat, and that cannot be denied by any one who knows anything about the grain trade. Why should there be this difference? Why should every man who grows wheat in Canada be crucified to the extent of ten cents a bushel on his wheat? It was stated during the reciprocity debate that we would be paying too much for reciprocity. I do not believe it. But supposing it were true. Two years ago the United States put wheat on the free list to any country that adopted the same policy with regard to their wheat. All we have to do to secure the American market for the Canadian farmer is to put our wheat on the free list. Why should that not be done? Why does not the Government give our farmers access to the American market?

The Minister of Finance made this statement the other day:

I always assume that those engaged in a business know the best way of carrying that business on. My hon. friend says quite truly that men can give essays and lectures as to what class of farming should be carried on, but after all the farmer knows best what kind of farming he should engage in. I have always said that.

Further, he said:

I may say, however, that the legislation has been brought forward for no other purpose than to meet the needs of a growing industry in the West, as presented to me by the parties engaged in that industry.

The Minister of Finance thought the Farmer knew his own business best, and that the farmer's advice should be followed. Now, if my hon. friends on the Government benches listen to these Western farmers when they ask for an amendment of the Bank Act, why should not they listen to exactly the same association and exactly the same men when they ask the right to sell their own products in the American markets? I will tell you why. When the farmers ask for an amendment to the Bank Act, it happens to be in the interest of the Bankers' Association, and the Government are quite ready and willing to grant what is asked. But when the demand is made for free wheat, the millers and the dealers jump in and say: we do not want that; and so the Government turn a deaf

ear to the request that is made. If you ask why the interests should be favoured rather than farmers, the only reason I can suggest is that the big interests are fat subscribers when it comes to raising election funds, and the farmers are lean subscribers.

Last summer I was out in my constituency, and one day I drove into the town of Carievale. I was accompanied by Mr. Burke, and Mr. Little, two well-to-do farmers. We went to the elevators in Carievale and asked the price of wheat. Also we went to an elevator where they sold flour, and asked the price of flour. Then we jumped into an automobile and inside of an hour and a half we were in Sherwood, North Dakota. We went to the elevators there and asked what they were paying for wheat and found that they were paying just 13 cents a bushel more than was being paid on the Canadian side at Carievale. There was a lot of Canadian wheat coming over and paying the duty of ten cents a bushel and making more by selling it in Sherwood than they could make by selling it at home. Why, Mr. Speaker, one of the big elevators in Sherwood, North Dakata is owned by my own constituents, a farmers' elevator. They own it and run it and they ship thousands, and tens of thousands, and some years hundreds of thousands, of bushels of Canadian grain to that elevator, and they send it there because they can get better prices than they can get at home. And hon. members on the other side tell us that wheat is lower in the United States than it is in Canada. They tell us also that the United States exports wheat as we do, and, consequently, their market can be of no use to us. I do not care whether the United States exports wheat or not. What I know is that the American elevator man is there with money ready to buy our wheat, and pay a higher price for it than we can get on our side of the line. And that argument of a higher price is good enough for me and for the farmers I represent. On that occasion at Sherwood, we asked also the price of flour, and we found that the best quality of flour—the practical farmers who were with me told me it was practically the same as the best brand of Lake of the Woods and Ogilvie flour on our side—was selling at thirty cents a sack cheaper than we could buy it in Carievale. The American miller pays 13 cents a bushel more for his wheat, and sells his flour at 60 cents a barrel less than on our side. Will hon. gentlemen opposite explain that? I should like the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who is great at explanations, to explain that. He may explain it satisfactorily to the hon. members about him, but when they go back to their constituents on the prairies they will find that their explanation is mighty thin, and that it does not explain to the farmer at all, for the simple fact is that the American miller is prepared to pay a higher price for wheat and to take a lower price for flour than the miller on our side. And remember, our farmers are practically all buyers of flour from these big milling concerns. There are practically no small mills doing business in the West. A number have been built, but the majority of them are standing idle to-day. And why? I will tell you: The moment a small mill starts in any of the towns through the West, at once the price of wheat is put up in that particular town, and also they will ship in flour and put its price away down, and they will keep that going for a year, or two years, or three years if necessary, until they have throttled that man and ruined him. Then they can put the price of wheat down and the price of flour up. That is done every day in the week in our country. I leave it to hon. members from the West to say whether it is not the same in their constituencies as it is in mine.

If Canadian wheat were put on the free list and the Canadian farmer given the right to ship to the American market, who would suffer? Let my friends opposite answer this question. The Canadian farmers are asking that wheat be put on the free list; why not grant their request? Let us suppose that the woollen and cotton manufactures came to the Government in a body and said: we have been paying duty on our products long enough; if the duties were taken off cottons and woollens, we should be able to ship a great deal more and get a much better price for our goods. Would the Government turn them down if the farmers should say that they did not want the duty taken off? No, the Government would listen to the demands of the people who were in the business. The Government are prepared to listen to the farmers of the West when they ask for an amendment of the Bank Act, because it is in the interests of the banks that they should do so, but when the farmers ask for an amendment of the Customs Act so that wheat may be put on the free list, the Government say, no. I ask again, who is going to suffer if we have free wheat, except, perhaps, the millers and a few dealers?

Will any other interest suffer? I do not see what other interest can possibly suffer. Why should half a dozen millers have more influence with the Government than all the farmers of Canada? The united farmers of Ontario have asked for free wheat; so have the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta; and the only reason why their request has not been granted is that the millers and a few dealers have asked that the duty be retained.

I am free to admit that the miller will suffer from any provision for free wheat; he would have to pay more for his wheat and sell his flour at a lower price. A few of the dealers might not get so much wheat to handle, because a considerable quantity would go to the South, and there might be more competition in buying. I do think it is unfair that the interests of a few millers and a few dealers on the Grain Exchange in Winnipeg should overrule the interests of all the farmers of Canada who are asking for free wheat. I venture to say that no man in this House can get a single farmers' organization in the West to pass a motion asking that the duty on wheat be retained. It cannot be done; all the farmers of the West, Conservative as well as Liberal are in favour of free wheat. My hon. friends have been able to shuffle this question in the past, but it is getting more difficult all the time to do this, and if the matter is not soon settled in the interests of the farmers it will be hard for my hon. friends to make a satisfactory explanation of their course. The western farmer is a reasonable man; he does not try to shirk his share of taxation. He demands the right to sell his product in the best market; he is going to have that right, and if this Government will not give it to him, when the time comes there will be a Government in power that will give it to them. I would have my friends opposite remember that in the next Parliament there will be sixteen more members from the prairies than there are at the present time; and all of them, Liberal as well as Conservative, will be in favour of putting wheat on the free list. The Minister of Public Works and the Solicitor General are to-day in their hearts as much in favour of free wheat as I am; they know it, and they cannot honestly deny it. They cajoled the people into believing that they were going to give them free wheat, and they have been unable to do it.

It may be said by some that the removal of the duty upon wheat would not be in the interests of the railways; the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think—one of the ministers of the Crown, in any case—said that this fact would have to be considered. Well, Mr. Lanigan, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, made the statement two or three months ago that the putting of wheat on the free list would not particularly affect the railways. I happened to have some interviews with the Railway Commission quite recently, and they told me that all the railroads were so tied up that they would be glad to see wheat go into the United States in order that the blockade might be relieved.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman Mr. Lanigan's statement?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes; I shall be very pleased to give it. I quote from the Grain Growers' Guide—my hon. friend the Solicitor General—knows that paper—of December 1 last, page 9:

> Free Wheat Won't Hurt Railroads.
>
> Some of the politicians who are opposed to free wheat have stated that they are against opening the United States market to Canadian farmers because it would send all our wheat south and leave the tracks of the three Canadian transcontinental railroads to become mere streaks of rust.

What fools we Canadians must have been to spend a thousand million dollars in building three Canadian railroad lines when, merely by putting wheat on the free list, we shall make them mere streaks of rust. That is kind of argument my hon. friends opposite are advancing. This article goes on to say:

> That would, of course, be serious if it were true, but W. B. Lanigan, an important and well-informed official of the Canadian Pacific railway, says is is not so. In the Manitoba Free Press of November 24 was the following:
>
> Will Equalize Prices. Lanigan Says Free Wheat Will not Affect Canadian Pacific railway.
>
> Free wheat would have no effect on the amount of hauling done by the Canadian Pacific railway according to W. B. Lanigan, assistant freight traffic manager. Mr. Lanigan explained the statement by saying that free wheat would equalize the prices in Canada and in the United States. Then there would be little or no incentive to ship grain south.

That is exactly what we have always claimed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be interested to know that he is quoting the Free Press and the Guide, instead of Mr. Lanigan. I wrote to Mr. Lanigan with regard to that statement.

and I have a letter from him to the effect that he gave no such statement.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend may have written to another Mr. Lanigan. I have great respect for the ability of my hon. friend; however, I will read this statement, because I believe it is true:

> Both the United States and Canada have a surplus crop which they export and it would be cheaper to haul by way of Canada than by way of the United States. It would be the railway hauling out of North Dakota that would have to reduce their rates, said Mr. Lanigan.

I wonder if my hon. friend would deny that Mr. Lanigan said that.

> Otherwise the North Dakota farmers would ship by way of the Canadian Pacific railway as the rate would be cheaper that way to Fort William than it is over the United States lines to Duluth.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that the railways have not much to fear. We have never claimed that if wheat was put on the free list the price would remain, say, ten cents higher in Canada. There would be an equalization of prices; the American price would go down some and ours would go up some, but the farmer would make a very handsome difference in the price of his wheat. Why is that? Simply because there is only a very limited quantity of hard wheat grown in the United States. It can be grown only in Minnesota, the Dakotas and a small portion of Montana. These American farmers get a great big bonus in the way of a premium for their wheat over the American farmer down in the Southern or Western or Pacific states. Why? Because their wheat is worth a lot more. Why is our Manitoba wheat worth more than Ontario wheat? Why is it that Ontario millers will at times pay anything from ten cents to twenty cents a bushel more for Manitoba hard wheat to mix with their own wheat? Ontario millers buy western wheat and grind it in their mills, mix it with their soft wheat and ship out and sell the wheat that they have bought in Ontario. It is the quality of the wheat that does it. One wheat is worth five, ten or fifteen cents a bushel more than another simply because it makes more flour to a bushel. Then, with the soft wheat grown in the United States they cannot make the first grade of flour, they must have about one bushel in five of hard wheat to mix with it in order to get the best grade of flour, and there is a large class of people in the United States who will have the best grade of flour irrespective of what it may cost. For that reason the North Dakota wheat, the Northern Minnesota wheat, the Northern Montana wheat, the Manitoba wheat, the Saskatchewan wheat and the Alberta wheat, can always have a great big preference, will always be worth a great deal more per bushel than the wheat grown in Ontario or in the other portions of the United States.

My hon. friends opposite will tell me that the United States cannot be a market for our wheat simply because they export wheat. The United States export cattle, but they buy our cattle just the same. They export many classes of goods of which they import thousands and millions of dollars worth. But let me tell my hon. friends that the United States does not export one bushel of hard wheat, and has not for years. They export the wheat from the Pacific coast, they export the winter wheat of Nebraska and Kansas and Texas, and those states that are tributary to the gulf of Mexico. They can put their wheat at tide water at a cheap rate of freight, but we in Canada are much nearer the great bulk of the consuming population of the United States than many of these wheat growing states and we can supply the mills in Buffalo and tributary to Buffalo while our summer rates are on, at a cheaper freight rate than can the farmers from southwestern states. Therefore, their wheat is exported and these millers throughout the populous part of the eastern United States buy our hard wheat. They are ready to buy our wheat; they have got the money to pay for it; and that is all we need worry our heads about. That is all the Canadian farmer in the West at all events, is worrying about. He does not care how much wheat the American people export; he knows that there are in the United States a hundred millions of people, the wealthiest people on earth, people who want the best grade of flour that can be made. The American millers are willing to buy our wheat, to pay the price for it, to pay a premium on it—and our farmers want to sell it. Yet this Government stands in the way and refuses to allow the farmers of Canada to sell their wheat in the United States. They simply refuse to come to the relief of the farmer, when the farmer is not asking any favours, but is only saying: Give me the privilege of selling my wheat where I can sell it to the best advantage. But it is not only the farmer who grows the wheat who suffers. What about that great big class of the workingman and the

mechanic and the consumer of Canada? Give us free wheat and the farmer who grows the wheat will get a better price and the man who is working at $1.50 or $2 or $2.50, with a big family to feed and support, will buy his flour cheaper so that it works both ways. I say that the mechanic can buy his flour cheaper. He can go into any market in the United States and buy flour cheaper than he can buy our flour made from our western wheat. Does anyone tell me that concerns like the Ogilvy Milling Company, the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, the Western Milling Company, the Maple Leaf Milling Company, with the greatest waterpowers in the world, cannot make flour as cheaply as the American millers? Our millers have the greatest water-powers in the world. For one horse-power in the United States our millers have one hundred horse-power available. We have the cheapest and best water-powers, we have the best wheat on earth, we have as able men in the milling business as stand on the face of this globe; and will anyone tell me that with all these advantages the Canadian miller cannot hold his own against the American? He can do it but he does not want to do it. I do not blame him for not wanting to. As long as he can get this Government to stand between himself and competition, why should he not do so? Why should he not save ten or fifteen cents a bushel on his wheat and chisel the consumer out of fifty cents a barrel on the flour if he can do it and can have the Government look after him in that way so that he can rob the people to that extent? That is what the millers are doing, they are robbing the farmer on one hand and the consumer on the other—and this Government is upholding them in doing so. The millers could not do this for one moment without the assistance of this Government. The people of the West know this and the consumers of the East are beginning to learn it. Give us free wheat and you will satisfy everybody except the millers and a few dealers. You will save millions of dollars to the growers of the wheat, and you will make a great big saving to the men who have to buy the flour. If that is not a good argument why we should have free wheat I do not know what you would consider a good argument. There is no question that it is simply because this Government refuses to go against the wishes and the demands of the big interests that they refuse to take action in this matter. A few months ago, when the crop was seen to be so large for the American market, the Government wavered as to whether or not they should grant the demand then made. But what did the millers tell them? They said: You give free wheat, and then we will demand free machinery for our mills, free bags to put our flour in, and free everything that we use in the mill. The Government listened to the seductive voice of the big interests, but the demands of the farmers were of no avail whatever; the Government turned a deaf ear to them. As I said before, this is a matter that will have to be settled with the farmers the next time the Government go to the country.

Before I take up the question of the millers, however, let me give you a quotation of the prices at Sherwood, the town in North Dakota that I spoke of a few minutes ago. I have the resolution here, copies of which some farmers in my constituency sent to the Prime Minister, to myself, and to the Grain Growers' Association. This resolution was passed by the Elmore and Fife Association on December 29, 1915. I will take the prices for the previous four months. On September 15 bonded wheat was 75 cents, and domestic wheat 86 cents, a difference of 11 cents per bushel. On October 15 bonded wheat was 83 cents, and domestic wheat 86 cents, only 3 cents better. On November 15 bonded wheat was 81 cents, and domestic wheat 89 cents, a spread of 8 cents. On December 15 bonded wheat was 88 cents, and domestic wheat 98 cents, a difference of 10 cents per bushel. And this was at the time of the year when some of the papers were pointing out that wheat was higher in Winnipeg than it was in Minneapolis. No doubt there will be certain days when the price of wheat will be higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, but does that prove anything? If, on one day in twenty, wheat is higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, does that imply that the Minneapolis market is no good for us, when, on the other 19 days, there is a difference of 5, 10 or 12 cents a bushel in favour of Minneapolis? My hon. friends opposite must think the farmers are a lot of thick-headed fools if they assume that they would send their wheat to Minneapolis and take a lower price than they could get at home for it. Does anyone believe that the farmers would do that? Does anyone believe that a Canadian farmer would ship a carload of wheat to

Minneapolis if he could get a better price at home? If he can get as much at home for his wheat as at Minneapolis he will sell his wheat at home every time. If the Government believes that wheat is worth more in Winnipeg than it is in the United States, why not give the Canadian farmers what they want, because it will not do anybody any harm? It will not affect the market to the extent of the sale of a bushel of grain because the Canadian farmer will sell at home if the market is equal to the best he can get. But during September, October, and November, the farmers of the West lost over $10,000,000 in not being able to have the American market for their wheat. The Government would not give them the American market, they sent their wheat to the old country, and the farmer is paying from 40 cents to 45 cents a bushel to take his wheat from tide water to Liverpool. For the munition manufacturers who were able to charge this and the British Government four prices for their goods, they could get a rate which was practically the same as the rate before the war, but the rate for carrying wheat which, before the war, was from 5 to 7 cents a bushel, went up to from 40 to 45 cents a bushel. The Government were either powerless or careless, or they did not have the interest of the farmers at heart to the same degree that they had the interest of the manufacturers, they did not give them the American market and they allowed them to be robbed on this last year's crop to the extent of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 in excessive freight rates.

That is the position that the farmer is in. Is it any wonder that he is demanding free wheat? The wonder is that any bunch of men could be got together who would refuse it. The wonder is that any Government would refuse such a reasonable demand from the people as that they be allowed to sell their wheat in the best way they could. What I say about wheat applies to wheat products and potatoes. If potatoes were put on the free list the American market would prove most profitable to the Canadian farmer who grows potatoes. We, in the West, do not grow potatoes to any considerable extent, not that we cannot grow them and grow them in abundance, but because there has never been a market. In my own constituency one year a man put in fifteen acres of potatoes and bought the necessary machinery to handle them. He had a large crop, he wrote to Winnipeg and the best price he could get left him only six cents a bushel for the potatoes loaded on the cars, after buying the sacks to put them in and paying the freight rate. He sent a man down into the United States and he sold these potatoes, consisting of fifteen or twenty car loads at St. Louis. I cannot remember the exact figures but after paying the duty he had the big price of 30 or 40 cents a bushel for his potatoes. However, as I said, we do not grow potatoes up there because we have no steady market. If we had the American market for potatoes we could grow them profitably.

It is the same with our cattle. Formerly the prices kept going up and down all the time. Every little while there would be a combination of the buyers, and the price would go down. Prices have been steady and higher ever since we had the American market for our cattle. Does anybody say to-day, as some people said in 1911, that because the farmer of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario sells his cattle in Buffalo and Chicago, instead of sending them to Liverpool, he is any less loyal? Nobody will advance that argument now, but it was advanced in 1911.

11 p.m. Great reams of figures were given by Conservative candidates in 1911 to prove that if the American market was opened to Canadian cattle it would be disastrous to Canada and to the cattle raisers. But two years ago that came about, and it has been of such benefit to everybody that hon. gentlemen opposite could not go into Saskatchewan, Alberta or Manitoba and get any farmer to advocate the Americans putting on a duty and shutting out Canadian cattle. There is another reason why we should have free wheat now; that offer is liable to be withdrawn at any time. This arrangement of free wheat is not as good as the reciprocity agreement, because, under the reciprocity agreement we would have got free wheat, and all the rest of the world would have been shut out or would have had to pay the duty. But at the present time there is a strong agitation in North Dakota, Northern Minnesota, South Dakota and Montana, amongst the farmers, who are calling on the American Government to withdraw the offer of free wheat to Canada. It is not in the interest of the American growers of hard wheat to have Canadian wheat going in there. One of these days, if we do not accept the offer, it will be withdrawn, and then we will not be able to secure it. If for no other reason than that,

my hon. friends ought to take action in the very near future.

Mr. CARVELL: They ought to take it to-morrow.

Mr. TURRIFF: They ought to take it to-morrow, I know, but I do not anticipate that they will do it as soon as that. The Government had the opportunity to save the farmers from loss early last fall. They had the right, by Order in Council, to put wheat on the free list. In order to make that clear, I had better read the clauses of the Acts. Section 92 of the Consolidated Revenue Act reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council whenever he deems it right and conducive to the public good may remit any duty or toll payable to His Majesty, imposed or authorized to be imposed by any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

If that clause was not sufficient, there is another clause that would have enabled my hon. friends opposite to have put wheat on the free list had they been so inclined. The hon. Minister of Public Works went up through the West and told the people there that he had an open mind on the subject. It was well pointed out by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that the farmers were much more interested in having an open market than in having an open mind. It takes my hon. friend's mind a long time to get fully opened, because I remember having heard him three years ago telling the farmers that free wheat was all right. In view of that statement, he believed that they were going to have it right away. However, he has not made much progress in three years, and his mind is still open. Here is another clause under which the Government could have acted. It is section 286 of the Customs Act, and it reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, and in the manner hereinafter provided in addition to the other purposes and matters in this Act mentioned, make regulations for or relating to the following purposes and matters:
> " (k) Transferring to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of duty, any or all articles, whether natural products or products of manufacturers, used as materials in Canadian manufactures; any such materials transferred to the free list by such Order in Council, to be free of duty of customs for the time therein appointed for that purpose."

The Government could have passed an Act this session, but it is now almost too late. Already over two hundred million bushels have gone east of Winnipeg, that is, seven-fifteenths of the crop. Still, even at this hour, the Government could give some relief to the farmers who have not sold their wheat. At all events a measure of relief passed now would encourage the farmer to grow another large crop next year. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes advance the argument that England is our natural market. Now, England consumes about three hundred million bushels of wheat a year. Of that, she grows about sixty million bushels. That leaves about two hundred and forty million bushels which she imports every year. How would the most loyal man on the opposite side of this House say that England would import all that amount from Canada? I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite would say so. England buys in the best market. She sends her ships to every country in the world, and will any one tell me that England would send a ship to the Argentine Republic, unload it there, and then have the ship come up to Halifax or Montreal for a load of Canadian wheat for England. England did not become rich by doing business on those lines, but by buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest. Why is it that we have to pay such high freight rates—and I am speaking of freight rates in ordinary times, not war times. One of the reasons is that we impose a high duty on British goods entering this country. Let the Government take off this duty, if they will not give us free wheat, and then we shall import goods from Great Britain, and send the ships back to the Old Country laden with Canadian wheat. England will then be our market, and in that way we will get reasonable freight rates. But the Government will do neither one thing nor the other. They are like the dog in the manger. They will not give us the American market, nor will they take off the duty on British goods, so as to give us cheaper freight rates and a better price to the farmer.

In speaking of the millers a little time ago I forgot to say that in my opinion they do not deserve much consideration. I have in my hand a copy of the annual report of the Ogilvie Milling Company—a company with millions of common stock that never put one dollar into the treasury. Last year the Ogilvie Milling Company earned $1,600,000, or fifty-six per cent on their common stock. It is for the benefit of this poor concern than hon. gentlemen opposite are taxing every farmer and every consumer of bread in Canada! The Lake of the Woods Milling Company made a more modest showing. It only shows about $500,000 or $600,000 of profit. Is it not strange, under those circumstances—the

Lake of the Woods Milling Company earning $600,000 profit and the Ogilvie Milling Company $1,600,000—that the stock of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company is higher than the stock of the Ogilvie Milling Company? Does any one believe that the Lake of the Woods Milling Company made merely that amount last year? I have never found a man yet who believed it. That company is simply hiding its profits, and I understand that the Ogilvie company have been kicking themselves ever since for not doing the same thing. It is for these two concerns, and one or two others like them—they can be counted on the fingers of one hand—that the Government is punishing every labouring man and every artisan in Canada, and this is something that hon. gentlemen opposite will have to explain to the people of Canada.

In speaking of the difference in the price of wheat, I mentioned only commercial grades, but in the off grades—number 4, 5 and 6 Northern rejected, tough or smutty wheat—the farmer loses still more. Many and many a time there has been a difference of twenty-five cents a bushel between the price the Canadian farmer could get for this class of wheat on the Canadian market, and the price he could get on the American market. During the first three months of last year fifteen million bushels of this tough wheat went into the hospital elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and to-day in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta millions and millions of bushels are lying out on the prairies, covered over with straw. The Goose Lake line of the Canadian Northern railway, to which company the Solicitor General gave $45,000,000 two years ago, has not taken out a car load of wheat per day per station from that section of the country. The wheat is still lying on the prairie, covered with drifting snow, and unless we have wonderful weather this spring, millions of bushels will get wet and be more or less ruined, and the farmer will have to send it to the hospital elevators at Fort William at fifteen to twenty-five cents a bushel less than if he sold it at Minneapolis. In Minneapolis the wheat would be dried, put on the market, and sold by sample. The intrinsic value of the grain, as a maker of flour, is not depreciated much in the process, and in many cases the American farmer gets a fair price for this class of wheat. But this Government shuts our Canadian farmer out from that market. But this Government shuts them up. They cannot get the wheat out. They could not get it out last fall in the good weather, and now the railroads cannot haul it at all in that country. When the thaw comes in the spring the wheat will be wet and there will be millions of bushels more of tough wheat and on that wheat the farmer is bound to lose anything up to twenty-five cents a bushel. But that can be obviated by my hon. friends opposite being reasonable, being decent. The Lord knows they have stood by the manufacturers long enough. Let them take a day off and give the farmers a fair deal for just one day by passing this Act allowing the farmer to sell his wheat in the United States if he can get a better price for it there. You are not going to hurt the railroads, you are not going to hurt the farmers, or the people generally; you are only going to cut down the profit of the miller. But no one can make me believe that the Canadian miller, with the advantage of water power, wheat, and short haul to tide-water, cannot make, under competitive conditions, all that a legitimate company is entitled to make. So I hope the Government will take that into consideration and at this session put wheat on the free list.

But the answer the Government has been making in the past is that this is too deep a question for the farmer to understand, and, therefore, they must interpret it for him. I do not know that there ever was a day when the farmer had to be looked after in that way, but I do know that that is not the case to-day. I try to represent the views of my farmers here to the best of my ability, but since the organization of the Grain Growers' Association ten or fifteen years ago I have dozens and dozens of farmers in my constituency, members of local grain-growing associations, and some of them officers in the central association, who, when it comes to a matter of marketing the farmers' crop, or a question of the tariff as it affects the farmers, or matters of transportation as affecting farmers, know a great deal more about the subject that I do, can handle it better than I can, and, if they were here, could explain it to the House better than I can. It is no use for the Government to take the position that the farmers do not know what they are talking about, do not know what is good for them; and that, therefore, this Government—endowed, I presume, in their own estimation, with all the brains of Canada—must tell the farmer

what is good for him. That is one of the things my hon. friends will have to explain to the farmers when the right time comes.

Not very long ago I received, as, I suppose, did other hon. members, a copy of a Fort William newspaper, I think it was the Journal, giving the reasons why wheat should not be put on the free list. But the people of Fort William did not believe their own argument. They pointed out that they had far better facilities, that their freight was cheaper, and that the Winnipeg market was higher than the United States market, yet they still want the Government to insist that the wheat must come down that way. They must be in the same category as the members of this Government, they must think that the farmer does not know where his best market is. Their idea is that the farmer would ship to Minneapolis even when he had a better market at home. I read that whole statement, and I did not see one argument in it that appealed to me, in fact not one that I thought the very writer of it himself believed.

Mr. ROGERS: Was that written by Lanigan?

Mr. TURRIFF: Oh, no, Lanigan believed what he said all right, that unless the United States railroads would put down their rates the wheat of Minnesota and Dakota would go out by Fort William instead of by way of Duluth. But he did not write the article in the Fort William paper. They talk in that paper about unity between the East and the West. There never will be unity between the East and the West so long as the western farmer feels that he is suffering under an injustice. And for what? To bolster up a company like the one to which I referred, that makes $1,600,000 profit in a year—56 per cent on its millions of watered stock that never put a dollar into the treasury. You cannot have unity so long as one great section of the country feels that it is suffering under the greatest injustice that human beings were ever called upon to undergo. If you could show the farmer that this was on account of the war, that it was for the good of the country that it should be maintained during the war, he would be the first man to agree to it. But this is not a question of the war but a deliberate policy of this Government to stand by the interests, to stand by the millers and a few dealers in Winnipeg and Fort William, and to refuse to give the farmer even fair play.

If dissension arises the farmers of the West will not be to blame, nor the farmers of the East; nor will the labouring men of the West or of the East be to blame. But this Government will be to blame, because they are allowing this condition of affairs and continuing it with their eyes open and against the advice of their supporters from the West. And they know it.

I have articles here showing the congestion that exists in Canada to-day. I will not take up time to read them, for I have spoken already longer than I intended, and there are no doubt other hon. members who wish to express their views on the subject.

There is a way to relieve the farmers of the West. To lack of action on the part of this Government is due a large part of the extra freight, amounting to $45,000,000, that the farmer is paying on this year's crop to the Old Country. The Government allowed $45,000,000 to be taken out of the pockets of the people only a couple of years ago for Bill and Dan. There is the difference: hand it out to the big interests; squeeze it out of the farmers and consumers. I have not painted the picture worse than it is, I have not gone as far as I might reasonably have gone under the circumstances. I have described the conditions simply as they exist on the prairies. The question now is: are we going to have a remedy? I think that the putting of wheat on the free list would be the best thing the Government could do for themselves; I should be glad to see them do it. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have the interests of my constituents—some forty or forty-five thousand people in an agricultural district—at heart more than I have the idea of an easy election. If the Government grant the farmers this boon they will make it much harder for the Liberal candidates and much easier for the Conservative candidates, but they will make the conditions much better for the people of the West and the people of the East, except the millers and a few of the grain dealers. I shall be more than satisfied, therefore, to have this advantage come to the people I represent. It is the duty of the Government to take some action in the matter; I ask again, Mr. Speaker, will the Government do it?

On motion of Mr. Thomas MacNutt (Saltcoats), the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.29 p.m.

Tuesday, February 15, 1916.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CLERK ASSISTANT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table my recommendation and his report on the subject of the appointment of Mr. Arthur Beauchesne, B.A., K.C., to the position of Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons in place of the late Mr. J. B. R. Laplante.

DISTURBANCES AT CALGARY AND CAMPBELLTON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I asked yesterday for information with regard to the riots alleged to have taken place at Calgary. Has the Minister of Militia received any information on the subject?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Inquiry has been made concerning this matter from the district officer commanding the Calgary and Alberta divisions, and an official report will be received in due course. I am sure that the reports have been very greatly exaggerated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has any report been received from the commanding officer?

Sir SAM HUGHES: A report has been received that everything is perfectly quiet; we shall have an official report by to-morrow. I have read in Hansard the inquiry of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) concerning an alleged disturbance among the soldiers at Campbellton. We have no record of anything of the kind, although inquiry is being made. From my knowledge of the soldiers of that locality, I have no reason to believe that there is any truth whatever in the statements made.

Mr. MARCIL: I read in the last issue of the Campbellton Graphic that on pay-day twenty men had to be put in the guard-house; that some persons had the means of reaching the soldiers there and of distributing whisky among them, much to the annoyance of the whole community. I merely inquired whether any steps were being taken to prevent such occurrences.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Reports of that description have frequently been received from all over Canada, and I have never found one of them justified in the slightest degree by the facts.

SHELL CONTRACTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CARVELL: I should like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that on two different occasions I received the promise of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a complete list of all shell contracts would be laid upon the table of the House. We have waited patiently for this valuable information, and should like to know when we may expect to receive it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to my hon. friend's statement. I presume the information could only be obtained from the Shell Committee, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend could obtain it as easily as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CARVELL: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries got a portion of it, by some means—I suppose by asking for it. He promised to supplement that information and to give us the whole of it. We feel that that is the proper channel through which it should come.

EMBARGO ON OATS AND OATMEAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to repeat a question I asked yesterday, which followed up one I asked some days before of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to the reported imposition of an embargo on the export of oats and oatmeal. The minister said he would give the information at a later date.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no embargo on the export of oats or oatmeal to British countries, to the United States, or to most of the allied countries, so far as I recollect.

Mr. OLIVER: I would gather from what the minister says that an embargo has been placed on the export of oats to certain countries.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just to certain neutral countries. In respect of some of these countries the embargo was modified by permitting exportation under certain conditions of consignment. This is particularly true with reference to Holland, to which country shipments have to go either to the Government or to a company

which has been formed under the joint auspices of the Governments of Holland and of Great Britain.

Mr. OLIVER: As the matter seems to be somewhat complicated, would it be possible for the minister to give detailed information as to what can be done and what cannot be done? This matter is one of considerable importance in the part of the country which I represent, and I should like to have the information.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I understood that my hon. friend's questions at first had reference simply to the United States.

Mr. OLIVER: That was because the report was that the embargo applied to exports of these commodities to the United States.

THE COMMANDEERING OF WHEAT—THE IMPERIAL MUNITIONS BOARD.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KNOWLES: During the course of his speech in the debate on the Address, the Prime Minister was good enough to promise that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would make a full statement with regard to the commandeering of wheat. Can the right hon. gentleman give the House any information as to when we may expect a statement of the circumstances connected with that action on the part of the Government?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not discussed the date with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I will bring the matter to his attention.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear. It is very difficult to get information, for instance, with regard to the new Shell Committee, the other day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) told us in so many words that he would bring down information asked for by my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). To-day the Prime Minister tells us that he will confer with them again, just as he will with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. But conferring is not action. Are we to understand that we cannot have any information with regard to the operations of that committee, in accordance with the promise of the Minister of Marine.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As to information which we shall seek or bring down

with regard to the Shell Committee, we are entirely governed by the wishes of the British Government in respect to matters that they esteem to be confidential.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand that the Government has no control over the Shell Committee?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: None whatever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Can we have information by whom it is appointed? There must be correspondence.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is my hon. friend speaking of the Imperial Munitions Board or of the Shell Committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know which it is. I have no information; I wish I could know what we are talking about. I know there is some mysterious organization, somewhere, presided over by Mr. Flavelle, which is supposed to be a Shell Committee, which is supposed to give contracts for munitions; and I know further that the Minister of Marine said he would bring down information as to the contracts given by that committee.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may say to my hon. friend, what I thought he knew already, that the records of the Shell Committee or the Imperial Munitions Board are not in the possession of the Government, and never have been. The Imperial Munitions Board was appointed by the British Ministry of Munitions through Mr. W. L. Hichens, who represented that board fully in this country at the time of the appointment and who, as I said, communicated the personnel of the whole board to the Ministry of Munitions before he appointed them. They are acting under the direct orders of the Imperial Ministry of Munitions, not under the orders of the Canadian Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then I understand that when the Minister of Marine says he will give information he does not know what he is talking about.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend can draw any conclusion he likes. I have no doubt that the Imperial Munitions Board will afford any information to either a member of the Government or any member of this House except what is regarded as confidential by the British Government. I do not think there is the slightest disposition on their part to conceal or withhold anything, subject to considerations of

public interest, which they must take into account under the instructions of the Government which has appointed them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have to draw the conclusion that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine does not know what he is talking about. It is no pleasure to me to draw that conclusion, but I am surprised to have to draw the further conclusion that this committee has been appointed and all this has taken place without the knowledge of the present Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say it had taken place without the knowledge of the present Government, but that that committee had been appointed by the Imperial Ministry of Munitions. The action which they took was made public in the press at the time by a statement from Mr. Hichens, the fully authorized representative of the British Ministry of Munitions. I do not think there has been any mystery about it; whatever mystery my right hon. friend may find in the matter is purely conjured up in his own imagination.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry to say that this is not a place where ignorance is bliss; quite the reverse.

Mr. HAZEN: I was not in the House when this matter was first brought up. When I was speaking in the debate on the Address, I referred to the names of certain people to whom orders had been given for the manufacture of shells, in answer to the statement that these orders had been given for political purposes. I was asked by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) for further information, and I suggested that the information which he wanted might be obtained from the Shell Committee. The hon. gentleman then asked me if I would obtain the information for him, and I said I should be glad to do so if I could, and I believed I could. I wrote a letter to the Munitions Board asking for the information which I said I would endeavour to obtain for the hon. member for Carleton. I received a reply from Mr. Flavelle this morning, and enclosed it to my hon. friend with a covering letter. My hon. friend should receive that letter to-day. Mr. Flavelle in his letter said he did not think that under existing circumstances it was desirable to give that information to the public. In good faith I applied on behalf of my hon. friend who desired the information, and the answer will be in his possession this afternoon. As to my hon. friend's statement that I did not know what I was talking about, I think that statement ought to be modified by my right hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: It has been pretty well verified. The Minister of Marine now says he has been refused the information which I wanted by the Munitions Board. Will he kindly tell us how he was able to get the information which he wanted and which he furnished to the House?

Mr. HAZEN: The statement which I had was furnished to me by a private individual who knew some of the firms to whom these orders had been given in the province of Ontario. Those that were given in the province of New Brunswick I happened to know myself; but the Ontario names were given to me by a gentleman who happened to know of his own information what firms were manufacturing munitions in that province. My hon. friend wanted further a statement as to the amounts of the orders, the prices, etc., which information I did not have at the time, as I told him then. In reply to my request for this information, I got the letter which I have enclosed to my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the minister object to giving us the name of the private individual?

Mr. HAZEN: It was given me privately.

CANADA'S WAR CONTRIBUTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister made a statement in answer to a question which I put to him some time ago, to the effect that there was an arrangement which was contained in despatches or correspondence with the British Government in reference to Canada's contribution to the cost of the war. My hon. friend then stated that Canada had agreed to pay her proportion of the entire cost of the war, which included guns, rifles, munitions, and everything of that kind. I would ask the Prime Minister if, without the necessity of my making a motion, he would be good enough to lay on the table of the House the correspondence or despatches which have passed between this Government and the Imperial Government in reference to Canada's contribution to the cost of the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall look over the correspondence, and, subject to the confidential character of the communica-

tions, and to considerations of the public interest, I shall be very glad to comply with the hon. gentleman's request. Some of the documents could not be brought down at the present time, as certain matters are still under negotiation.

DEBRIS OF PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MURPHY: In view of certain items that have appeared in the press, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what arrangement, if any, has been made with Peter Lyall & Sons for the removal of the debris of the destroyed Parliament Buildings, and also what arrangement has been made, if any, for the rebuilding of the destroyed structure.

Mr. ROGERS: The matter of removing the debris has been handed over to Messrs. Lyall with instructions to clean out the inner parts as well as they can. Nothing further than that has been done.

Mr. MURPHY: On what terms?

Mr. ROGERS: On terms of costs plus ten per cent.

THE CASE OF DR. BELAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the Prime Minister be good enough to tell the House whether he has received any advices from the Foreign Secretary as to the detention of Dr. Beland, our colleague, who is in prison in Germany?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All information on the subject which has been received has been communicated to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, also to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and I think to one other gentleman who is not a member of this House, but who is a warm personal friend of Dr. Beland. Every possible effort has been made by the Government of Canada through the Colonial Office and through the Foreign Office, as well as through the intervention of Sir George Perley, to secure the release of Dr. Beland. We cannot quite understand why certain difficulties have been put forward by the German military authorities. The situation is not clear either to us or to the authorities of Great Britain; but I think those to whom the communications have been sent will agree with me that everything possible has been done, both by the Canadian authorities and by the authorities of Great Britain, to secure the release of Dr. Beland, for whose detention there seems to be no justifiable cause.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am bound to say that my right hon. friend, the Government, and the British authorities, have done everything that could be done on behalf of Dr. Beland.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to raise a question of privilege. A few days ago, a discussion took place with reference to the building of mercantile ships in Canada, and I ventured to make some suggestions to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to the action which I thought ought to be taken for the encouragement of that industry. My remarks appear in Hansard, and, to use the language of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) last evening, he who runs may read, and even other persons such as he spoke of, who might not have been present when I spoke, may understand. But the Journal of last evening does me very great injustice in using the following words with regard to my position on that important matter. It says:

> There was an interesting discussion toward the close of the week on how Canada might build up a merchant marine. Several suggestions were offered as to how we might build ships in this country, some of them apparently sensible, several manifestly stupid. As a seemingly supreme example of the latter, Mr. Pugsley advanced the idea that we could build ships in the Dominion if we imposed a high protective tariff on all ships imported from other lands.

Now, what I sought to do, and what I did, was to call attention to the disabilities under which shipbuilders in Canada suffered, and I emphasized the fact that while the materials which entered into the building of British ships were free of duty, the materials required for shipbuilding in Canada were subject to a very heavy rate of duty. I suggested that the Canadian shipbuilder should be placed in a position as like that of the British shipbuilder as possible, and I thought that an excellent means of encouraging shipbuilding in this country would be to give a bonus to those who engaged in shipbuilding. That was the mode of encouragement which I suggested, and I am utterly unable to understand how the editor or the reporter of any newspaper who heard my remarks in the House, or who read them in Hansard,

could make the comment the Journal makes with regard to my position in the matter.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I think I should draw the attention of the House to a paragraph which appears in this morning's Citizen, and which attributes to me statements which I never made, as having been given out at a meeting of the French Canadians at St. Ann's hall last evening. Here are the words which the Citizen puts in my mouth:

He expressed the opinion that the question should be taken to the Federal Government, which, he was sure, would find an equitable solution to the difficulties and differences which has arisen over the school question.

I never made such a statement; on the contrary, I said that the question was not one within the purview of the Dominion Government. But, as there were several hon. gentlemen who had come there to gather information concerning the question, I stated that it was desirable that the members hailing from the province of Quebec should be posted in regard to the matter. In substance, that is what I said.

THE BUDGET.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: The Budget of February last, by a comprehensive scheme of general and special taxation, aimed to increase the revenues of the Dominion for the present fiscal year to an aggregate of $150,000,000. I am happy to be able to inform the House that the expectations then formed have been realized in a degree beyond our most sanguine hopes, and that for the present fiscal year ending on March 31 next we confidently anticipate a total revenue of at least $170,000,000, that is to say, $20,000,000 in excess of our estimate. From the date of the introduction of the Budget the sharp monthly declines which had been experienced in our customs duties were at once arrested, and our revenues, until August, restored to the basis of the corresponding months of the year preceding the outbreak of the war. Since August a marked and continually progressive increase has characterized our monthly revenues as compared with those of the corresponding period of the previous year, when the profound derangement of finance and commerce resulting from the war was exercising so serious an effect upon our imports and general business. From the beginning of the present fiscal year up to February 10 the total revenue of the Dominion from all sources has amounted to $145,000,000, an increase of $31,000,000 over the same period of the preceding year. Of this revenue the sum of $82,000,000 has been derived from duties of customs; $19,000,000 from excise; $14,000,000 from post office receipts; and about $3,000,000 from the special taxes other than postal levied under the Special War Revenue Act of last year. Of the amount of customs duties mentioned, the sum of $19,000,000 was derived from the increased duties levied under the Customs War Revenue Act.

Civil Expenditure, 1915-16.

In the Budget of last year I stated it to be the policy of the Government that new works would not be undertaken until the financial outlook became clearer, and we should have in view the source of funds from which to meet the expenditure. This policy has been rigidly followed. Only works actually under contract have been proceeded with and civil expenditure has been kept within close bounds. As a result, our outlays for the year for purposes other than those of the war have been much less than the estimate of the Budget. Up to the present our expenditure on ordinary account has been in round figures $93,500,000, a decrease of over $13,000,000, as compared with the same period of the previous year. On capital account our expenditures—principally upon such works as the National Transcontinental railway, the Quebec bridge, Halifax terminals, improvements to the St. Lawrence Ship channel, the Welland Ship canal, and the Hudson Bay railway—have amounted to $30,500,000, a decrease of $7,000,000 over the corresponding period of the previous year.

Taking into account our increased revenue on the one hand and our decreased ordinary and capital expenditure on the other, it will be seen that, apart from the cost of the war, there has been an improvement in the financial position of the Dominion for the period since April last of no less a sum than $51,000,000. The improvement for the entire fiscal year will probably reach $57,000,000.

War Expenditure—1915-16.

During the last session Parliament passed a War Appropriation Act for

$100,000,000. This was the second Act of the kind, the first having been passed at the special session following upon the outbreak of the war and providing for an amount of $50,000,000. The Prime Minister will introduce at this session a further measure providing for an additional sum of at least $250,000,000. The number of our troops having grown by successive steps to 50,000; to 100,000; to 250,000, with a present authorized establishment of 500,000, our war expenditure has correspondingly increased and has now reached very large figures. From the outbreak of war to the end of January, 1916, it has amounted to $158,000,000.

From what I have said it will be gathered that the general position of our finances has been that while our revenues have been substantially increasing and our ordinary and capital expenditures materially declining, our war expenditure has been mounting rapidly. Our problem has therefore been one of raising money to fill the gap between revenue and total outlay, and I turn now to describe the financial operations of the year.

Loan Issues—1915-16.

We entered upon the present fiscal year with £3,000,000 of Treasury Bills maturing in June. We had also a bank indebtedness of $5,000,000. These Treasury Bills were retired upon maturity and our bank indebtedness has been paid off. The Dominion Government has no outstanding Treasury Bills in the London market and is not overdrawn with any financial institution. On the contrary, we have, at the present time, very large balances to our credit both at home and abroad. In fact, the Government is financed until the beginning of next summer.

Our loan transactions for the year have been as follows:

In March last we made an issue in London of £5,000,000 of four and one-half per cent debenture stock maturing 1920-25. The issue price was 99½ and the offering was over-subscribed.

In August we made an issue in New York of $25,000,000 of 5 per cent notes maturing August 1, 1916, and of $20,000,000 of 5 per cent notes maturing August 1, 1917, or a total issue of $45,000,000. These notes were sold at the price of par and 99½ respectively, less a commission of ⅜ of 1 per cent, and are convertible into 5 per cent bonds of the Dominion of Canada, maturing August 1, 1935. The purpose of this loan was to provide for expenditure upon public undertakings under contract and other capital outlays throughout the Dominion.

In November we offered to the Canadian public a domestic loan of $50,000,000 of 5 per cent ten-year bonds, the issue price being 97½, payable in instalments extending over the period from November, 1915, to May 1, 1916. This issue, as is well known to the House, was most enthusiastically and patriotically received by the people of Canada, with the result that it was more than doubly subscribed. In view of this response and the earnest desire on the part of private investors and financial and other institutions who had subscribed for large amounts to participate in the loan, the authorized amount was doubled and an allotment made of $100,000,000 of these securities. It chanced that at the time of this issue the Imperial Government, owing to adverse sterling exchange conditions which had for some time prevailed, were at a serious disadvantage in making payment for munition and other orders placed in Canada. To assist in overcoming the difficulty and to facilitate further purchases in Canada the Government placed the sum of $50,000,000 from the proceeds of the domestic War Loan to the credit of the Imperial Treasury. This credit is now being availed of for the purpose mentioned.

In my last Budget speech I explained to the House the arrangement made by the Government for advances by the Imperial Treasury towards our war expenditure. The total amount of such advances to date has been £27,000,000. It will be gratifying to the House to learn that since the beginning of the period of serious decline in sterling exchange from June onwards, the Government has been able to finance all our war expenditures in Canada without assistance from the Imperial Treasury. Had we been obliged, during the period in question, to bring funds for this purpose from London to Canada, we should not only have made a heavy loss on the transactions but would have been in direct competition with the Imperial Treasury in selling sterling exchange for the purpose of meeting their obligations maturing due upon orders for munitions and supplies placed on this side of the Atlantic. By reason of our improving revenues and our borrowings in the United States and Canada, it has not been necessary for us to negotiate any sterling bills since June of last year.

Outcome of 1915-16.

As closely as we can estimate, the financial outcome of the present fiscal year will be as follows:

Revenue from all sources -	$170,000,000
Ordinary expenditure- - -	125,000,000
Surplus- - - - - - - - -	$ 45,000,000

As the proceeds of the American loan, which was specially made to meet capital expenditure, have been more than sufficient for the purpose (the expected expenditure under this heading being $40,000,000) it has been possible for the Government to devote its entire surplus, estimated at $45,000,000, as stated, in payment of the principal of our war expenditure. The House of course understands that in our ordinary expenditure is embraced the entire interest charge upon our public debt, which includes our war borrowings. Ordinary expenditure also includes pensions.

Briefly, then, the result of the present year's transactions as to revenue and expenditure may be summarized as follows: We borrowed in the United States the amount required for our capital expenditures. Our revenues will exceed our ordinary expenditure by $45,000,000. This $45,000,000 we devote to the payment of our war expenditure. By the end of the year, the net national debt will stand at about $580,000,000, an increase of $131,000,000 during the year.

Economic Conditions, 1915-1916.

Turning from the financial transactions and position of the Government to the general affairs of the country, we find much cause for gratification and thankfulness. Business has adjusted itself in a remarkable way to the altered conditions. We have been blessed with a most bountiful harvest, the greatest by far in the history of the Dominion, and this, coupled with the demand for war material, supplies and munitions, has given such stimulation and impetus to trade and industry that, notwithstanding the war, we are experiencing a high degree of prosperity. Probably the most outstanding feature of our national economy during the year has been the extraordinary change which has taken place in our international trade balance. For the fiscal year 1912-13 it was adverse to the extent of over $300,000,000; in 1913-14 of $180,000,000; and in 1914-15 of $36,000,000. For the present fiscal year it seems certain that we shall have a favourable trade balance in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000. That so great a change has been effected in one brief year is a striking tribute at once to the marvellous productivity of the Dominion, and to the capability, industry, and thrift of our people. Our total trade for the year will aggregate approximately $1,200,000,000, an increase of nearly $200,000,000 in exports, and a slight reduction in imports. This is the largest aggregate trade in the history of the Dominion.

On the financial side stability continues to be maintained. The statements of our great monetary institutions disclose a position of growing strength. The savings of the public are rapidly increasing in volume, thus ensuring adequate credits for the commercial, industrial, and agricultural needs of the community. Although, since the outbreak of the war, borrowing for our capital requirements has been possible in Great Britain only on a greatly reduced scale, our provinces, municipalities, railway, industrial and other corporations have resorted with a marked degree of success to the investment markets of the United States, where a strong demand exists for their securities.

While these features of our economy are significant and encouraging in the extreme, we must continually keep before us the salient fact that we are participants in a war, the greatest in all history, still being waged on an increasing scale, with undiminished vigour and with no prospect of early termination. Indeed, all signs seem rather to point to prolongation until the issue shall have been determined by superior resources on the one hand, and exhaustion with collapse on the other. To win the war with the decisiveness which will ensure lasting peace, the Empire will require to put forth its full collective power in men and in money.

From this viewpoint it is our true policy to augment our financial strength by multiplying our productive exertions, and by exercising a rigid economy which reduces to the minimum all expenditures upon luxuries and non-essentials. Only in this way shall we be able to make good the loss caused by the withdrawal of so many of our workers from industrial activities, repair the wastage of the war, and find the funds for its continuance. It cannot be too frequently or too earnestly impressed upon our people that the heaviest burdens of the conflict still lie before us, and that industry and thrift are, for those who remain at home, supreme patriotic duties upon whose

faithful fulfilment our success and consequently our national safety may ultimately depend.

Apart altogether from these higher grounds, it is to be pointed out that in so far as our present prosperity is based upon abnormal prices for our produce and upon the production of war material, it is precarious and transient, and dependent upon the continuance of the war and its conditions. On ordinary business grounds alone, the prudent husbanding of resources and the wise conservation of profits are dictated by the plainest considerations of practical wisdom and good sense. It is in the spirit of these remarks that I now approach the consideration of our financial estimates and programme for the coming year.

Fiscal Year 1916-17.

It is well to make it perfectly clear at the outset that notwithstanding the satisfactory increase in revenue and our diminishing civil expenditures, the burden of financial administration will be much heavier in the coming than it has been in the past year. The last War Appropriation Act authorized an expenditure of $100,000,000.. The War Appropriation Act of this session will authorize an expenditure of $250,000,000, all of which, and possibly more, will be required for the raising, equipping, transporting and maintenance of our rapidly increasing forces. The all-important question, therefore, to be considered is, "How shall we provide the money?" There are only two sources from which it can legitimately come, namely, from revenue, and from borrowing. The Government is resolutely determined to maintain the standard of our currency and not to resort to the issue of unsecured paper money, which is merely a forced loan without interest, leading to depreciation and the gravest economic evils which can afflict a nation. In this connection it will be of interest to the House to know that our gold reserves held against Dominion notes amount to $115,147,985, or 64·2 per cent of the outstanding circulation.

As regards our ordinary and capital expenditure, we shall endeavour to continue to effect all possible reductions. Our Estimates contain numerous items hitherto adopted by Parliament, representing works with which it is not our intention to proceed during the period of the war. The policy adopted from its outbreak, which has given such excellent results to date, of proceeding only with works actually under contract, will continue to guide us. Further, should financial exigency so require, we shall not hesitate to terminate contracts and leave works in an unfinished condition, notwithstanding the immediate and prospective loss and damages involved. I do not, however, think that such a course will be necessary.

So far as we can estimate, our ordinary expenditure for the coming year will amount to about $135,000,000 as compared with $125,000,000 for this year and $135,000,000 for last year. Our capital estimates are $30,000,000 as compared with $46,000,000 for this year. Adding the ordinary and capital expenditure we look forward to a total civil expenditure for the year of $160,000,000 as compared with $165,000,000 for the present year and $187,000,000 for last year. It must be borne in mind that included in our ordinary expenditure for the coming year is the sum of $36,000,000 representing charges upon our public debt, of which sum no less than $20,000,000 represents increased interest due to our war borrowings; and a further sum of $2,000,000 for pensions payable on account of the war. In making a comparison between our ordinary expenditure for the coming year and that of preceding years, these important items aggregating an increase due to the war of $22,000,000 must be taken into account.

Should it seem expedient, we shall feel justified in borrowing, as we did during the present year, for our capital expenditure. Assuming that this is accomplished, we should have on the basis of present revenue a surplus of $35,000,000 to apply upon our war expenditures. This would leave the sum of $215,000,000 additional to be borrowed for the war. Adding to this our proposed borrowing for capital expenditure, we are confronted with an increase of public debt during the coming year of nearly $250,000,000.

The question has often been discussed as to the true financial policy of a nation in time of war. Some have strongly favoured the policy of large borrowing; others have insisted that the cost of a war should be defrayed by a nation at the time it is being waged. Obviously, in a war such as this, the latter course would be impossible. The truth seems to be that it is not practicable for all nations to adopt the same policy or for any nation the same policy at all times. The circumstances and conditions of individual nations must be taken into consideration. If a country has much accumulated wealth, a policy of drastic taxation would appear to be advisable. With a country such as ours, rich in potential resources, certain of future development and great ex-

pansion of production and population, but without at present large accumulations of wealth, it would appear to me that we are justified in placing upon posterity the greater portion of the financial burden of this war, waged as it is in the interests of human freedom, and for their benefit in equal if not in greater degree than for our own. Canada in future years of peace, with the prosperity which will be her heritage from the development of unbounded resources, will be well able to meet the interest and sinking fund charges upon such debt as we shall be obliged to incur in defence of our country and its liberties. From an example the House will more readily see what I have in mind. Let us assume that our indebtedness on account of this war will reach $500,000,000. At 5 per cent the annual interest will amount to $25,000,000. This sum with a substantial amount added yearly for a sinking fund could in my opinion be met, provided strict economy be practised by Governments, from the future revenues of the Dominion. In national finance, if debts can be funded, the practical question is that of payment of annual interest. But while this is so, the fact must not be overlooked that debt is debt, a financial obligation and burden upon the body politic, whether owed to investors at home or abroad. In making these observations it is my earnest desire that neither the House nor the country will gather the impression that we underrate the magnitude of the liabilities which we are assuming or the gravity of the financial considerations involved in our participation in this great struggle. We believe, however, that the people of Canada desire the Government to put forward the maximum of effort in the cause, and that they will, both for the present and the future, be prepared to cheerfully bear whatever burdens may be entailed upon them in consequence.

4 p.m.

While I have stated, as I think correctly, what the general policy of Canada should be so far as relates to our war finances, I do not desire to be understood as saying that we should not endeavour to raise by taxation a considerable part of our war expenditure. On the contrary, it is my view that it is our clear national duty and supremely in the interest of our credit to provide what we reasonably can without impairing our economic strength. To attempt more would mean too drastic taxation upon a community whose trade and commerce have been seriously interrupted and affected by war conditions, and unduly heavy burdens upon a people already contributing generously of their substance to funds and organizations whose patriotic object is the comfort and well-being of our soldiers and the dependents they have left behind. In connection with taxation, there is another feature which we must also bear in mind, namely, that Canada is a country inviting immigration, and we must be careful not to create the impression that it is likely to become a country of heavy individual taxation. In this connection I think it opportune to state, on behalf of the Government and as enunciating its settled policy, that in providing our war expenditure resort will not be had to taxation upon the farms, personal effects or incomes of those engaged in our great basic industry of agriculture.

Taxation and Loans, 1916-17.

With these preliminary observations as to general financial policy applicable at this time, I approach the consideration of our taxation proposals and financial programme for the coming year. By the last Budget we increased, with certain exceptions, the general and intermediate tariff rates by seven and a half per cent, and the preferential rates by five per cent. We also imposed special taxes upon banks, insurance, loan and trust companies, and upon cheques, money orders, telegrams, railroad, sleeping-car and steamship tickets, letters and postal cards, and upon wines and certain other commodities. At the time this broad measure of taxation was imposed, many were of opinion that the war might not last through the year, and the measures then adopted were regarded as adequate to meet the needs of the military establishment we had then in view, viz., one hundred thousand men. With the altered situation which I have before mentioned, in which we have recruited troops to the number of 250,000 and are aiming to increase these to 500,000, it is manifest that we must devise further ways and means of meeting the expenditure necessary to organize and equip the new contingents and maintain our entire forces.

Tariff Proposals.

As to taxation measures we have no tariff proposals to offer except the following. We propose to alter the duty payable on apples to 90 cents per barrel. We regard this duty as indispensably necessary for the preservation of the apple growing industry of Canada and particularly that of British Colum-

bia, which has been most seriously affected since the outbreak of the war. We also propose a duty of one-half cent a gallon on oils, petroleum, not including crude petroleum imported to be refined, or illuminating or lubricating oils, .8235 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature. This change will include heavy distillates that are now assessed duty at two and one-half cents a gallon and which have been chiefly imported into the prairie provinces. We expect this item will yield a revenue of about $500,000. The goods covered by the tariff proposals will be exempt from the provisions of The Customs Tariff War Revenue Act, 1915.

For the reasons which I gave in my last Budget speech we regard it as inexpedient to consider, for the present at least, the imposition of a direct income tax. We find, therefore, the area of taxation considerably restricted. In estimating further sources we have carefully considered the question of what class or classes can best bear the burden of further special taxation, because it is an axiom of taxation that the burden should fall upon those in the community best able to bear it. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are in time of war many businesses and industries, which for one reason or another are able to maintain profits above the average return to capital in time of peace. There are others whose profits arise directly from the manufacture of munitions or the furnishing of supplies in connection with the war itself and are in some instances of abnormal character. It has appeared to the Government that persons, firms, and corporations whose profits have been such might well be called upon to contribute a share to the carrying on of the war. Their position being advantageous as compared with less fortunate fellow-citizens, it is just that a portion of their advantage should be appropriated to the benefit of the state. In this connection we have prepared a measure which I propose to introduce to the House, providing for the taxation of profits in excess of a certain percentage upon capital engaged in all classes of business and industry, including railway, steamship, public utility, financial, commercial, milling, mining, and industrial enterprises. We have fixed upon a rate of profit in the case of corporations, individuals and firms which may be taken as a fair annual return in normal times. We propose to impose taxation to the extent of one-fourth of the amount of net profits upon capital derived since the outbreak of the war in excess of this fixed rate. To particularize, our proposal is as follows:

Upon all incorporated companies carrying on business in Canada, excepting life insurance companies, which are otherwise dealt with, and those engaged in agriculture, we propose to impose a tax of one-fourth of the net profits for every accounting period ending since the outbreak of war in excess of seven per cent upon paid-up capital. Provision is made for determining the profits and paid-up capital made and employed in Canada in the case of non-Canadian companies carrying on business in Canada and subject to the tax.

Upon individuals, firms, partnerships, and associations, we propose a tax of one-fourth of the net profits for every accounting period ending since the oubreak of the war in excess of ten per cent upon the capital engaged in their business.

The taxation will not apply to persons, firms or companies whose capital is less than $50,000. This limitation will not, however, apply to those engaged in manufacturing or dealing in munitions or material of war and supplies for war purposes. The duration of the measure will be limited to August 3, 1917. Banks and companies which are already taxed under the provisions of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, shall during the period of the measure now proposed, be exempt from taxation under its provisions to the extent to which they are taxed under the said Special War Revenue Act. The yearly taxation under this measure will be payable on or before the first day of November in each year. The first payment will therefore not be called for until next November.

It will be observed that incorporated companies are taxed upon a higher basis than individuals and partnerships. The reason for this is that capital in the case of joint stock companies frequently represents intangible assets or capitalized earning power or goodwill. We found it a practical impossibility to go behind the capitalization of companies and endeavour to ascertain the precise cash value of their assets as can be done in the case of individuals or partnerships. The cases of railway, public franchise, and so-called holding companies, mining and other corporations, illustrate the difficulty to which I am referring. In addition there is the further fact that shareholders have purchased their shares and receive their dividends upon the basis of issued capital stock.

Provision is to be made for preventing evasion of taxation by further stock issues or the incorporation of companies for the purposes of taking over existing businesses. Provision is also to be made for preventing the postponement of the taking of profits on orders and contracts wholly or partially performed.

I am unable to give the House an accurate estimate of what this measure of taxation will realize, but we believe its results will be very substantial—probably as much as twenty-five or thirty million dollars for the period mentioned. In Committee I shall be pleased to give more detailed information. It is to be borne in mind in connection with the subject of war profits, which have been much discussed, that many of our industrial companies were obliged during the period immediately succeeding the outbreak of the war to pass their preferred and other dividends owing to the general depression which then prevailed.

From my statement it will be gathered that what we propose is a very comprehensive measure of taxation, not confined to those who have since the outbreak of war made more than their usual profits, but applying to all businesses, whether in existence before the war or established after its outbreak, whose profits exceed the percentages which I have mentioned.

No doubt in the administration of this legislation some anomalies will arise, but these are inseparable from any comprehensive scheme of taxation upon a numerous class of the community. I am confident that those upon whom the burden will fall will gladly make the contribution which it calls for to the cause for which we are contending.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the taxation proposals which we have to submit for the consideration of the House at this time, and in connection with them I beg leave to lay upon the Table the following resolutions:

1. Resolved that it is expedient to amend schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, and to strike thereout tariff items 92 and 267, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set opposite each of the said items, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duties be inserted in said schedule A:

Tariff Items.	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
92. Apples.. .. ..per barrel	60 cents.	90 cents.	90 cents.
267. Oils, petroleum, (not including crude petroleum imported to be refined or illuminating or lubricating oils), ·8235 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature .. .. .. per gallon.	½ cent.	½ cent.	½ cent.
267.a. Crude petroleum in its natural state, ·7900 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature, when imported by oil refiners to be refined in their own factories..	5 p. c.	7½ p. c.	7½ p. c.

Provided, however, that the goods hereinbefore enumerated shall be exempt from the rates of duties of customs specified in section 3 of the Customs Tariff War Revenue Act, 1915.

2. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into force on the 16th day of February, 1916, and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions, imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have also applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide:

1. That, in the following resolution, "Minister" means the Minister of Finance of Canada; "non-Canadian company" means an incorporated company having its head office or principal place of business outside Canada but having assets in or carrying on business in Canada; "person" means any individual or person and any partnership, syndicate, trust, association or other body and any body corporate, and the heirs, executors, administrators, curators and assigns or other legal representatives of such person, according to the law of that part of Canada to which the context extends.

2. That there shall be charged, levied and paid to His Majesty a tax of twenty-five per centum of the amount by which the profits arising from any trade or business subject to the tax in every accounting period ending after the fourth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, exceeded, in the case of incorporated companies, seven per centum, and, in the case of all other persons, ten per centum, upon the capital employed in such trade or business.

Provided, however, that the amount paid or payable by any person under the provisions of Part one of the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, shall be deducted from the amount which such

person would otherwise be liable to pay, and the minister shall have power to determine any questions that may arise in consequence of the difference of the several periods for which the taxes under the said Act and those proposed herein are payable.

3. That the accounting period shall be taken to be the period for which the accounts of the trade or business have been made up, but where the accounts of the trade or business have not been made up for any definite period or for the period for which they have been usually made up, or if a year or more has elapsed without the accounts being made up, the accounting period shall be taken to be such period and ending on such a date as the minister may determine.

4. That the trades and businesses to which the tax shall apply are all trades and businesses, including the business of transportation, (whether continuously carried on or not) of any description carried on, or partly carried on, in Canada, except:

(a) any trade or business other than a trade or business which, or any portion of which, is the manufacturing or dealing in munitions of war or in materials or supplies of any kind for war purposes, the capital employed in which is less than fifty thousand dollars.
(b) the business of life insurance.
(c) the business of farming and stock raising.

Computation of Profits.

5. That the profits shall be taken to be the net profits arising in the accounting period.

(2.) The profits of a non-Canadian company shall be such proportion of the net profits as shall bear the same proportion to the total amount of its net profits as the capital of the company as defined herein bears to the total amount paid up upon its capital stock.

(3.) No deductions from gross profits for depreciation or for any expenditure of a capital nature for renewals, or for the development of a trade or business, or otherwise in respect of the trade or business, shall be allowed except such amount as appears to the minister to be reasonable and to be properly attributable to the accounting period.

(4.) Any deductions made from the gross profits for the remuneration of directors, managers and persons concerned in the management of the trade or business shall not, unless the minister, owing to any special circumstances, otherwise directs, exceed the sums deducted for these purposes in the last accounting period ending before the fourth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, and no deductions shall be allowed in respect of any transaction or operation of any nature where it appears, or to the extent to which it appears, that the transaction or operation has improperly reduced the amount to be taken as the amount of the profits of the trade or business.

(5.) In the case of any contract extending beyond one accounting period from the date of its commencement to the completion thereof and only partially performed in any accounting period there shall (unless the minister, owing to any special circumstances, otherwise directs) be attributed to each of the accounting periods in which such contract was partially performed, such proportion of the entire profits or estimated profits in respect of the complete performance of the contract as shall be properly attributable to such accounting periods respectively, having regard to the extent to which the contract was performed in such periods.

Capital.

6. That the capital employed in the trade or business of an incorporated company having its head office or other principal place of business in Canada shall be the amount paid up on its capital stock.

7. That the capital employed in the trade or business of a non-Canadian company shall be such portion of the amount paid up on its capital stock as shall bear the same proportion to the amount paid up on its entire capital stock as the value of its assets in Canada bears to the value of its assets outside Canada.

8. That the minister may determine the amount of the capital of any incorporated company issuing stock after the fifteenth day of February, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, and if, after the said fifteenth day of February, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, the capital stock of any incorporated company is increased or additional stock is issued, or if the stock is in any way changed or reorganized in such manner as to increase the amount of the capital, the minister may decide whether or not it is fair and proper to include such increase or any part thereof when determining the capital stock of such company, and the decision of the minister shall be final and conclusive.

9. That the capital employed in the trade or business of any person other than an incorporated company shall be taken to be the value of all assets real and personal, movable and immovable, used in connection with such trade or business:

(a) so far as the capital consists of assets acquired by purchase the value shall be the price at which such assets were acquired, subject to any proper deductions for depreciation or replacement, or for unpaid purchase money; and
(b) so far as the capital consists of assets being debts due to the trade or business the value shall be the nominal amount of those debts, except bad debts proved to be such to the satisfaction of the minister; and
(c) so far as the capital consists of any other assets which have not been acquired by purchase the value shall be the value of the assets at the time when they became assets of the trade or business, subject to any proper deductions for depreciation or replacement.
(d) Accumulated profits employed in the business shall also be deemed capital.

(2.) Any borrowed money or debts shall be deducted in computing the amount of capital.

(3.) Where any asset has been paid for otherwise than in cash the cost price of that asset shall be taken to be the value of the consideration at the time the asset was acquired.

10. That provision be made requiring persons liable or believed to be liable to make such returns as may be necessary to assess the tax; and that provision also be made for the assessment of the several persons liable to taxation; for the appointment of a Board of Referees to determine assessment appeals; for a further appeal to the Exchequer Court of Canada; and for the collection of taxes, interest and costs in the Exchequer Court of Canada and other courts of competent jurisdiction.

I have now to direct the attention of the House to the matter of the borrowings by which we shall supplement our revenues to the full amount necessary to meet our war expenditure for the coming year. At present we are, as I have stated, financed as to our requirements in Canada until the beginning of summer. We have, however, a large body of troops—over 100,000—overseas, whose pay and cost of maintenance run into large figures, and will continually increase as its number increases. To pay and maintain these forces abroad we should, if we relied entirely upon our own resources, be obliged to raise the money here and purchase exchange on London, as the expenditure in question is made in Britain and on the Continent. To provide this money, and as an efficient safeguard to our own financial situation in Canada, we arranged last fall for a total authorized loan of £30,000,000 from the Imperial Treasury, to be availed of, if necessary, at a rate not exceeding £2,500,000 a month during the present calendar year. In connection with this loan I may point out that with the large invisible balance of interest payments amounting to about $150,000,000 annually, which Canada owes to Great Britain on past indebtedness, and our annual interest debit of $37,000,000 to the United States, we should, if an arrangement of the kind was not effected, be obliged to export gold to Great Britain or to the United States to the amount of a part at least of our war expenditure abroad. While this arrangement absolutely ensures the stability of our finance for the year, it will be our most earnest endeavour to avail ourselves as little as possible of this generous provision on the part of the Imperial Government, sustaining, as it is, the heavy burden of financing its own unparalleled war expenditures, and making loans on a vast scale to allies. Further, it is our intention, to the extent we may be able, to make advances in Canada to the Imperial Government to facilitate its additional purchases here of munitions and supplies. Some plan of the kind, either with the Government or with our banks or business interests, would seem, in the present state of sterling exchange, to be necessary if such purchases are to continue, at least on the large scale which has obtained during the past year.

In considering the question of future loans, it is to be pointed out that while there is considerable money on this continent for short-date investment, the amount obtainable diminishes and the rate of interest increases with length of term. My personal view of the policy to be followed in war finance is that it is preferable to face the higher rate payable on long-term issues rather than to make repeated short-date issues whose maturities may have to be provided for by payment or renewal at times when further funds have to be raised for fresh war expenditures. Moreover, it is not, in my opinion, desirable that in the period immediately succeeding the conclusion of the war the Government of the day should be hampered in its financing, in the possibly trying conditions of recuperation and reconstruction, by the necessity of funding numerous issues maturing due at brief intervals.

The conspicuous success of the recent Canadian war loan encourages us to hope that a large portion of our requirements from this forward may be raised from our own people. There is no doubt that this can be done if the production of the Dominion continues to increase, and if strict economy and thrift are exercised by our people with the intention of investing their savings in Government securities. In considering the question of future Canadian flotations, we shall, of course, have regard to existing banking and exchange conditions, with the object of causing as little as possible disturbance to and interference with general credit conditions and arrangements.

To assist in our war financing I have to propose a legislative measure whereby life insurance companies and associations carrying on business in Canada under Dominion license will be obligated to invest and keep invested a certain portion of their assets during this and next year in the currency, bonds, or debenture stock of the Dominion. We propose that companies whose domicile is outside of Canada, but which are licensed to transact business in Canada, shall make the deposits which they are required to make in 1916 and 1917 as security for their policyholders in the Dominion in such securities, and as to Canadian companies we propose that for the same two years they shall invest in such securities one-half of the increase in their net ledger assets during the years 1915 and 1916 after making provision for increase in foreign reserves and in policy loans. Provision will be made to meet the case of foreign companies which have already made their deposits for the present year. The aggregate amount of such investments will reach a total of at least

$15,000,000. Having regard to the rate of interest which the Dominion is now paying upon its securities, there can be no hardship in such legislation either to the insurance companies or their policyholders who will obtain an investment of the highest character yielding a most attractive interest return. I have the less hesitation in proposing this legislation because, unlike other financial companies, life insurance companies and associations have not been subjected to Dominion taxation. In connection with this measure, I desire to express my sincere thanks to the life insurance companies and associations for their prompt, generous, and patriotic response to the appeal for subscriptions to the Canadian war loan. Their holdings in this issue will, of course, be available pro tanto in discharge of their obligations under the proposed Act.

I now beg to give notice of a Bill intituled, "The Life Insurance Companies Investment Act, 1916," which I shall later introduce to the House.

To promote saving among the public and afford a ready means of remunerative investment in Dominion securities for funds seeking investment during the intervals between public offerings, we have determined to authorize the sale, from time to time, in principal sums of $100 and multiples thereof, of debenture stock repayable in five years from date of issue, and bearing interest payable half yearly by cheque negotiable without discount at any branch of any chartered bank in Canada. The price will be par, and full information as to the nature and terms of the issue will be published later. The Government will reserve to itself the right to limit the amount of individual sales, and generally to deal with the issue as may be deemd advisable having regard to the national credit and requirements.

These, Mr. Speaker, are all the fiscal and financial proposals which I have to lay before Parliament in the present Budget, and it is my earnest hope that they may merit and find general acceptance. Taxation measures can hardly ever be expected to be popular, at least with those upon whom they fall. But I much mistake the spirit and temper of the Canadian people if they do not cheerfully accept as hitherto in the spirit of the loftiest patriotism and willing self-sacrifice the added burdens which the exigencies of the war compel us to cast upon them.

It may seem premature at this stage of the conflict to touch upon the question of policy to be pursued after its termination. But this I feel justified in stating, that the Government is fully alive to the importance of taking immediate action looking to the promotion of desirable immigration and land settlement, both during and after the war, and the creation of all necessary machinery and organization to that end. The future of Canada rests with the development of its great resources, of which the greatest and most fundamental is agriculture, and this development is in turn bound up with the question of increase in population of the productive sort and the facilities afforded it for the application of its intelligence and industry. It is probable that in the straitened financial conditions which may prevail for some years forward the question of capital for the development of agriculture may be of paramount importance, and it is our intention to inquire carefully during the coming recess into this most important subject, with a view, if desirable in the public interest, to supplementing by federal aid existing facilities in this connection. Particularly will the questibn of the establishment of a system whereby loans at reasonable rates repayable on the amortization principle engage the attention of the Government.

It might be assumed that in so important a deliverance as the Budget speech I should say something as to the war and its progress. But the subject has been dealt with so ably and so eloquently by the leaders and members on both sides of the House that further reference on my part could be only superfluous. The conflict has developed and extended upon a scale and to an extent far beyond our expectations or imaginings at its inception. Looking backward over its tragic course and reflecting upon its varied fortunes, there has grown in the hearts and minds of all an ever-deepening sense of its increasing gravity and menace to the Empire's safety. But the Empire's courage and the Empire's strength have steadily grown with the growing peril. Never has our national spirit been more high, never our resolve more unshaken, never have we been more supremely confident of ultimate victory than we are to-day. We have taken the measure of our foe, we have estimated the resources of our manhood and the other elements of Imperial power, and we steadfastly abide the issue in calm consciousness of inherent strength and the eternal justice of our cause. We fight for human

progress and for human rights, and we can and shall endure unto the end.

Mr A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, the financial statement which has just been delivered by the Minister of Finance involves a great many important matters which one could not very well anticipate, particularly in detail; and we on this side of the House would like some short opportunity for studying the same. I trust, therefore, that it will be agreeable to the House if I move the adjournment of the debate until Thursday, when we shall be ready to resume. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Before that motion is put, there are one or two things that, perhaps, the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) would clear up, and in regard to which he might give some further information to the country. Is it the intention to create machinery in connection with the Finance Department for the collection of these special taxes. I would like to understand also, how he proposes to deal with companies who are making profits from the war, and which have organizations both within and without our country.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I read the resolution somewhat hurriedly, but it very fully explains the points raised by my hon. friend. There will of course be machinery for the making of assessments under the Act and the collection of the taxes through the Finance Department.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY.

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

Department of the Interior—Dominion lands and parks—salaries of the outside service, $465,000.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): This is to cover the expenses of the following officials: Homestead inspectors, inspectors of land agencies, inspectors of branches, Dominion lands and Crown timber agencies and sub-land-agencies, and to provide for any additional help that may be required during the year, or for any increases in salaries.

Mr. MURPHY: There is no increase?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he intends to spend all of this money, or if he wants to be economical and retrench somewhat. We have just heard the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that the Government will not expend the whole of their Estimates. Does that apply to the Department of the Interior? It is a very wrong practice to make the Estimates larger than the intended expenditure. The Estimates which have been brought down provide for an expenditure on consolidated fund account of $158,958,730.58. In the Budget speech the Minister of Finance stated that he did not contemplate expending $158,000,000, but only $125,000,000, if I understood him aright. Therefore, to provide in the Estimates for $33,000,000 more than you intend to expend, is a very wrong practice. I do not want to enter into a discussion with the Minister of the Interior on that point; I will discuss it with the Minister of Finance. Does my hon. friend intend to expend the whole of the amount that he is asking for, or is he going to economize.

Mr. ROCHE: I might explain to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that this is to provide for the salaries of 463 officials. Of these there are some 55 who have enlisted and whose places we have not as yet been filled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And which you will not fill?

Mr. ROCHE: Not unless it is absolutely essential.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are you paying their salaries?

Mr. ROCHE: Those who enlisted prior to the 1st of November, 1915, are drawing their civil pay and their military pay; but those who enlisted after that date receive only their military pay and the difference between that and their civil pay.

Mr. NESBITT: Why not put them all on the same basis?

Mr. ROCHE: We are governed by an Order in Council which applies to the whole service. On account of the pretty heavy drain on the war fund to pay these salaries and the salaries of substitutes, we thought it wise to impose some safeguard, and in consequence the Order in Council was passed that those who enlisted after the 1st of November, 1915, should receive, not their civil pay and their military pay, but merely their military pay and the difference between that and their civil pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that the Order in Council passed on the 1st of November applies to all departments. Suppose a young man in one of the departments wishes to qualify as a commissioned officer, either a captain or a lieutenant; is he allowed any portion of his salary while he is attending one of the training schools, say in Quebec or Halifax? Is he obliged to pay his own expenses while at the school?

Mr. ROCHE: We have allowed leave of absence with pay to those who have left for the training school, as some of them have. Of course, if they go to the school after they enlist, they receive their military pay while there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that done under a general Order in Council, or is it a matter of favoritism by the head of the department?

Mr. ROCHE: So far as leave of absence is concerned, I do not think there is any general Order in Council. A few men in my department have asked me for leave of absence to attend one of these training schools, and I have always granted it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where leave of absence is granted, then, the men receive pay during their absence under a general Order in Council?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, under the general Order in Council.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason I bring this up is that I know of a young man in the employ of the Government who wished to attend one of these training schools. The information he has been given is that he will have to forfeit his pay during the time he is at the training school. I am therefore very glad to hear the minister say that there is a general Order in Council, applying to all departments, that these young men shall receive pay while at the training school. This is a very important matter, for this reason. These young men cannot very well afford to pay their own expenses and lose their pay. All of them have to have uniforms before they can attend the school, and I believe they are obliged to buy their uniforms themselves. If that is the case, it strikes me as very unfair, and I think it will prevent many thoroughly good young men who would make splendid officers from attending the school. A man, for instance, earning two or three dollars a day, would have to spend two or three months' wages in buying his uniform. This is a very important matter, and I am therefore glad to hear the minister say that the men in the departments are allowed their pay while at the training school.

Mr. ROCHE: Either the hon. gentleman misunderstood me or I misunderstood him. I did not wish to give the impression that there is a general Order in Council allowing pay to any person in the department while he is qualifying at one of the training schools. There is no general Order in Council to that effect. The Order in Council of November 1 simply provides that those who enlist on and after the 1st of November shall receive only their military pay and the difference between that and their civil pay. Those who enlisted previous to that date draw both their civil pay and their military pay. Prior to the 1st of November we did not make this distinction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the minister misunderstood my question, or he may have received different information since he gave his answer. But in answer to my question he said that to the men in his department he had granted leave of absence to attend a training school, and that their pay had been allowed to go on while they were at the school. Does the minister wish to withdraw that statement?

Mr. ROCHE: I can only answer for my own department. There is no general Order in Council covering such a case. I have in all cases allowed young men in my department who wanted to attend the training school three weeks' holidays, and three weeks additional leave of absence with pay. The course takes about six weeks, I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They get paid during the whole six weeks?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If this is simply a matter of favouritism by the head of the department, it is entirely wrong.

Mr. ROCHE: I have allowed leave of absence in every case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But other ministers have not. There should be a general Order in Council providing for the same practice in every department. It is entirely unjust that while employees of the Department of the Interior are granted three weeks' holidays, and a further three weeks' leave with pay, to attend a training school, em-

ployees of other departments of the Government are denied the same right. There should be one rule, and only one rule, applying to all departments. It is a very great hardship that any of these young men should be deprived of their pay during the period they are qualifying at the training school, and that they should have to pay for their own uniforms. This is a state of affairs which prevents the country from having the benefit of the services of hundreds of young men who, while they have not much of this world's goods, would make just as valuable officers as the sons of wealthy parents, and in many cases better.

Mr. KYTE: Did I understand the minister to say that all those in his department who enlisted previous to the 1st of November, 1915, enjoy their civil salaries in addition to their military pay?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: A man drawing three or four thousand dollars a year from this Government might enlist prior to the 1st of November, and be appointed to a military position paying two or three thousand dollars a year. Would that man get both salaries?

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think there has been a case of that nature in my department, and I think there would be very few such cases in any of the departments. But that is the principle.

Mr. TURRIFF: On what grounds does the Government justify paying a man who enlists on the last day of October both his civil and military pay, and a man who enlists on the 1st of November only his military pay, and the difference between that and his civil pay? If that practice is followed there will be no harmony in the departments of the Government nor in the trenches. I am not speaking particularly against either system, although I think the latter system is the best; but I say that all the men should be treated alike: put them all under one system or under the other. I do not think the present system is fair. A man drawing a large salary from this Government may be appointed to a position in the service overseas, carrying with it a large salary. That position may take the man into the trenches, or he may be miles away from the trenches, and in no more danger than in a civil position in the city of Ottawa. Why should such a man be allowed to draw two big salaries just because he happened to enlist prior to the 1st of November? Why distinguish between those who enlist before the 1st of November and those who enlist after? If it is wrong to pay a man both his military pay and his civil pay, why does the Government continue to do it? As the Minister of Finance pointed out this afternoon, we do not know in what position we are in this war; we may be only at the beginning of it. We must, therefore, conserve our resources and we must practise economy. If the Government wants the people of Canada to economize, the Government should set the example; but it is not showing that example of economy that we would like to see, especially in some cases that I have in mind, though not in the department of my hon. friend. Some explanation ought certainly to be given as to why a distinction is made between men joining before the first of November and men joining after that date.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to ask the hon. gentleman a question in regard to promotion after enlistment. Take, for instance, an official in the Post Office Department, who is entitled to promotion from one grade to another after a certain examination. If such an official has enlisted, is he still entitled to that promotion?

I must say that I find the distinction quite invidious between soldiers or officers who enlisted before the first of November last and those who enlisted after that date. It might happen that certain men were not of age or were not ready to enlist before the first of November last, and because they enlisted on the first or second of November last, there would be an invidious distinction made as to the amount of money they would draw from the department. Now, it seems to me that this war is being waged for the principle of equal rights. Is it fair, then, among men of the same national family who are fighting in the trenches one should be able to say to another: I enlisted on the 30th of October, being an official of this or that department, and I receive my full monthly salary, whilst you, my comrade, because you were not of age or had not at that time passed the medical examination enlisted on the first or on the second of November, and receive less than I do. This is not fair, and the Government should apply to all the policy which it has adopted by the terms of the Order in

Council of the first of November last. The same treatment should be meted out to every member of the Canadian expeditionary force. They are all fighting the same enemy; let them fight on the same terms and with equal rights.

Mr. ROCHE: In regard to the first point raised by my hon. friend that promotions have been refused to those——

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has misunderstood my question. I want to know if the officers of this department, outside or inside, who have enlisted and who are entitled to promotion on account of service for a certain number of years, for instance, will receive their promotion.

Mr. ROCHE: I understand that the Civil Service Commission has refused to sanction such promotions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have in my mind the Post Office Department, because that is the department over which I formerly presided. Perhaps my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) could explain this matter to me. There are various grades in the outside service. A man may enter the service at a salary of say $600, and after twelve months or twenty-four months he is entitled to promotion, provided he passes a certain examination. Will that officer, being in the expeditionary force, be entitled to that promotion which he would have received had he been on duty in Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If he has to pass an examination, obviously he cannot be promoted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He cannot pass it, because he is on service overseas.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Civil Service Act would control that.

Mr. MARCIL: Why was the change made on the first of November? No reason has yet been given.

Mr. ROCHE: I have explained the reason. Substitutes for civil servants who have gone to the front have to be paid out of the war appropriation, and we felt that there was too big a drain on it. That was one reason that led us to make the change. Hon. members who have spoken seem to think that the present system is the proper one, that is, only to pay these men the difference between their military and their civil pay, but they wish to go further and reduce the pay of those who enlisted prior to the first of November. I do not agree with that proposition, because it would be a breach of contract. All those men enlisted on certain conditions, and, as they did so enlist and went overseas, to reduce their pay would not be doing justice to them; but we are not doing any injustice to those who have enlisted since the first of November, because they know in advance what pay they are going to receive.

Mr. KYTE: I have in mind an appointment made by the Minister of the Interior in October, 1914, to a position commanding a salary of $1,800 a year. There was no attempt made to justify the appointment on the ground that it was necessary; in fact, the duties assigned to the young man who was appointed had been discharged by another official, who had a smaller salary. About the first of August, 1915, this young man enlisted in one of the regiments which were being recruited at Halifax. He has undergone some training and up to the present time he is in Halifax still enjoying his salary of $1,800 a year, as well as the allowance made to him by the Militia Department in his rank of lieutenant. I do not know what the salary of a lieutenant is, but I presume it is a respectable sum.

5 p.m.

Mr. TURRIFF: $125 a month.

Mr. KYTE: Then he is in receipt of $275 a month, if you take into account his civil and his military pay. When the minister's Estimates were up last year, I pointed out to him that the appointment of this man was entirely unjustifiable, because the other official had never complained that the duties were too arduous, nor that his territory was too large for him to cover. The appointment was, I say, for the purpose of giving this young man a position, and the country was doing very well when it provided him with a salary of $1,800 a year. Now, by reason of the policy adopted by the Department of the Interior prior to the first of November last, this man enjoys the additional salary which comes to him as a lieutenant. The duties of the position to which he was appointed in the Department of the Interior are being discharged by the gentleman who has discharged them during the last seven or eight years. I have no fault to find with the treatment that has been accorded to this young man in Halifax, but I do think there is no logical reason why those men who enlisted since November 1, should not have the same privilege as to salary as those who enlisted previous to that date. I

am informed that employes of other departments who volunteered for service previous to November 1, were told that they would not receive their salaries as civil servants if they joined the forces. I am not in a position to vouch for the accuracy of this, but it has been a matter of complaint in the province of Nova Scotia that the same rule has not been made applicable to the employees of all departments of Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To what regiment is this gentleman attached?

Mr. KYTE: I am not in a position to say.

Mr. ROCHE: What position did he hold in the department?

Mr. KYTE: He was Superintendent of Indian Agencies in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. ROCHE: That does not come under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend said a moment ago that he thought it would be a breach of contract if those who enlisted prior to November 1, 1914, did not continue to receive their double salaries. That is to say, in effect, that that class of men joined the colours simply because they wanted to get the double salary.

Mr. ROCHE: Not necessarily.

Mr. TURRIFF: It practically amounts to that. If these men have any complaint, it is that they would not have joined had they known that they were not to receive their salaries as civil servants. If, as the Minister of Finance said to-day, we desire to do our part to carry the war through successfully, we must economize. The Minister of the Interior is a level-headed, reasonable man; does he think it is reasonable that a political position should be created for the gentleman referred to by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), when there was no more need for his services than there is for a fifth wheel to a wagon? He has not gone overseas; a great many men who enlisted in the early part of the war are shirking their duties, and have absolutely no intention of going to the war. I have in mind the case of a man who was drawing a salary of $80 a month. He joined the army, and his wife is now getting his salary, $80 a month, besides separation allowance, part of her husband's pay as a soldier, and, I think, an allowance from the Patriotic Fund. So that she has plenty of money to spend, and is making no attempt to save it. That is the kind of economy that my hon. friend recommends; it is not the economy referred to in the splendid speech of the Minister of Finance this afternoon. I agree with the Minister of Finance that in order to bring the war to a successful issue we must expand our production, develop our resources, and practise economy, and what kind of example is this department giving us? I consider the case brought forward by the hon. member for Richmond to be a strong indictment against this Government, and I think it would be well if the Minister of Interior should get from the Minister of Militia a statement of the amount being paid to this official, and the nature of the duties which are still occupying his attention in Halifax, notwithstanding the fact that he enlisted in the early days of the war. There may be a good reason for his not going overseas, but I do know of many cases where men who joined early in the war are still strutting round in their frills and feathers without the slightest intention of going to the front.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot concur in the observation of my hon. friend that a considerable number of persons who have enlisted desire to avoid overseas service. My experience teaches me that the young men of Canada who have enlisted have been eminently desirous——

Mr. TURRIFF: The great majority, certainly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In almost every individual instance they have desired to go to the front.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend takes issue with me on that. I am speaking only of my own experience; perhaps he may have had a different experience. As to the young man to whom my hon. friend from Richmond has alluded, if he will send me his name I certainly will have that matter looked into, because I cannot understand why any young man who enlisted for everseas service more than a year ago—

Mr. KYTE: I said he enlisted in August of 1915. He was appointed to his present position in October, 1914.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought he had been amusing himself for more than a year.

Mr. TURRIFF: I misunderstood what the hon. member said. I thought he had enlisted in August, 1914, instead of August, 1915.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, we know that some regiments have been kept in Canada for rather prolonged periods of training. That has not always been due to any desire or action of the Canadian Government; it has been due very often to the inability of the British authorities either to provide transport or to furnish suitable accommodation for the men on the other side. An Order in Council was passed in the early weeks of the war providing that persons in the Civil Service of Canada who enlisted for overseas service would be paid their salaries during the time they were so serving their country at the front. At that time it was not anticipated that the war would last so long, and we had before us at that time the example of municipal corporations and railway and other corporations throughout Canada that were proposing to do exactly the same thing. The idea was impressed on the Government that the country could hardly afford to be less generous with regard to men who were prepared to make the supreme sacrifice than private corporations throughout the country. As the war went on and a greater number of forces had to be recruited, it became evident to the Government that some question might arise as to the continued efficiency of the public service if men were allowed to go on these terms. Moreover, we could not let them go without any consideration of the question whether their services would be more valuable to the country and the Empire at the front or in the performance of the duties they had hitherto discharged. After a good deal of consideration it was proposed that the Order in Council which has been laid on the Table should be passed. I am not quite clear as to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite; perhaps they may not all have the same view. It has been suggested by some of them that we should immediately pass an Order in Council amending the Order in Council of 1914 and providing that these men should no longer be paid the salaries to which they were entitled under that order. There are other hon. gentlemen who seem to take the ground that the order of November last should not have been passed and that we should continue to pay all civil servants who go to the front the full amount of their salaries in addition to their pay and their allowance as soldiers. We did not adopt either of these courses, but provided that civil servants hereafter going to the front should go on certain conditions which they well understood before enlisting. They know perfectly well when they enlist the terms on which the Government think civil servants should be permitted to give up their duties in Canada and go to the front to serve in a military capacity. Of course, when we adopted a policy of that kind some date had to be fixed and we fixed, I think, the 1st of November last. Every civil servant who has enlisted on or since that date has enlisted under terms and conditions which were perfectly well known to him at the time. In addition to that, we had to consider, when a man desired to go to the front, whether or not the duties which he had been performing in the department could be discharged without the engagement of some other person to take his place, to whom an additional salary would have to be paid. The considerations which have been alluded to by the Minister of the Interior were before us in that regard. So we thought that, under the circumstances, the best solution of the matter was along the lines which the Government have pursued. But if my hon. friends opposite have any definite concrete suggestions as to some other solution which in their judgment is better, we should be very glad to have their suggestions. We made the Order in Council in the first instance in the expectation that the war would not last nearly so long, and we made it having regard to similar proposals which had been made by municipal and other corporations in the country. When the war did last for such a very considerable period, in view of the increased additional strain put on the public service by reason of the duration of the war and of the greatly increased number of men we are sending, we came to the conclusion that some change should be made, and it was made along that line.

Mr. GRAHAM: One can readily understand the situation in which the Government found themselves at the beginning of the war. At that time no person, in Canada at least, anticipated that the war would be either so serious or so long drawn out. Municipalities and other institutions were granting pay or part pay to those in their service who enlisted, and the Government did likewise. But the conditions have so changed now that it is a serious matter just to decide what ought to be done. This condition confronts one now in discussing the question of enlisting with the ordinary young man: the man in the Civil Service, under the first regulation, is getting in some

instances double pay, and is twice as well off from a financial standpoint as he was before he enlisted. Looking at it only from that viewpoint, he has made no sacrifice; he has made an improvement. Under the second Order in Council the man who is sufficiently fortunate to be in the Civil Service is not making any financial sacrifice; he is in the same position financially as he would have been had he not enlisted. But when you come to the average young man in the country, he is making the supreme sacrifice, he is giving up his employment, giving up perhaps the future prospect of it when he comes back, and is taking instead the small amount given to him as a private. Financially he is really giving up his entire future. It is difficult to have the best feeling prevailing when you find two men side by side, one better off financially than he was before enlisting, and the other having made the great sacrifice of giving up his salary and any chance of promotion if he was employed by some person or some company. On the other hand, we have thousands of young men in Canada who are locking the doors of their business establishments, so far as they are concerned, young practioners who have just started in the practice of their profession, who are just getting, as it were, on their feet. They are giving up their prospects, locking the door, settling their little businesses, and going overseas for, perhaps, twenty per cent, or twenty-five per cent of what they had hoped to make. It is difficult to convince them of the reasonableness of the man side by side with them being so much better off financially and making no sacrifice in that respect, while they sacrifice everything. It is a difficult situation, and one requiring serious consideration. I think the step the Government have taken towards reducing the amount so that those in the service are not getting any more pay than before they enlisted was a reasonable one, and if the war is to continue perhaps another step will have to be made, so that every man in Canada will be on an equal footing as to the sacrifice he is required to make for the country.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not wish to discuss the concrete cases mentioned by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), but I do feel disposed to say that, the Government having come to an understanding with certain young men prior to their enlistment at the outbreak of the war, it would not, in my opinion, be an honourable course for the Government to go back on that understanding. We believe there should be honour between nations, and we also believe that there should be honour between governments and individuals with whom they deal.

Mr. KYTE: With respect to the men who have actually gone to the front, there is considerable justification for the course taken by the Government; but in cases where the young men have not gone to the front, and are not suffering any more physical or personal discomforts than their neighbours who have not enlisted, I think the minister should suspend payment of the civil salary until they have actually gone to the front, and not put them in a position to draw double salary while their services to the country are not manifest to the onlooker. I said a moment ago that I had moved in the House for a return of all the employees of the Government who have enlisted since the outbreak of the war, and who are enjoying both civil and military salaries. I would like to ask the minister if he would be good enough to bring down a list of the employees in the Department of the Interior before his Estimates are again under consideration.

Mr. ROCHE: If my hon. friend means a list of all the officials in the Department of the Interior who have enlisted, and of the salaries they are getting, that list has already been brought down. I handed it to the ex-Minister of the Interior the other day. I think that all the employees in the Department of the Interior who enlisted have gone to the front, except in two instances, and in these cases the men are specially required for organization purposes by the Militia Department. The hon. member has not pointed out any instance of an employee of the Interior Department getting double pay who has refused to go to the front.

Mr. KYTE: I did not insinuate that any man had refused to go to the front; I simply referred to cases of young men who had not gone to the front, and who nevertheless were enjoying double salaries.

Mr. ROCHE: No doubt the reason they have not gone is that the regiment has not been moved to the front; but we should not dock a young man of his salary because the Government have not seen fit so far to send his regiment overseas. In that respect the Government are guided by the

British War Office. I think it would be distinctly unfair to dock a young man, who comes within the provision of the original Order in Council, of his civil pay simply because his regiment has not been ordered to the front.

Mr. KYTE: I have no fault to find with the men who are drawing double salary, but I think the Government were guilty of a mistake in making an arrangement which applied only to those who enlisted previous to the first of November, and which they could not carry out in respect to those who enlisted subsequent to the first of November. I think the whole difficulty lies in the circumstance that the Government had not a well-thought out plan that could be made applicable to all the employees in the different services who have enlisted.

Mr. ROBB: It is true, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, that many companies and municipalities agreed at the commencement of the war to pay salaries to their employees if they enlisted and went to the front. I should like to cite the case of one large corporation, perhaps the largest railway corporation in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The arrangement they made with their employees who enlisted, was that they received no pay so long as they remained in Canada, but when they went overseas they or their families received it for six months, and then it stopped. That was a fair business arrangement, and an inducement to the men to enlist.

Mr. KYTE: I have looked over the list brought down by the minister, and I find that it refers only to employees in the inside service. I would like to get a return giving the names of the employees in the outside service who have enlisted.

Mr. ROCHE: There is a return to that effect, and it will be laid on the Table tomorrow.

Mr. TURRIFF: The right hon. the Prime Minister pointed out that at the time the first and second contingents were sent overseas it was expected that the war would be short, and a certain arrangement was made with the men who enlisted in those contingents. It seems to me that it would not be unreasonable to look upon that arrangement as a limited one. These men joined in the fall of 1914, and many of us, and I imagine the members of the Government themselves, thought that by November of 1915 the war would be practically over. These men enjoyed double salary up to that date, so it does not seem to me that it would be a hardship to say that on the first of November, 1915, they should come under the new rule. Let me point out to the Prime Minister just how it works out. Take the case of a young man who was earning say $80 a month in his own business or in the employ of a merchant or insurance company that did not give any pay at all to the employees who went to the front. That young man loses his $80 a month, and at the rate of $1.10 per day he takes $33 a month from the Government. Out of a sense of duty to his country and to the Empire he makes that sacrifice. Then take the case of a young man who happened to have the good fortune to work for the Government, and who enlisted subsequent to the first of November. He gets say $80 a month. Right beside them is a man who was in the Civil Service and earning say $80 a month, but who joined prior to the first of November last; he draws $80 plus $33 per month. There you have three young men, one getting $33 a month, another $80 a month and a third $113 a month. I leave it to this House and to the Prime Minister to say whether that is a satisfactory state of affairs.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are no doubt, anomalies, but my hon. friend will doubtless remember that in respect to the employees of municipalities and great corporations who have gone to the front under arrangements that have been already alluded to, precisely the same condition exists. Any man who was employed by one of those corporations or municipalities, and who has gone into the trenches, naturally has a very much larger income than the man alongside of him who did not happen to be an employee of one of those corporations or municipalities; so that the anomaly could not be removed even if the Government should take the course, which my hon. friend seems to suggest, of giving them no portion of their salary. The anomaly would still continue in respect to those members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces who were employed by those corporations and municipalities. You cannot get away from certain anomalies in any case, because our own men at the front enjoy a pay that is very considerably larger than the pay of the British soldier fighting in the trenches alongside of him. I am not quite sure what the pay of the British soldier is; I think it is

about a shilling a day; and the pay of the French soldier, at the commencement of the war, if I remember correctly, was two cents a day.

Mr. MARCIL: It has been increased to five cents a day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was originally two cents a day. But, as a matter of fact, in regard to these men who have gone from Canada, whether they are employees of the Government or of any municipality or of any corporation, I for one decline to believe that the question of the remuneration which they were to receive had much to do with it. I believe these men went from a sense of duty. Undoubtedly there are some anomalies which we have endeavoured to correct along the lines laid down by my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin), who expressed views in regard to our undertaking any change in the arrangements made which were practically those I had expressed to the House before. I am afraid that we could not cure all the anomalies, even if the Government should take the action which my hon. friend thought we should have taken in the first instance. I do not believe that any one in Canada or in the Empire, outside possibly of a few military experts, thought, in the opening months of the war, that it would last for anything like the period during which it is likely to continue; so that arrangements were made having regard to a probable duration much shorter than the period which it has proved necessary to provide for.

Mr. MARCIL: I think the Government should give notice in the future of any change which they intend making. Any bargain you have made should be lived up to. If a man has gone under certain conditions the Government cannot break the engagement. If we are going to have 250,000 more men, and it is doubtful that we can raise that number without interfering very much with the domestic services of the country, the Government should give warning of any intended change so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. NESBITT: I am very much surprised to hear that the Government made any such promise as that which was first given. I think they must have become a little bit hysterical or excited at that time. The arrangement which the minister states came into effect on November 1, is absolutely fair and just. The men who joined the forces were prepared to sacrifice their lives. I do not agree with my hon. friend that men who have not been sent out of the country are not just as loyal as any who have gone. They have enlisted, they have put themselves in a position to go, and they may be sent away at any moment. If they are not sent abroad it is probably not their fault. We have never seen any indication that they were not willing to go when the word was given. Simply because there are some still remaining in Canada, I would not deduct from them what they would be entitled to receive if they went to the front. If these men joined under a certain understanding or promise I do not see how the Government can honourably go back on that promise any more than an individual could. I know personally an individual who promised his men who joined that their salaries would be paid, and who issues his cheque every month to the men who went with that understanding. Personally, if I induced men to go to the war, or to enlist, upon a certain understanding, I would carry out that understanding as long as I was capable of doing so. I am not blaming the Government for doing what I would do personally, but at the same time I confess to the belief that the Government were carried away by excitement when they made the first promise. If the men go because of their loyalty to the country it was absolutely unnecessary to make such a promise. You cannot get away from anomalies in the trenches any more than you can in private or commercial life. I think the arrangement beginning on the first of November last is perfectly right and proper. I am sorry I cannot advocate the cancellation of the first arrangement, because the men joined on the understanding that it would be carried out.

Mr. CRUISE: Do I understand from the Prime Minister that the arrangement was made that the Government would pay all men who enlisted their full salaries for the duration of the war? The Government has the precedent established by railway and other corporations which undertook to pay their men for six months or a year.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That may be the case with some corporations, but I know there are other corporations who are paying their men at the front, and propose to pay them during the whole period of the war their full salaries while they are absent, and to keep their places open for them. Doubtless if the Government had anticipated that the war would continue so

long we might have made, in the first instance, the arrangement that was made on the first of November last. But, in the course which we did pursue, we were only adopting the same policy as that which was adopted by many private individuals and public corporations throughout the country.

Mr. OLIVER: This is a very large amount of money—nearly half a million dollars. I would like to know how this amount stands as compared with the amount for the same services during previous years. I see that this is the same amount as was voted last year. How far back does it run at the same amount, or has there been in recent years, an increase or a decrease? There are certain questions I would like to ask, and I might ask them collectively, so that they could be answered after eight o'clock if desirable.

Mr. ROCHE: We have the Estimates here for last year and this year, but I have nothing here that goes back further than that. I could give the information to the hon. gentleman at a later sitting.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to know what the yearly amount for this service has been for, say, the past five years. Then I would like to know what has been the amount of the services rendered or called upon in each of the same years in the matter of homestead entries, homestead patents, and the collection of moneys in payments on pre-emptions and purchased homesteads.

Mr. TURRIFF: In view of the need for economy during the war, would it not be possible for the minister to reduce this item? When I was out West a few months ago, I ran across an outside service official, a timber ranger for the Department of the Interior in the district north of Winnipeg. This man was dismissed two or three years ago on the ground that his services were no longer required. He told me that when working for the department he received a salary during only certain months of the year and a certain amount for expenses. Three men had since been engaged, he said, to do the very work that he had done himself, and they were each drawing $100 or $125 a month all the year round, and expenses. Now, if one man can do that work, and will do it for a much less salary, it seems to me that the minister could practise economy in that very case. I notice that the reduction this year amounts to only a few million dollars in an expenditure of $150,000,000, to $160,000,000. The percentage of reduction is very small, and I think the minister could help out the Minister of Finance by reducing this particular item. I do not know of any other item in the whole Estimates that could be cut down with less injury to the public service. I might tell my hon. friend that his predecessor the present Minister of Public Works took on a great number of unnecessary men, and I would suggest that the minister let some of these men out; he could do it without injury to the public service, whatever harm it might do to the ex-minister. I venture to say that this item could be reduced by $100,000 without the public service suffering in the slightest degree.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. member will agree that the word of a dismissed official is not always the most reliable or impartial; but if it is true that three men are now engaged where there was only one official heretofore, I think I can suggest a reasonable explanation. The hon. gentleman knows that a certain section of the country has been filling up very rapidly during the last three or four years. A large number of homestead entries have been made between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, which of course makes more work for our officials. I might also say that last year our whole outside staff—range inspectors, homestead inspectors, and other officials—turned in and assisted in the seed grain work, on which we spent $13,000,000 last year. More than that, we had to engage extra help, temporarily, to assist in the work. I think it would be false economy to reduce our staff as the hon. member suggests, for in the event of a similar emergency occurring this season we would simply have to engage outside help again. The Estimates for the Department of the Interior this year are $1,800,000 less than last year's estimates.

Mr. TURRIFF: Was the whole of last year's vote expended?

Mr. ROCHE: All except $7,000 or $8,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Finance Minister told us this afternoon that we should economize, that we should cut out luxuries and buy essentials only. He called attention to the fact that he expected to spend only $135,000,000 next year. Now, these Estimates call for an expenditure of $158,000,000. Therefore, $23,000,000 has to be cut out by somebody, and I think the Interior Depart-

ment might lend the Finance Minister a hand in this particular item. There are, I think, fifteen departments of the Government altogether; that would mean that each department should cut down its Estimates by $1,500,000.

Mr. ROCHE: My reduction is over $1,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has done pretty well on the total, but I think on this particular item he could make a nice reduction and spend the money, if he must spend it, on something that is more urgently needed. There is another point. Are we to understand that officials of the Department of the Interior who have enlisted reecive their full salary from the Government, and that the war appropriation fund makes up the difference?

Mr. ROCHE: Only those who enlisted before the 1st of November, 1915, are drawing civil as well as military pay. I might point out that we do not pay the substitutes as much as the permanent men. For instance, the substitute of an official drawing a salary of $1,500 would receive only about $1,200 from the war vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then the department is not out anything at all; it is the war vote that is touched, not the department. Under the circumstances, therefore, I think the minister could reduce this vote by the salaries of the men who have gone off the pay-roll.

At six o'clock, the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

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

Dominion lands and parks—contingencies, advertising, etc., $300,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the minister say what kind of advertising this is?

Mr. ROCHE: This item covers advertising re sale of timber berths, insertion of homestead and coal mining regulations, notices in connection with lands open for entry, etc.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I remember when my hon. friend was sitting on this side of the House, not himself but some of the members of his party, notably my good and genial friend the member for Peel (Mr. Blain), used to argue very strongly, in sitting after sitting, that even in the case of advertising, tenders should be invited. Has my hon. friend taken a leaf out of the book of the hon. member for Peel by deciding to ask for tenders from the different papers, or does he give this advertising to the party press?

Mr. ROCHE: The homestead and mining regulations are published in the press of the country at the King's Printer's price. No tenders are asked for, but there is a standard price.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I venture to say that the publishing of the homestead regulations is done only by a certain class of papers. My hon. friend will look in vain through the pages of the Regina Leader, the Saskatoon Phoenix and the Moosejaw Times for the homestead regulations; but he will find them in the Regina Province, the Moosejaw News, the Saskatoon Star, and other minor Conservative papers in the province of Saskatchewan. It is a matter of business that the homestead regulations should be published by the papers having the largest circulation in the province, or outside of it, for that matter. I suppose the minister would not care whether the coming of an immigrant into Canada was the result of an advertisement in the Saskatoon Star rather than in the Saskatoon Phoenix; I think he would be perfectly satisfied if a man came into this country as the result of the circulation of a Liberal newspaper. There must be a patronage list of some kind with respect to these newspapers.

Mr. ROCHE: That would be a crime, I suppose.

Mr. MARTIN: When I sat on the Government side of the House I used to hear criticisms from many hon. gentlemen who are now supporting the present Administration with respect to advertising only in certain classes of newspapers. I do not know whether I would find fault with my hon. friend if he wanted to favour his friends with some special advertising, but in a matter of this kind, which affects the whole people of the country, he should put his patronage list aside.

Mr. TURRIFF: Has the hon. member for Peel asked the minister to call for tenders in connection with these advertisements?

Mr. ROCHE: I do not recollect that at the moment.

Mr. OLIVER: What are the principal headings under which this large sum of $300,000 for contingencies, advertising, etc., is to be disbursed?

Mr. ROCHE: Expenses of homestead inspectors, including purchase of travelling outfits, $65,000; expenses of timber inspectors, including purchase of travelling outfits, $20,000; expenses of inspectors of ranches, $10,000; expenses of 27 Dominion lands and crown timber agencies, $60,000; travelling expenses of outside service officials when away on Government business, $35,000; items for printing and stationery, timber berths, and unforeseen expenses.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Could the minister give me any information offhand as to the number of homestead inspectors there are in Saskatchewan at the present time?

Mr. ROCHE: There are 30 in Saskatchewan; 63 altogether.

Mr. MARTIN: Is it not correct that there has been a substantial increase in the number of homestead inspectors?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. MARTIN: I am at a loss to understand why so many homestead inspectors should be needed to-day, and why there should be so marked an increase in the number of homestead inspectors since 1911. It cannot be on account of an increase in the number of homesteads which require to be inspected. In one place with which I am familiar there are, or were for a time, four homestead inspectors, and there are scarcely any homesteads in the district. I remember the case of a homestead inspector who came to the Regina land office from the city of Moosejaw. According to information furnished to the House a year or two ago by the Minister of the Interior, this man drew his salary for four or five months, although during that period he did not inspect one solitary homestead. He had a team of horses eating their heads off in a livery stable in the town of Rouleau; during that period the horses were not used except on the occasion of a provincial election in Saskatchewan in 1912. Apparently the department did not know whether to pay this man his salary or not; but as the result of a meeting that took place at Regina between a former inspector of Dominion land agencies at Regina and three or four members of the Conservative patronage committee in that city, it was finally decided to pay the inspector his salary. This gentleman, therefore, drew about $500 for a period of five months during which he made no inspections. If this matter had come to the attention of the minister, I have no doubt that he would not have allowed it to take the course which it did. The minister was in Regina in 1912 with the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), then Minister of the Interior, when, with a great flare of trumpets, a large meeting was held in that city, and all sorts of promises were made to the people, which have not been fulfilled to this day. If the minister had prolonged his stay he would have seen what this homestead inspector and his team did in that Saskatchewan election.

Mr. ROCHE: There has, of course, been an increase in the number of homestead inspectors during the last few years. As the hon. gentleman knows, the immigration to Canada subsequent to 1911 was the largest that we ever had. In the year ended March 31, 1913, the immigration to Canada reached the high-water mark, 412,000. In 1914 it fell off about 17,000 to about 385,000. A great many of these new immigrants settled upon the land back a considerable distance from transportation; the Peace river country has been opened up and this necessitated more officials. These men after being in the country for three years required inspections when they were applying for patents, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, the principal immigration has taken place in the northern, in the Peace river country. The larger number of homestead inspectors were appointed in northern Alberta, although there were some additional ones in Saskatchewan. While I do not know anything about the particular instance brought forward by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin), I can quite understand a homestead inspector sometimes not being engaged in homestead inspection; frequently they are deputed to perform other duties than homestead inspection. Then, again, we often find it more convenient for homesteaders settled at considerable distances from sub-agencies to have inspectors visit them in order to obviate the necessity of homesteaders travelling great distances to make applications for patents. Certain homestead inspectors have been deputed to visit farmers practically five times.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: That was done before.

Mr. ROCHE: Not to the same extent. There is now, in fact, a special homestead

inspector who has been deputed during the last few years to do this in Saskatchewan and to do nothing else. We have adopted the same principle in Alberta. I will investigate the case mentioned by my hon. friend if he will give me the name of the homestead inspector.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister pointed out that because there was an increased immigration during 1912-13 there was an increase in the number of homestead inspectors. Will he apply the same principle and, because during 1913, 1914 and 1915 there was a decrease in the number of immigrants, decrease the number of homestead inspectors? Then in southern and central Manitoba and the eastern portions of Saskatchewan that are well settled, and where 95 per cent of the homesteads have been patented, has the number of homestead inspectors been reduced? I know that in my own part of the country, there has not been any reduction in the number, although in the greater part of that country practically all homestead lands have been patented. In connection with the Estevan land office, where Mr. Morrison is the agent, there is practically no homestead inspection to be done. Fully nine-tenths of the inspector's time is devoted to political work; he is canvassing practically all the time. I do not know that he is neglecting his duties, because I do not think there are any duties for him to perform. In the last year or two the land district was divided and a new district formed in Weyburn. It was the practice in the past for the homestead inspector to reside at headquarters, at the town where the land office was. This homestead inspector does not do that. He has been in office since the change of Government four years ago, and still lives in his old home, probably seventy-five miles or so away. He goes home over the week ends, and spends probably half his time either travelling to or from his home or at his home. Again I cannot say he is neglecting his duty, because I do not think there is any work for him to do. I know that in the newer sections of the country there is extra work, but in the settled portions of the West the decrease in the amount of inspection work to be done is quite as great as the increase in the newer sections, so that the total work of inspection could be done just as efficiently without any increase in the number of inspectors. Yet new inspectors are being constantly appointed, and there are no reductions in the staff in the sections where there has been a falling off in the work to be done. In these sections where the homestead land has all been patented a number of inspectors could be dispensed with without any impairment of the public service.

Mr. McCRANEY: I should like a further explanation from the minister as to the proceedings at the recent conference between the minister and the premiers of the western provinces and the Canadian Government immigration agents at Chicago. My reason for asking about this is that various reports have been published in the newspapers. I am sorry that the fire destroyed some of my papers, including clippings to the effect that the minister had given assurance, which was made public purposely, to the effect that there would be no conscription in Canada—that no matter what course the British Government took, the Government of Canada would not be guided by it. Since the fire I have looked up the Ottawa Citizen of January 31, and, while the report is very much modified from what appeared in the western papers, even there the idea is given. The despatch is as follows:

> Chicago, January 30.—Canada governs itself and is not influenced by Great Britain in any way; conscription never will be adopted in the Dominion, and there are no war taxes on Canadian land and never will be. These are some of the assertions here Saturday by Dr. Wm. J. Roche, Minister of the Interior of Canada, and T. Crawford Norris, Premier of Manitoba, at the meeting of Canadian immigration agents in United States.

I asked the minister a question the other day as to the terms of any statement he made, and the minister's reply was as follows:

> In addressing a conference of our United States immigration agents recently in Chicago for the purpose of reviewing the immigration situation and making plans for the future, the Minister of the Interior took an opportunity of making a statement refuting the false impression which had been created by articles which have appeared in certain United States papers regarding conscription.

The answer given by the minister does not touch the point that has been published in the western papers, that is, as to any assurance that may have been given to the American public and to intending immigrants that there would be no conscription in Canada. I am bringing this to the attention of the House to give the minister an opportunity of making further explanation, and also for the purpose of expressing the view, which I hold very strongly, with regard to representations made to those who may purpose coming to Canada. We are at this time at war; the Parliament of

Canada has not made any declaration in favour of conscription and is not likely to; I notice, however, that every man who has a son at the front is in favour of some form of universal service at this time. I think all the members of this House take the position which I take, that, if necessary in the defence of this country, and for the purpose of winning this war, we should have conscription or anything else required to bring about that end. I have no doubt that the question has been raised in the United States as to whether there will be conscription in Canada, and it is not at all improbable that immigration agents may have asked from their minister some assurance on that point. It is not at all improbable also that some expressions of opinion may have been given. We find that many immigrants who went to the United States were born in Germany. They left Germany and went to the United States to escape military service; but when they got there they found they were in a country where conscription is the law of the land, because in the American Civil War conscription prevailed, great numbers of Northern troops having been raised in that way. I want to make my own attitude clear, and I want to give the minister an opportunity to state his own position, and to affirm that it would be most unwise that anything should be said in public which would lead those who live in a country where there is compulsory military service to believe that they might come into a country which is now at war and not be subject to like service. I believe that such dispatches as have been sent out misrepresent the opinion of this country, and possibly misrepresent the minister, if they have led anybody to believe that such is the policy of Canada in regard to that question.

One of my reasons for bringing up this matter is that on a previous occasion some representations were made to intending settlers which to-day are a source of considerable trouble. The Minister of the Interior is aware that at the present time the province of Manitoba is considering the whole question of teaching of languages other than English in the schools of the province. It appears that in what is known as the Mennonite reserve, in the southern portion of Manitoba, the Mennonites have been accustomed to conduct private schools in which German only is taught, and which are non-English schools. I have here a letter which was published in one of the Manitoba newspapers of recent date, and which was written by P. M. Lowe, secretary of the Department of Agriculture, on 23rd July, 1873. It was addressed to representatives of the Mennonite community who were visiting this country, and whose homes were in Russia. One of the assurances given by Mr. Lowe is contained in paragraph 1 of this letter:

> An entire exemption from any military service is, by law and Order in Council, granted to the denomination of Christians called "Mennonites."

I think that was a proper thing for Mr. Lowe to say, because under our Militia Act there is an exemption in respect to bearing arms, or to military service, under prescribed conditions. But the dangerous point in Mr. Lowe's letter was with regard to the educational question. I am only quoting this letter now for the purpose of showing how dangerous it is for any person on behalf of this country to make representations upon which any settler may come to this country, and which may become a bill of rights. Here is the clause to which I refer—clause 10:

> The fullest privilege of exercising their religious principles is by law afforded to the Mennonites, without any kind of molestation or restriction whatever, and the same privilege extends to the education of their children in schools.

In the province of Saskatchewan we have, under the Mennonite Church, non-English private schools which teach only the German language. This letter was handed to me as establishing the right of the Mennonites to do so, they having been promised on behalf of the Government of Canada, before they came to this country, that they would be able to exercise their religion and to have the schools to which they had been accustomed in Russia. I am quoting it merely to show how easy it is for some persons in the Government service, no doubt well intentioned, to make a mistake which might be the cause of misunderstandings long after the members of this House had ceased to have any say in public affairs.

Mr. ROCHE: I have no objection whatever to give the hon. member the information he desires in regard to what took place in Chicago, although I trust that at this stage it will not result in precipitating a debate on the question if immigration. It would be scarcely apropos in considering an item of contingencies for Dominion lands and parks to have a discussion with regard to a department, the estimates of which

are not up for discussion to-night. However, out of courtesy to the hon. member, I have no objection to explain the position I took while attending the conference of Dominion immigration agents in Chicago. I do not know whether or not the hon. member was in the House yesterday when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) read a somewhat similar article, if not the same article, from one of the Canadian papers regarding what I was reported to have stated, and what Premier Norris was reported to have stated in connection with conscription. But upon that occasion I informed the hon. member for Assiniboia that there were no newspaper reporters present at our conference. They are a very enterprising lot of gentlemen, and what they may have surmised I do not know, nor am I responsible. I gave no interview to any newspaper reporter while in the city of Chicago. Who gave out the information of course I do not know, but what I am responsible for is the letter in regard to conscription that has been circulated through some thousands of United States newspapers in order to correct the eroneous impression that had been scattered broadcast for the purpose of preventing immigrants from going from the United States into Western Canada. I felt it was my duty, over my own signature as Minister of the Interior, to dissipate the erroneous impression that our agents had to contend with in their propaganda for securing immigrants. What I stated was assuredly nothing more than what was stated in this House at the instance of the right hon. leader of the Opposition in the debate on the Address. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition pressed the Prime Minister to state once more his position in regard to conscription, and the Prime Minister did state that we have no conscription in Canada, and that we did not propose to have it. That is the effect of the letter which I caused to be circulated in the United States press. It was dated 8th January, 1916, and reads as follows:

> Through either lack of knowledge or from some ulterior motive numerous papers in the United States have recently advised American citizens that by going to Canada they incurred the risk of being drafted as soldiers in the present world-wide war. Were these articles confined only to that portion of the pro-German press, which without regard to the truth, have been publishing fictitious news items intended to injure the trade or stir up friction between the States and Canada, the reports might safely be let go uncontradicted, but when responsible journals are misled into publishing erroneous information regarding conscription it seems advisable to make an official pronouncement upon the matter.
>
> I therefore beg to advise you that all troops from Canada for the war have gone voluntarily; that while the Government has the power to enforce conscription, such action has not been considered either advisable or necessary, and that even were conscription introduced it would apply to Canadian citizens only.
>
> For your information when dealing with this subject, I may say that many Canadians resident in the United States and many American citizens have crossed into Canada since the outbreak of war, have offered their services, been accepted, did valuable work and in some cases gave up their life in the cause of liberty and justice.
>
> Any publicity you may care to give to this letter will be appreciated by,
>
> Yours faithfully,
>
> W. J. Roche,
> Minister of the Interior.

I do not think even the hon. gentleman will take exception to the statements contained in that letter, and it was precisely those sentiments that I expressed to our own agents there when they were telling me of the obstacles they had to encounter in securing immigrants for Canada. I realized the difficulties the hon. gentleman has spoken of, but at the same time I thought it my duty to correct the absurd rumours that had been designedly circulated in the United States for the purpose of keeping immigrants from Canada, and which were being taken advantage of by the railways, by land companies, banks, and everybody else interested in preventing immigration to this country.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think anybody would take exception to the letter my hon. friend has just read, and if it had received the same measure of publicity that the alleged interview received there would be no reason for discussing this matter in the House. Unfortunately, while the alleged interview was given very wide publicity, the letter has not been given anything like the same measure of publicity. Now, the difference between the position of the Premier and the leader of the Opposition, and the position of the minister, supposing the interview had been correct, is this: The Premier and the leader of the Opposition were stating the policy, one of the Government, and the other of his party, at that time. Necessarily, what is the policy of a Government, or of a party, to-day may not be the policy to-morrow, and therefore the statements made by the Premier and the leader of the Opposition were not binding upon the country for the future. But a

statement made by a member of the Government to private individuals in another country who would be prejudiced by that statement is in quite a different category. The one is in the nature of a private contract, the other is in the nature of a declaration of public policy—two different matters altogether. While, therefore, I take no exception to the letter my hon. friend has read, and which no doubt has been duly distributed, I take the liberty of saying that in view of the very wide publicity that was given to the alleged interview, and the construction that must necessarily have been placed upon it, my hon. friend would have been well advised to have taken an early opportunity in this House of properly expressing his position and that of the Government in regard to this important matter. Of course, it is an easy way out of it to let it go, but it is not the right way, it is not the best way, and it is a way that is liable to produce unfortunate results in the future. The credit of this country at the present time, and for the future, is in a large measure in the hands of my hon. friend, and since the misrepresentation of the facts of the case has been given wide publicity, I take the liberty of saying that it is his business, at all risks and at all costs, to see that that misrepresentation is publicly and efficiently corrected.

Mr. ROCHE: I might point out that while probably more publicity has been given in the Canadian press to the remarks that were attributed to me than to the denial, it is quite the contrary in the press of the United States. The letter I have just read has been inserted in thousands of journals in the United States, and that is where we wish to have the facts of the case known. As for the publicity given to the alleged interview, I do not suppose that any words of mine spoken in the city of Chicago would be of sufficient importance to the people of the United States to be printed in thousands of their papers. After all, what statement contained in the alleged interview is the hon. gentleman taking exception to? Is it the statement that it is not the intention of the Canadian Governmen to enforce conscription?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend was in Chicago as the representative of Canada, and he is represented as assuming to have given the people of the United States a statement as to the future policy of the Government of Canada. Now, he was not entitled to do that; it was not proper that he should do it; and as he had been represented as having done it he should have corrected the impression promptly and with all publicity. My hon. friend has said that he has done so, and of course we must accept his statement to that effect. While it is of course desirable that the correction should be made in the United States, it is also desirable that there should be a thorough understanding in Canada as to how far the Government was committed to a certain policy in connection with this country. There is another side to the question, namely, that if the Government of Canada is to be understood as making a declaration that under no circumstances will we put forth the whole strength of our people in support of our cause in this war, Canada, in the mind of her Allies, will be put in a position that is certainly unfortunate, undesirable, and one that does not tend to success. If we are understood throughout the allied world not to be willing to do everything we can for the cause, not willing to support it to our last man and our last dollar, then we are weak where we should be strong, and we are doing ourselves an injury the extent of which cannot very well be estimated.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Could the minister say that whether Peter Brandt is still employed by the Government as a homestead inspector, at Regina or with a roving commission?

Mr. ROCHE: He is not in the service of the Government at the present time.

Mr. MARTIN: Could the minister say approximately when this man ceased to be employed by the Government?

Mr. ROCHE: I cannot tell the hon. member to-night.

Mr. MARTIN: Perhaps the minister could say why he is not now in the employ of the Government. Was he dismissed?

Mr. ROCHE: I cannot say just now, but I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: In connection with this very large item it is only right to say that there has been a great decrease in the amount of work required of the officials of the lands department during the last several years; that is also true with regard to timber administration. Under these circumstances, therefore, when we see that

the vote for contingencies is not diminished, we are bound to take with several grains of salt the declarations of the Minister of Finance as to the Government's intentions in regard to economy of administration because of war conditions. There is no doubt that there should be economy in order that there may be success; but economy should be practised as well as preached, in all departments of the Government; and if the people are to take the expressions of the Minister of Finance seriously, they will look to the Government not to maintain the expenditures in the several departments at the standard at which they were years ago when a great deal more business was being done. They must naturally look to the Government to cut their expenditures in these various departments down, at any rate, to the same level, as to percentage of business, as prevailed in former years. They could even afford to look for a cutting down of these expenditures lower than they ever were before, because the stress of circumstance is greater than it ever was before. With the debt of the country piling up at the rate of two or three hundred million dollars a year, surely the condition is one that calls for greater economy in administration than at any time in the previous history of the country. Therefore a comparison between conditions as they are to-day and conditions as they were three years ago is not a fair comparison, even though the service rendered was as great and the expenditure was no greater.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I shall expect the minister to lay the information about Peter Brandt upon the Table before the Estimates are completed.

Mr. ROCHE: I will do so.

Mr. TURRIFF: How was the corresponding vote expended last year?

Mr. ROCHE: I think the vote has been nearly all expended, with the possible exception of some $1,500. Our homestead inspectors, timber inspectors, and ranch inspectors never were as busy as in the past year, for the reason that they were nearly all engaged with the seed grain distribution, and we had to go outside of the department for other officials because we did not have enough to do the work.

Mr. OLIVER: This vote is for next year, not for this year?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: We are not looking for a seed grain distribution next year.

Mr. ROCHE: I hope not, but we cannot tell; an emergency may arise. We do not wish to add to existing hardships by turning a great many men out of employment. In the Department of the Interior some 219 officials have enlisted; that is, entirely outside of the immigration staff. There were some sixty-eight in the inside service, and fifty-five in the outside service of the Dominion lands branch alone who enlisted.

Mr. TURRIFF: Do I understand the minister to say that he proposes to keep on the extra staff on the possibility that there will be another seed grain distribution at some time in the future?

Mr. ROCHE: No. We have put off that temporary staff altogether.

Mr. TURRIFF: But the general staff has not been reduced?

Mr. ROCHE: The general outside staff of the Dominion lands branch?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then the minister does not purpose following the advice of the Minister of Finance to economise in regard to his staff?

Mr. ROCHE: I think that we shall probably have sufficient work to keep the staff going.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to seed grain distribution, there is no doubt that what the minister says is very true; there was necessarily a large amount of work to be done last year by reason of the seed grain distribution, but there is not going to be any seed grain distribution during the coming year. There has been the greatest harvest the country ever saw throughout the whole West. This is a vote to cover the coming fiscal year, and there cannot be any seed grain distribution during that year, whatever there may be in the future.

9 p.m.

Mr. ROCHE: I used that argument because the hon. gentleman said that the work had fallen off. I said that the staff was more busily engaged last year than ever before. In addition to the fifty-five who have obtained leave of absence to enlist, we have twenty-five applications before the department now for leave to enlist from the outside service of the Dominion lands branch.

Mr. OLIVER: While we are very willing to give credit to the members of the service, either inside or outside, who offer their services to the country for military purposes, I think it will be found on examination that the falling off in the business of the department during the last three or four years is very much greater than the percentage of officials who have enlisted. I do not think the percentage of enlistments bears any reasonable proportion to the falling off in the amount of the ordinary business transactions. The reason given by the minister a few moments ago that he did not wish to throw men out of employment, or to disarrange the working of the department, was, I think, the real reason why this vote is kept at the figure at which it appears in the Estimates.

Dominion lands and parks—salary of one carpenter, Mr. John Mason, $914.50.

Mr. ROCHE: I would move to strike that out, inasmuch as this gentleman has since died, and it is not the intention to fill the vacancy.

Motion agreed to.

Dominion lands and parks—surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, etc., $976,300.

Mr. McCRANEY: What plans has the minister for surveys during the coming year?

Mr. ROCHE: Do you want to know how this money is going to be expended during the coming year?

Mr. McCRANEY: Yes.

Mr. ROCHE: There are a great many items, as follows:

Surveys of base lines and initial meridians, five parties	$114,000
Subdivision surveys, twenty parties	332,500
Miscellaneous subdivision surveys in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, five parties	75,500
Subdivision surveys in the Railway Belt, B.C., seven parties	72,500
Inspection surveys, six inspectors	38,400
Retracement surveys in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, four parties	45,500
Retracement surveys of old initial meridians and base lines, one party	12,000
Miscellaneous surveys by travelling parties, three parties at $6,000	18,000
Stadia surveys of lakes reported to have dried up in the western provinces, twelve parties at $5,750	69,000
Survey of the Alberta-British Columbia boundary, ⅓ share, two parties	7,000
Checking measurements on base lines and initial meridians, one astronomical party	6,000
Topographical survey of Jasper Park, office expenses	$4,300
Yukon surveys	21,800
Levelling, two parties at $6,600, one party at $5,750, one party at $3,500, one party at $3,000, office expenses, $7,850	33,300
Outside service, 32 office employees at $1.50 per day, caretaker of warehouse at Edmonton $50 per month, carpenter for surveys laboratory and special surveys division at $65 per month	18,900
Manufacture and storage of iron posts and bench marks	40,000
Printing and stationery	20,000
Lithographers' and printers' wages	12,600
Lithographic, photographic and sundry office supplies	12,000
Freight and express charges	5,000
Purchase of instruments and canvas boats for use on survey parties	17,000
Premiums for surveyors' bonds	1,000
	$976,300

Mr. McCRANEY: What progress has there been compared with the work done last year, or, say, before the war? Has there been any restriction of the work since the war commenced?

Mr. ROCHE: There is a reduction of $67,200.

Mr. TURRIFF: About how much was expended last year?

Mr. ROCHE: Practically the total amount.

Mr. TURRIFF: How does this amount compare with the amounts spent in the last three or four years?

Mr. ROCHE: There has been a reduction in the cost of the surveys during the last couple of years.

Mr. DOUGLAS: There is a demand for more work in the Peace river country. I notice that $75,000 is all that is appropriated for Alberta. I am under the impression that there has been a great demand in the northwest section of Alberta for the survey of lands which are not at present under survey.

Mr. ROCHE: There is just the one item of $75,000 for subdivision surveys, that is, the base lines, and they are nearly all in the north country. As the hon. member states, a considerable number of requests have been received for surveys in the Peace river district; in fact, the greater portion of the money that is being expended for surveys in the province of Alberta is for surveys in that country.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I have heard of a number of people desiring to have surveyed lands

which were formerly considered timber lands, but on which fire has destroyed the timber. Is the minister doing anything in the way of having an examination made of such lands which are in close proximity to settled districts, and which might profitably be surveyed and thrown open to the public? I refer particularly to lands along the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, which is being opened at the present time. Under present conditions the land is not available for entry, although the timber presumed to be on the land is of no merchantable value. There have been many instances of this character close to the settled districts. On another occasion I discussed with the minister the question of some land in Wetaskiwin, which is presumed to be timber land, but which is of no merchantable value whatever; in fact, rather a detriment than an advantage, and yet which, under the regulations, is not available for homestead entry.

Mr. ROCHE: Very recently this matter was gone into between the Forestry Department, the Surveyor General's Department and the Timber Branch. There have been some lands on which a large area of timber has been burned, and the Surveyor General's Department has been given instructions to make special reference to the character of such lands and to lands that might be thrown open for homesteaders. We shall be guided largely by the reports of the surveyors as to what disposition we shall make of those lands. If they are despoiled of their merchantable timber, and are suitable for agriculture, they will be thrown open to homesteaders. If not suitable for agriculture, they will be included in a forest reserve.

Mr. DOUGLAS: That also applies to certain timber berths which have been cut off. I hope the minister will include in the reports lands along the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway which are close to possible stations, and yet under present conditions cannot be settled.

Mr. ROCHE: I should think the holders of those berths would be delighted to surrender them in view of the provincial tax upon land. I have been asked by the holders of certain timber lands in the province of Alberta to disallow the provincial legislation which imposes a tax upon their timber berths. At present they have to pay a tax of so many cents an acre, and it is so difficult for them to meet this tax that they want to surrender the portion upon which there is no merchantable timber.

Mr. DOUGLAS: They may not be paying their dues.

Mr. OLIVER: How many survey parties are going into the Peace river country during the coming summer?

Mr. ROCHE: Parties are usually made up in the month of April, although, of course, we estimate now for a certain number of parties.

Mr. OLIVER: Can the minister tell me how many parties there are and in what direction they are working?

Mr. ROCHE: I notice that they are included under "miscellaneous," with the survey parties for the other provinces, and I do not know that I can tell the hon. member how many are intended for the Peace river country.

Mr. OLIVER: A good deal of surveying was done in the Peace river country last year; but as it is the country that at present is attracting settlement more than any other part of the West, if there is to be a large expenditure on surveys, I hope that the Peace river country will receive fair attention at the hands of the Government.

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Has a programme been decided upon in regard to surveys along the line of the Great Waterways railway between Lac la Biche and Fort McMurray on the Athabaska? The line is now graded; tracks will be laid during the coming summer; and the time has now arrived when it is desirable that the country along that line should be made available.

Mr. ROCHE: We have been and propose to continue doing work along the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Hudson Bay, the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, and the Edmonton Great Waterways railway.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the Great Waterways railway on the programme for the coming summer?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes. A certain amount of surveying will be done.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the minister give the committee some information in regard to the inspection of the land in that northern country north of the Saskatoon river? Six or seven years ago a party was sent

throughout that country northeast of Edmonton to ascertain the general conditions and to find out whether the country was fit for settlement. It had been understood that a great part of that northern country was unsuited for settlement by reason of the amount of water that was standing on the land. As a result of the investigation made, I believe it was found that the presence of much of this water was accounted for by beaver dams, and that a great deal of it could be drained off without much labour. There is a great stretch of country in northern Saskatchewan that will be settled when we have a big flow of immigration. Has anything been done to ascertain just what that country is like, and to what extent it is suitable for settlement? It may not be adapted to the growing of wheat, as are the southern portions of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, but it may be valuable for purposes of mixed farming if stock-raising and the growing of coarser grains can be carried on successfully.

Mr. ROCHE: There is in the Estimates an amount of $18,000 for forest surveys. They are in the nature of exploration work to locate the timber areas, to determine the stand of timber in the country and to define the tracts of non-agricultural land that should be reserved for timber. This work will have to be continued until all the forest lands are inspected. During the year 1915 two parties were working in Manitoba, two in Saskatchewan, and two in Alberta. A strip from 50 to 125 miles in width, covering forest lands immediately north of the prairie land in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, has now been examined and the timber areas located. The area of matured timber is found to be small, but there are extensive areas of immature timber—much of which is upon non-agricultural land—which, if protected, will be of great value, especially as it is in such close proximity to the prairie country. It is proposed in the coming year to have one party work in Alberta, two parties in Saskatchewan and two in Manitoba.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand that a certain amount is appropriated for surveys in the Yukon; what is the purpose of that survey?

Mr. ROCHE: Most of the work is in connection with mining claims. There is a reduction of $6,000 in this item.

Mr. MARCIL: I happen to be acquainted with a draughtsman who has been employed in the Government for fifteen years. He left first-class employment in Montreal to come here—in fact, the department went after him—and has done good and loyal service. I understand that he has been recommended by Dr. Deville several times for promotion, but he still remains in the same class in which he was placed many years ago, and receives the same salary. I should like to know from the minister whether there is any promotion at all in that branch of his department.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not know the gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers; Dr. Deville has, of course, recommended quite a number of persons for promotion.

Mr. MARCIL: This man has been in his present employment for 12 or 15 years, but his salary remains the same.

Mr. ROCHE: Some two years ago I asked Dr. Deville to prepare, in order of merit, a list of his employees whom he would recommend for promotion. He sent me twenty names—a first list of ten and a second list of ten—and when promotion has been made from that branch I have invariably followed Dr. Deville's recommendation, taking the employees in order of merit. The gentleman to whom the hon. member for Bonaventure refers may not yet have been reached; his name may be fifth on the list, and I may have promoted only four.

Mr. MARCIL: Are promotions made every year, or will this gentleman have to wait until the war is over?

Mr. ROCHE: They are made as vacancies occur. We are not creating any new clerkships now, and have not been for the last year or so.

Dominion lands and parks—protection of timber in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Northwest Territories and the Railway Belt in British Columbia, tree culture in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and inspection and management of forest reserves, $750,000.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: The minister will remember that last year there was brought to his attention the matter of the conduct of one R. H. Keay, who lived near the Riding Mountain forest reserve. As the result of an investigation held last year by an inspector sent out for that purpose, it was shown that seventeen different men in that district got homesteads by agreeing to vote Conservative. A further condition of the agreement was that each of the parties was to pay R. H. Keay the sum of $100; accordingly, each gave Keay a promissory note

for that amount. When the matter was up last year the minister stated that Keay had interviewed him, and had been severely reprimanded for his conduct. The minister also said that he would notify these men not to pay the notes—I have not Hansard here, but the impression given was that the men who had signed these notes would be protected in some way. It might be quite impossible for the minister absolutely to protect these men, but they had gathered the impression that the minister was going to protect them and that they would not have to pay the notes. I understood that the notes got into the hands of a Manitoba bank, which has actually secured judgment against some of these people. Keay had hypothecated or discounted the notes at the bank and secured the money on them. I would suggest to the minister that if T. R. Ferguson is still in the employ of the Government, either he or some other person of equally good character might be delegated to investigate R. H. Keay, or that some other steps should be taken to protect these men.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. member has not stated the position quite accurately. It is true that he brought up this matter in the House last session, and that I explained to him that a man named R. H. Keay, not in the employ of the Government at all, according to his own statement to me, charged certain Galicians for marking the limits of their homesteads, certain sums of money. He took notes from a number of these people for $100 apiece. When I learned of this I instructed our inspectors to inform these men who had given notes not to pay them, that they were not liable, in my opinion, as I believed that this man had imposed upon them. I said nothing about protecting them in any way further than that. I have learned that Keay has discounted these notes in the bank, and that action has been taken against a number of the makers of the notes and judgment recorded against them. The whole matter, as I informed the hon. gentleman, has been referred by myself to the Justice Department. Although I do not think that we are legally bound to prosecute Keay, the Justice Department are taking criminal proceedings against him.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: The facts are that this man Keay was a justice of the peace of the province of Manitoba at Asessippi, a village not far from Roblin. A justice of the peace, by reason of his position, is able to exercise a great influence over these foreigners, who think that a man in that position has a great influence in the community. Keay was a most prominent Tory heeler in that district, as I am informed. Why in the world such a man was allowed by the Dominion lands agents to use his position as a justice of the peace to impose upon these people is something I am unable to understand. There is surely something wrong with the administration of the Crown lands in that part of the country when a Tory heeler occupying the position of justice of the peace under the late Roblin Government was allowed to impose on people in that way.

Mr. CRUISE: Would the minister explain the duties of fire rangers in connection with timber reserves?

Mr. ROCHE: Their duties are, in the first place, to reside upon the forest reserve, where they have little houses. In the reserve there are certain trails that have to be patrolled daily by the rangers. They are supposed to safeguard the forests against fire, to look after the operators of portable and other saw mills operating in the reserves, and to see that they adhere to the timber regulations as to the cuts, and to see that no trespass is made. Then, they must keep in repair the telephone lines in the reserve.

Mr. CRUISE: Some of these officials do not carry out their duties very well. I do not think they live in the houses built for them. There is not much danger of fire in the winter, and the rangers are required only for a few months in the fall. We have been advised by the Minister of Finance to economize. I think the Minister of the Interior could dispense with many of these fire rangers, at least until the termination of the war. There is not much lumbering going on in the West at this time, and I am quite sure that this economy could be effected without detriment to the public service.

Mr. ROCHE: As my hon. friend knows, the mills operate during the winter. He is probably thinking of fire rangers, not forest rangers. We have a number of fire rangers who are employed during the summer, but we also have the regular permanent staff of forest rangers to whom I referred in the answer I just gave.

Mr. CRUISE: Is it the duty of the fire ranger or the forest ranger to look after the forests?

Mr. ROCHE: We have additional temporary fire rangers during the summer whose sole duty it is to patrol the forests and prevent fires. These are not kept on during the winter.

Mr. TURRIFF: How many fire rangers are there, for what portions of the year are they employed, and what pay do they draw?

Mr. ROCHE: We have a vote for forest work for the year 1916-17 of $750,000. In connection with forest reserves there is a decrease of $4,600. This is due to a slight rearrangement of the expenditures owing to the necessity of establishing some measure of fire protection in forest districts immediately adjoining reserves where new railroads have been recently built. All other divisions of the work of the branch have been kept down to the estimates of the present year. We have 275 rangers.

Mr. TURRIFF: Are those the temporary rangers?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, in all the western provinces.

Mr. TURRIFF: For what portion of the year are they employed and do they draw expenses?

Mr. ROCHE: They are employed for about half the year. They get on the average $100 a month and no expenses.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any competition in their appointment or are they appointed by patronage?

Mr. ROCHE: They are appointed in the usual manner of appointing temporary employees.

Mr. MARCIL: By a patronage committee? I want to know if you have the same system there as in the East.

Mr. ROCHE: The men are recommended usually by the supervisors and others.

Mr. MARCIL: What kind of fire protection is this? Have they any better protection than we have in Ottawa?

Mr. ROCHE: There are telephones built in most of those reserves, so that if a fire breaks out word can be communicated to those in the immediate neighbourhood and extra help called out when necessary. There are some places where we have fire appliances, but of course the hon. member will recognize that in a vast forest reserve our aim is prevention rather than cure.

[Mr. Cruise.]

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister the most modern method of fighting fires in forests? Is there not something more modern in the United States?

Mr. ROCHE: Of course we have no fire appliances such as you have in the cities and towns.

Mr. MARCIL: But I would expect more than a telephone.

Mr. ROCHE: We have look-out towers where the ranger can see all over the forest reserve, and he has to patrol a certain area and to keep a diary as to his actions.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister consider the system satisfactory?

Mr. ROCHE: We are improving it from time to time.

Mr. TURRIFF: How does the number of 275 fire rangers compare with the numbers that have been engaged in the past four or five years?

Mr. ROCHE: I am quite willing to confess that I do not know the exact number heretofore employed, but there has been a material increase. I think that in 1911, when this Government came into power, the total area of our forest reserve was slightly over three million acres, while the total area to-day is over twenty-two million acres. We have a very much larger area to guard against fire and to administer, but still the administration expenses are less than they are in the United States. The cost of administration in the forest reserves comes to about two cents per acre, which is less than the cost of administration in forest reserves in almost any other country in the universe.

Mr. TURRIFF: It would appear from the minister's explanation that the forest reserves have been increased for the purpose of finding employment for a large number of fire rangers. It was one of those fire rangers who told me that to do the work which he formerly did three men were now employed all the year round. The minister pointed out, and I must agree with him to a certain extent, that a dismissed official is probably not the best source of information. But according to the minister's explanation there are a number of extra fire rangers employed. I know some parts of the country where these positions are simply political appointments. While the timber reserves have been very largely increased, everybody who knows anything at all about timber in those

western reserves knows that there is bound to be a large percentage of them that have no commercial timber. The timber may grow up some time to be of some value in holding the snow and preserving the moisture, but, as I understand it, these reserves, especially the new reserves, are away from settlement to a very large extent. The payment of $100 a month to 275 fire rangers is a tremendous expenditure for the benefit we get from it, and it seems to me that if the Government wish to carry out the programme of economy laid down by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, they will have to go more steadily about it.

Mr. CRUISE: How many fire guards have been ploughed during the last season? I understand it is the policy of the Government to plough fire guards around the timber reserves, and I would like to know if the scheme has been successful.

Mr. ROCHE: In the different reserves there was a mileage of 252, and the total expenditure was $2,614.

Mr. CRUISE: How much was spent in the Riding Mountain reserve?

Mr. ROCHE: I have not the figures subdivided.

Mr. OLIVER: There is one remark to be made in regard to this vote as in regard to the others, and that is, that notwithstanding the professed economy on the part of the Prime Minister, the Department of the Interior has not reduced its expenditure in connection with these services to meet the stringent financial conditions that have arisen from the war. It is another case of "Do as I say, not as I do."

Mr. CRUISE: It is very important to the settlers in the western country that these timber reserves should be protected. I have discussed with several of the leading men in the northern district the question of how best to go about it, and we have come to the conclusion that instead of ploughed fire guards there should be some co-operation between the Provincial Government, the Dominion Government, and the municipalities, in the direction of building highways between the settlements and the reserves. These highways would act as fire guards in the sense that when a fire occurred the settlers would be enabled to get to the scene of the fire more rapidly. In the Riding Mountain reserve at present if a fire starts there are no good roads to enable the settlers and fire rangers to get to it. I do not think that the Dominion Gavernment alone should pay for the highways, but they might join with the Provincial Government and the municipalities in building them round the reserves. I am certain that they would be of great benefit in the way of protecting the reserves. I think this matter was brought to the ministers's attention before by my opponent, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not recollect having this matter brought to my attention before, but I see the force of the hon. gentleman's remarks. Of course, the building of highways does not come within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government, but I recognize that the question of co-operation between the Provincial Governments and the Dominion Government is well worthy of consideration. I will take the suggestion into consideration, and see what steps can be taken to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes.

Dominion lands and parks—protection of reindeer herds, $3,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Where is the reindeer herd now?

Mr. ROCHE: I am afraid the reindeer herd is practically non est. I am instructed that the number has been reduced to a solitary one. The experiment has been a failure right from the start. I would remind hon. members that it was not started under my jurisdiction, but before I became minister. We have one reindeer there now, and we are taking good care of it, but we do not expect a renewal of this vote.

Mr. OLIVER: Would it not be well to cut it out this year?

Mr. ROCHE: We may not expend the money this year.

Mr. OLIVER: Could we not persuade the minister to drop this item?

Mr. ROCHE: It is very small.

Mr. OLIVER: It would be an evidence of good faith in reduction of the Estimates.

Mr. TURRIFF: It would be better to bring that reindeer down and board it at the Chateau Laurier.

To pay expenses connected with water-power investigations and reports in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Railway Belt in British Columbia, $164,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would ask the minister to give us some idea of what was done last year and how much was expended.

Mr. ROCHE: I have a statement of the work that we propose to spend this money on during the ensuing year, and I find there is a reduction of $30,000 in the Estimates. It is to be expended under the following heads: British Columbia hydrographic survey, Manitoba hydrographic survey, international waters, storage in the Winnipeg river basin, power surveys, reports, etc., in Manitoba; power surveys, reports, etc., in Alberta and Saskatchewan; storage in Saskatchewan basin, administration of small water-powers, inspection of construction, drainage and reclamation, consulting engineers, head office and administration expenses, publication of reports, special engineering report on the water-power administration in the railway belt of British Columbia; hydrographic survey work, northern British Columbia, along the Grand Trunk Pacific in the Peace river block and Yukon territory; co-operation with the Nova Scotia Water-Power Commission. This was all spent, except a few hundred dollars, last year, and a good deal of this same work will be continued during the ensuing year.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is no doubt that the work is very important. I am not finding fault with the investigation of water-powers which can be utilized commercially as long as the money is well expended, but it seems to me a very large amount, although somewhat smaller than last year.

Mr. ROCHE: There is no new work.

Mr. OLIVER: I would be inclined to go a little further than my hon. friend from Assiniboia. While this work is entirely desirable under favourable conditions, it is a work of investigation, upon the result of which will be based investment in the development of water powers at a later date. At the present time, and under existing financial conditions, there is no pressure of demand for the opportunity of investing money in the development of water-powers. Therefore there is no pressure for this expenditure at the present time. It is certainly one amount in the Estimates that could be very greatly curtailed this year without the public suffering any damage whatever. That is not finding any fault with the purpose of the vote or with the work that has been done. But it is not at the moment opportune or pressing, and if there is any desire on the part of this department to economize, it should be shown by the cutting down of this particular vote.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. ROCHE: I have given instructions to the officers preparing the Estimates to do the work with regard to the strictest economy. I have a memorandum prepared by the head of the Water-Powers Branch, in which he says that if there is any further reduction of the Estimates, it will simply paralyse their work. He says:

> In response to the Deputy Minister's instructions respecting the reductions in the Estimates... I beg to state that... I would recommend under all the circumstances, a further reduction of $15,000 be made. This will make a total reduction of $30,000 from our Estimates for the last fiscal year, a little over one-sixth. If any further reduction is made it will simply paralyse our work. It should be stated that the Estimates, as submitted on the 18th September last, $179,000 represented a reduction of $15,000 of last year's Estimates and covered work that we considered to be absolutely essential in the best interests of our water-power administration. There were many important matters which we were exceedingly anxious to provide for, but which we considered might reasonably be postponed until after the war. It should further be pointed out that we have at the present time 16 members with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, their salaries representing a total annual expenditure of $20,650, which is, of course, a first charge on our Estimates. The further reduction of $15,000 recommended herein makes our Estimates for this year $164,000, which total amount should be distributed in the proper proportion among the seventeen items, about which detailed information was furnished you on September 18 last.

There are no new works to be engaged upon during the coming year, or provided for in these Estimates.

Mr. OLIVER: To what extent is there a prospect of the reasonably early development of any one of the water powers which have been under investigation by the department during the past year?

Mr. ROCHE: A great deal of the work that has been carried on in the past year has been on the Winnipeg river. Power is being developed there very extensively. The Provincial Government of Manitoba has asked us not to alienate any further water powers without their consent. They desire to make use of these powers; they have appointed a public utility commissioner with jurisdiction over such matters. We have been acting in co-operation with the commissioner there, and everything that has been done by the department has received his sanction and support. The Winnipeg river is a river on which there are enormous possibilities with regard to development of power, and some of the existing companies are applying for permission to further increase their water-

powers. Applications are now before the department for other power rights on the same river, but we have not dealt with them pending full information as to the results of these investigations.

Mr. CRUISE: What is the policy of the Government in dealing with these water-powers? Is it to dispose of them to private corporations, or to hold them for the people?

Mr. ROCHE: As I have just intimated, the Provincial Government of Manitoba has asked us not to alienate any further water-powers without the consent of that Government. There is an application before the department now from a corporation, or from individuals, and it has received the consent and endorsement of the Provincial Government of Manitoba.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the same policy be adopted in the other provinces?

Mr. ROCHE: We have not had any similar requests from the other provinces.

Mr. MARCIL: If you have no requests, do the Government not consider that these water powers should be kept for the public and not handed over to private corporations?

Mr. ROCHE: Is the hon. gentleman referring to any particular province?

Mr. MARCIL: No. I see that the vote covers the four western provinces, and my question is whether, after you have investigated and developed these water-powers, you are prepared to hand them over to a private company rather than to reserve them for public purposes?

Mr. ROCHE: What does the hon. gentleman mean by reserve them for public purposes?

Mr. MARCIL: A water-power might be reserved as the public utility of a city or town, to be kept under public control and not handed over to a private corporation.

Mr. ROCHE: Somebody has to develop them. If a province is willing to see them developed by a legitimate corporation, we have regulations which they must conform to. Ever since this Government came into power I do not think there have been any large water-power concessions granted to any private individuals. There was one small concession granted to a company, but outside of that I do not think there have been any.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I would like to direct the minister's attention to the question of diverting some of the waters of the Saskatchewan river through the southern part of Saskatchewan. I do not know whether any money was spent on that work last year, but I understand that two or three years ago the Dominion Government had surveys made for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was feasible to divert water from the Saskatchewan river to some of the southern parts of the province where water is badly needed. I remember very well that in the local elections in Saskatchewan, in 1912, the people in the southern part of the province, wherever they got the idea from—and it must have been from supporters of the hon. minister—were firmly convinced that before long they would have streams of water from the Saskatchewan river running across their farms and into the towns where water was scarce. I did not pay much attention to that promise myself, because my experience with this Government is that it is long on promises and short on fulfilment so far as my part of the country is concerned.

Mr. ROCHE: Who made the promise?

Mr. MARTIN: I do not know, but I do know that some of the minister's friends made the promise on the platform. The promise was certainly not made by Liberals. I certainly didn't make any such promise. I didn't believe the story at all myself, but the matter was very generally discussed by the people in the southern part of Saskatchewan. I think the Government has actually spent some money on surveys, though I believe nothing has been done during the last year or two. So far as this Government was concerned, I believe it was simply a fake election promise. I shall be glad to be informed by the minister whether anything can be done to furnish the people in that part of the country with the water which they are badly in need of. This would be a very proper work for the Government to perform.

Mr. ROCHE: We can discuss this more fully on the next item, but I have a memorandum here to the effect that surverys were made by the Department of the Interior in 1913-14 showing the feasibility of diverting water for the use of the cities of Moosejaw and Regina and the surrounding country. These surveys were made to enable the department to deal with a request from the Saskatchewan Govern-

ment for a reservation of water from that stream to assist in the development of that region. No direct application for permission to divert and use the water has yet been made by the Saskatchewan Government, and there is no apparent necessity for any further survey work by this department.

Mr. McCRANEY: Has the minister any information in his department in regard to some negotiations between the corporation of Prince Albert and the Dominion Government respecting water-power at Cole falls? I understand that the corporation entered into some big scheme which they were not able to carry through, and that they applied for assistance to the Dominion Government.

Mr. ROCHE: In regard to that I might say that the appropriation asked for under this heading has been considerably reduced from that requested for the past fiscal year. The studies in connection with storage in the Saskatchewan river basin were instituted at the request of the city of Prince Albert in connection with the hydro-electric undertaking of that city at Cole falls on the North Saskatchewan river. The question of profitable hydro-electric development on both the North and South Saskatchewan rivers is wholly dependent on the storage possibilities which may be available throughout the watershed. At present, the low winter flow forms the decisive feature in the consideration of hydro-electric development on the rivers throughout the central portion of the river basin, namely, throughout Southern and Central Alberta and Saskatchewan. The continuous demand for cheap power, which is in evidence in all the cities throughout the West, calls for every effort being put forth to meet the same. Whether this cheap power is obtainable from hydro-electric sources, is dependent upon the storage resources and possibilities of the basin. The extent of these is being determined by means of reconnaissance surveys, the continuation of which this appropriation is designed to cover.

10 p.m.

Mr. TURRIFF: Did the Dominion Government promise to assist in the scheme for diverting water from the South Saskatchewan river to the cities of Moosejaw and Regina?

Mr. ROCHE: Will the hon. member ask that question on the next item?

[Mr. Roche.]

Mr. OLIVER: Has the minister knowledge of any proposed water-power on the Athabaska river? I presume that if there was any such project on hand, the department would have knowledge of it.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think there is anything in the Estimates for work on the Athabaska river. I have no information on this subject; if there has been any correspondence on the matter, it has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister be good enough to make a note of my inquiry so that at some later date when his Estimates are up I can get information as to whether there has been an application of this kind. If any such application has been made, I should be glad to be informed of it.

Dominion lands and parks—for surveys and works under the Irrigation Act, etc., including $400 for P. Marchand as auditor of disbursements made by companies acquiring lands under the irrigation system, $200,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The minister is aware that irrigation districts are being formed in Alberta. One was known as the Taber Irrigation district. In order to raise sufficient money to build the ditches and provide the water, the whole district was bonded; but an obstacle was met in the school lands there. These school lands had been sold, but had not been paid for by the parties who had agreed to purchase them at sales held within the last two or three years, and the lands are still practically in the possession of the Government. This is a serious matter to that district, as it prevents the carrying out of this particular system. The money can be secured, I understand, from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company if the company can secure a lien on all the lands, but the school lands are standing in the way. I understand the matter was brought to the attention of the minister, and that the statement was made that if the Alberta Government would pass an Order in Council this Government would introduce legislation to overcome the difficulty. I should like to know if that is true, and whether anything has been done.

Mr. ROCHE: It is quite true. Mr. MacLean, the provincial secretary of Alberta, had an interview with myself and the officials of the department, at which he promised to get the Provincial Government to pass an Order in Council. We

were then to get legislation confirming it in connection with the school lands. The initial action, however, has not yet been taken by the Provincial Government.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the character of the surveys under this vote, and what is their purpose?

Mr. ROCHE: The expenses are divided as follows: Permanent office staff, Calgary, $34,150; permanent field staff, irrigation (Calgary), $27,300; permanent field staff, stream measurement, $19,200; irrigation administration, field work, $18,020; irrigation surveys, field work, $19,705; stream measurement, summer field work, $35,700; stream measurement, winter field work, $13,860; expenses head office staff, Ottawa, $10,000; publication of reports and printing, stationery, supplies, etc., $10,000; expenses staff, Calgary, $3,500; new field equipment, instruments, transport, camp equipment, office supplies, Calgary, $5,000; incidentals, $3,565.

Mr. OLIVER: That, of course, gives the details of the expenditure, but what I want to get at is what purpose is being served by the work that is being done.

Mr. ROCHE: As the hon. member will see, we have a reduction of $68,350 in the Estimates for the ensuing year, that is, a reduction of 25 per cent from the sum appropriated for the current year. The memorandum which I have is as follows:

The sum asked for will provide for carrying on only the work which is considered absolutely essential, including:

1. The inspection of existing and proposed irrigation and water supply projects.

This is required by law in order to determine the feasibility of proposed projects and to ascertain whether or not licenses are utilizing, or are in a position to utilize, the water to which they are entitled by license. No further reductions can be made without abandoning this work in whole or in part.

2. The continuation of the work of stream measurement.

The determination of the quantity of water available in the rivers and streams of the prairie provinces is the basis of all irrigation and water supply development and is absolutely essential to the proper administration of the Irrigation Act. Stream measurements must be carried on continuously for a long period of years in order to be of real value and any interruption seriously affects the value of the record. This work has been carried on systematically since 1908 and has been gradually extended as funds were made available so as to cover practically all streams in the southern part of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the principal streams in the northern portion.

The Western Canada Irrigation Association as well as the International Irrigation Congress have repeatedly urged the continuance of this work uninterruptedly.

3. The completion of the classification of land in the eastern section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's irrigation tract near Bassano.

About one-half of this tract was classified during 1915 and it is expected that the remainder can be completed during 1916 if funds are provided.

The works for the irrigation of some 400,000 acres of land in this tract are now completed and the system is in readiness for operation and the land is open for sale and settlement. The company is anxious to avoid the mistakes and serious misunderstandings which attended the colonization of the western section of this tract and this department is therefore inspecting and classifying as irrigable of non-irrigable all the land prior to its being offered for sale. In the western section this was not done with the result that this department had finally to intervene between the company and dissatisfied purchasers and to classify the land after it had been sold, thus necessitating readjustment of most of the sales-contracts and water-agreements. The company is at present carrying on an active campaign for colonizing this tract, which is at present waste and unproductive land, and if this department should now discontinue this work of classification, it would very seriously retard the settlement and development of the land.

4. The completion of surveys on the proposed Lethbridge northern irrigation project near Lethbridge, Alta.

In this district immediately north of Lethbridge some 100,000 acres of land can be economically irrigated by water taken from Oldman river near Macleod. This district has suffered severely from drought in past years, particularly in 1910 and 1914, when there was almost complete crop failure. The settlers have witnessed the prosperous development of the irrigated district of Coaldale, east of Lethbridge, and have repeatedly petitioned the Dominion Government to undertake the preliminary surveys necessary to determine the feasibility and probable cost of irrigating their own lands.

Surveys were accordingly undertaken in 1914 and carried on throughout 1915, which leave no doubt of the feasibility of irrigating these lands. The work is not yet sufficiently completed to enable the settlers to form an irrigation district under the law enacted by the provincial legislation in 1915 at their request, and if the survey work is now abandoned no such district can at present be formed.

The Western Canada Irrigation Association, at its session at Bassano, Alberta, in November, 1915, passed a resolution strongly urging the Dominion Government to complete these surveys in order that this district might be more fully developed. A similar resolution was passed urging the continuation of survey work to develop the feasibility of irrigating land south of Lethbridge and tributary to St. Mary and Milk rivers, but this work cannot be continued with the limited sum asked for in this reduced Estimate.

This practically is the explanation.

Mr. BUCHANAN: A great deal of money is being expended on irrigation surveys. I am inclined to think that the Government, in districts where there is a lack of mois-

ture, and at the same time where the soil is suitable for agriculture, might go into the establishment of these small irrigation systems. In nearly all the western states the American Government has undertaken the establishment of irrigation systems; lands have thus been reclaimed and settled, and the republic has gained by reason of that policy. In my own district there is what is known as the Iron Springs project, to supply water from the Old Man river. It was made clear to the people there that they would have to form themselves into an irrigation district like the Taber district, bond the district and practically provide the system themselves. Now there exists amongst people who have studied the question quite a strong opinion that the Government might very well go into the establishment of these systems instead of placing the responsibility upon the people or giving the privilege to private companies; because the experience of the United States warrants us in saying that the adoption of such a system in western Canada would be beneficial to the country. I am merely making this suggestion, and I would ask the minister whether the Government has anything in view in that direction after spending so much money on irrigation surveys. During the past year a number of survey parties were through the southern part of Alberta gathering information about the possibility of irrigating large sections of that country.

Mr. ROCHE: We have been requested to undertake this as a Government work. A deputation which came down here from that district merely asked us to do what we are doing now with this Estimate, that is, to allow them to form a company themselves, bond the district, raise the funds, and work in co-operation; but our system as it is at present differs from that in the United States, where the Government has undertaken such work as a Government enterprise, although it charges the people the cost just the same. We are carrying on these surveys at the expense of the public treasury; the result of them is given gratis to the farmers, and they can carry on the work under provincial legislation.

Dominion lands and parks—Canadian National Parks, $349,670.

Mr. OLIVER: What information can the minister give with regard to reported mishandling of funds in connection with the administration of Jasper park during the last summer?

[Mr. Buchanan.]

Mr. ROCHE: Charges were made against the administration of Jasper park so far as certain officials were concerned, but I do not think they involved any misappropriation of funds.

Mr. BOULAY: Where are the national parks of Canada situated?

Mr. ROCHE: Our national parks are situated in western Canada. The parks in the Rocky mountains are: Jasper park, Rocky Mountains park, Waterton Lakes park, Buffalo park, Elk Island park Yoho and Glacier park, Revelstoke park.

Mr. BOULAY: What is the use of these parks?

Mr. ROCHE: I think they are of great utility. They attract a large number of foreign tourists and cause to be spent in Canada much money that would not otherwise come into the country. As an illustration, I may point out that during the last year some 50,000 foreign tourists visited the Rocky mountains park alone. If they spent only $100 each, that would mean that $5,000,000 was spent in Canada by those visiting this park. I think it is well worth while doing something to beautify our parks, which are one of the greatest advertisements that Canada could possibly have.

Mr. BOULAY: Could not some of them be established in eastern Canada as well?

Mr. ROCHE: The Dominion Government do not own the lands in eastern Canada.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I should like to obtain some information with regard to charges of misappropriation in connection with the administration of Buffalo park.

Mr. ROCHE: The following memorandum was prepared in connection with the administration of Buffalo park:

Last August Mr. Silas Carpenter, Assistant Commissioner of Dominion Police, located at Banff, was instructed to make an investigation of conditions at Buffalo park. As a result, the following officers were dismissed: W. E. D. McTaggart, superintendent; W. Terpenning, gate-keeper; W. Douglas, farmer. The evidence collected indicated that these men were joint owners in a farm close to Buffalo park and that they used Government seed oats and Government teams and implements for its cultivation. It was also shown that they were joint owners in a herd of cattle which grazed on the Buffalo park range. There were also a number of minor irregularities. In addition, the superintendent failed to collect the amount of an over-payment he had made to the Imperial Lumber Company in connection with the purchase of lumber. It is calculated that the over-payment amounted to about $600. Instructions have been issued for the issue of a

writ against this company for the recovery of the money. An equivalent amount of seed oats has been returned to the department, and salary cheques of those three men covering a month and eight days are still held by the department. There are a number of other points upon which additional information is desired, and Mr. Carpenter has been instructed to make a further investigation. Mr. A. G. Smith has been appointed as superintendent in succession to Mr. McTaggart. Permanent appointments have not yet been made to fill the other vacancies. Mr. W. H. Walker is acting as general foreman and farmer, and Mr. W. Gano is acting as gate-keeper and rider.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Is there any item in that memorandum connecting the names of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Hudson of Wainwright with this nefarious scheme?

Mr. ROCHE: No, nothing has come out so far indicating that either of these gentlemen has been implicated in any way. As the memorandum states, Mr. Carpenter has been instructed to conduct a further investigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS: It is my opinion that Mr. Campbell was implicated in some indirect way in the erection of a barn in the park. However, that is mere rumour. I trust that I may get definite information later, when the minister has the whole facts as contained in Mr. Carpenter's report.

Mr. TURRIFF: Four or five years ago, when the late Government went out of power, provision had been made for placing a number of buffalo on the Moose mountain timber reserve, and three or four sections were obtained for that purpose. About the time that the change of government took place, or possibly after this Government came into power, tenders were called for the fencing of this land. The Moose mountains, which are in my constituency, have come to be a popular summer resort. People come there from different parts of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. I was up there one Sunday last summer, and in one part of the park I saw about 220 automobiles, which had come from all parts of the surrounding country, and many of which had been driven seventy-five miles in order that the owners might spend a pleasant day at the park. It had been decided years ago to put a herd of buffalo in that park, but as the park was not fenced, and the buffalo were somewhat wild, it was feared that they might escape and cross the boundary line, which is only fifty miles to the south. The buffalo at Banff have been fenced in for many years, and are very quiet, so that there would not be the slightest danger in bringing them down to the Moose mountains. It is hardly necessary to say that the presence of fifty or one hundred head of buffalo would be a great drawing card for that summer resort. If the park were fenced in and even twenty-five or thirty buffalo were brought down, a very good purpose would be served. Perhaps the minister can tell how many buffalo there are in Buffalo park.

Mr. ROCHE: Over 2,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is simply a question, therefore, of carrying out the idea which the late Government had in view when they went out of power. I should be glad to get an assurance from the minister that during the coming summer the necessary fencing will be done, and that a number of buffalo will be brought into the Moose mountain district. When this Government came into power they sent one or two men to Buffalo park to find out something about handling buffalo, but since that time nothing has been done. Every year when I am out there the people ask me what the Government are going to do, and I have never been able to give them a satisfactory answer. I hope now that the minister will put me in a position to give a satisfactory answer to the people in the vicinity of Moose mountain. Let me assure the minister it would be a great advantage to that whole southern district of Saskatchewan. Few of those people have ever seen a wild buffalo, and it would give them a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction to have a herd established there.

Mr. ROCHE: Of course, it was recognized some time ago that sooner or later the large herd at Buffalo park would have to be broken up and distributed to other parts. It is true that a small area was purchased with the idea of eventually removing the buffalo to the district referred to. I understand it is in a forest reserve, and that is why so many people go up there, owing to its beautiful location. The reason the Government have not thus far carried out the original project is that the land has been pronounced by the inspectors unsuitable for buffalo, as there is too much timber on it. A recommendation has been made to us to purchase some land in the Indian reserve adjoining, but I am not able to say whether these lands have been surrendered. The Indians, of course, would have to give their consent and surrender the lands. My hon. friend asks me to promise that something will be done this year. Owing to my efforts to economize, I am afraid I cannot give a

promise of that kind. Hon. members criticise me for not reducing the expenditure under this and other items; but this project would necessitate a considerably larger expenditure.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister is wrong in two particulars—

Mr. GRAHAM: Only two?

Mr. TURRIFF: —in connection with this one item. One is that, I do not care who the inspector is, if he reports that that land is unsuitable owing to the amount of timber on it, he does not know what he is talking about. I lived beside that place for many years, and the timber on it would not hurt anybody or anything. I think the difficulty was not that the land was not satisfactory, but that there was not enough of it, not more than four sections; and so it was suggested that a part of the present Indian reserve should be secured. Two Indian reserves on the west end of Moose mountain were released, the land sold and the Indians brought over to the present reserve, which is more to the east. I doubt if it would now be possible to get a release of that part of the reserve. But there is any amount of land in the vicinity that could be secured that would be satisfactory. My hon. friend speaks of economizing, but this is the first item in which he proposes any reduction. We have passed millions of dollars to-night for items in which there has been no retrenchment, and the total expense will be greater than in years gone by. If my hon. friend wishes me to practise economy I am willing to do it, and if it is from motives of economy that this park is not stocked with buffalo, I am willing to accept that answer; but I do not see why that particular item of expenditure should be cut out altogether.

Mr. ROCHE: It was not included last year.

Mr. TURRIFF: I know that, but the Government bought that land, and called for tenders for putting up the fence. They sent their employees to Buffalo park to learn how to handle the buffalo, and they have now cut all that out. It was not cut out on account of economy; why it was cut out I do not know. My hon. friend now says it was because the land was reported on as being unsatisfactory owing to the timber on it. That is not a sufficient reason. There is a large area of open land in it, the land is all suitable for running domestic cattle, and any land that is suitable for running domestic cattle is suitable for buffalo. I would ask the minister, in his capacity as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, if any attempt has been made to secure a release of the lands recommended by the inspector to be secured from the Indian reserve.

Mr. ROCHE: I am not sure whether such an attempt has been made or not. The information given to me was that, after an inspection of the land, it was pronounced unsuitable for the keeping of buffalo, largely on account of there being too much timber. That may or may not be so. I have no personal knowledge of the land, and I will not make a promise to the hon. member to respond to his request by including anything in the Estimates for this purpose. I have cut down the Estimates for the Canadian National Parks for this year by $300,000, and I do not see how I could reduce it further. I do not want to add to it by including an item for the purchase of lands for something that is not pressing for the present year.

Mr. TURRIFF: I quite agree with what the minister has said, that this is not a measure of prime importance; and war time, when we ought to be economizing, is certainly not a time to buy new lands and thus add to the expenditure. But here the land was purchased, and the excuse given is that it is not suitable. I am not going to press the matter, because it is a small matter after all, and I am quite willing that the Government should economize. But it looks to me as if they were economizing in this matter and were not attempting to economize in larger matters.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Will the minister give details as to the number of animals in the Wainwright, Buffalo, and Elk Island parks?

Mr. ROCHE: There are 2,080 in the Buffalo park.

Mr. DOUGLAS: There are some other animals besides buffalo in the Wainwright park, are there not?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, the animals in Elk Island park are: Buffalo, 108; moose, 39; elk, 50; and mule deer, 6. In Buffalo park: Buffalo, 2,080; moose, 17; elk, 57; mule deer, 100; and antelope, 3.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Is anything being done at present in regard to the sale of buffalo

meat in connection with the animals slaughtered through accident or in any other way in these parks?

Mr. ROCHE: There were a few slaughtered, and tenders were called for regarding the disposition of the meat.

Mr. DOUGLAS: These tenders did not include the hides or the heads?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. DOUGLAS: What is done with these?

Mr. ROCHE: The heads we have at present are being mounted; they have not been disposed of.

Mr. DOUGLAS: How many animals have been slaughtered during the past year?

Mr. ROCHE: Only five or six.

Mr. TURRIFF: Do I understand that the minister agrees to the suggestion that between now and next session he will look into the matter I referred to, and see whether he can secure some additional land on Moose Mountain, or whether such land would be suitable for a small herd of buffalo, so that next year we may have some assurance that something is going to be done to carry out the intention of the Government announced a few years ago to make some use of the land that has been secured?

Mr. ROCHE: Exception has been taken to-night to the Government's policy respecting another matter, and I would not like to say what may be included in our Estimates next session. But I will promise to have a re-inspection of the lands we already possess, and to get all information I possibly can on the subject.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I would like to draw the attention of the minister to some complaints I have had about the grazing lease in the Waterton Lakes park. I had considerable correspondence regarding the matter, but unfortunately it was destroyed in the fire in the Parliament buildings. I think the lease is held by a man named West, and the complaint is that the people in the surrounding district, mostly small farmers, are unable to get any of this land for grazing purposes unless they go to him and pay toll. There is a great deal of indignation in the country surrounding the park on that account. It is also charged that the first application for this lease was not given consideration, and that the man who secured the lease was a favourite, and he prevents other people from getting access to the grazing land except at a price fixed by him. I may be mistaken in some of the statements I have made, because I have not the correspondence, but that is my recollection of the complaints made by the settlers.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. member is incorrect in stating that any lease has been issued for any portion of the Waterton Lakes park. No leases are issued whatever, only permits, and no exclusive privilege is given to any man.

Mr. OLIVER: With regard to what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has said as to the establishment of a small herd of buffalo at Moose mountain, I would make the suggestion that the buffalo should be scattered in different localities in case of fire attacking any particular pasture, or in case of disease getting into any particular herd. It would be a form of insurance of the herd to have them scattered in as many localities as possible. The reason why no advantage was taken of the locality of Moose mountain at the beginning was the reason given by the hon. member for Assiniboia. The situation is considered to be very suitable in every way, but at that time it was thought to be too close to the international boundary, and that there was a possibility of losing the animals that might be herded there. It was always contemplated that there should be a portion of the herd located there. I would like to ask who is in charge of Jasper park?

Mr. ROCHE: A man from the head office of the name of Johnston.

Mr. OLIVER: Who was in charge before him?

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Harvey is acting superintendent.

Mr. OLIVER: There was a Mr. Maynard Rogers in charge at one time, was there not?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, but he has enlisted for overseas service. He was superintendent of the park.

Mr. OLIVER: Who succeeded him?

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Harvey is acting in his absence. There was another man of the name of Sparks, who had the general management, but under the supervision of Mr. Harvey, who was appointed by the department to act in the absence of Mr. Maynard Rogers.

Mr. OLIVER: Is Mr. Sparks connected with the park now?

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Sparks has been transferred to Wainwright park.

Mr. OLIVER: The case of Mr. Rogers, who, I see, has been appointed aide-de-camp to General Lessard, would come within the discussion that took place this afternoon. Does Mr. Rogers draw his salary as superintendent of the park as well as his allowance as a lieutenant-colonel?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to find fault with the patriotism of Mr. Rogers, or any other man, but I think that this case is really carrying what, under many circumstances, might be a very good theory, to an extreme. What salary does Mr. Rogers get as superintendent of the park?

Mr. ROCHE: $2,500.

Mr. OLIVER: I suppose the minister does not know what the allowance of a lieutenant-colonel is?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: My information is that Col. Rogers, although he volunteered at an early stage of the war, has not yet been fortunate enough to be able to give his services in the fighting line; in fact, he has been on duty in England ever since going across there. In face of that fact it seems to me that Mr. Rogers comes high.

Mr. BUCHANAN: What is the system followed in awarding these grazing leases in the park? Is it open to the public in the surrounding district to make application?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Are they notified publicly?

Mr. ROCHE: Any person in the immediate neighbourhood who desires may ascertain what the regulations are. The inspector, or the man in charge of the park, estimates as to the number of stock a given area can maintain, and then he will issue permits to any persons applying for the same to cover that area. There is no exclusive privilege given to any one man. I do not know whether they take them in accordance with their order of priority, but the superintendent of the park grants permits when applied for covering the amount of stock he estimates the park can carry.

[Mr. Roche.]

Mr. BUCHANAN: Is there a limit to the amount of stock a man can run under a lease?

Mr. ROCHE: As much as the area will maintain.

Mr. OLIVER: As the minister is responsible for the payment of Mr. Rogers' salary of $2,500 a year, is he able to give us any information as to what military service Colonel Rogers is rendering?

Mr. ROCHE: I have no personal knowledge, but I am informed that he is commander of the base brigade at Shorncliffe, England. I understand that he has had considerable military experience in the past, and I am informed that he has performed a very valuable service since going across the ocean. It is true that he has not as yet gone to the trenches, but I am afraid that if we were to individualize in that way and treat Col. Maynard Rogers in a different manner from any others in the same position, we would be treating him rather unreasonably.

Mr. OLIVER: I imagine that under ordinary circumstances it would be possibly out of place to say anything in this connection under these estimates. But we must consider Col. Rogers as an officer of the Interior Department so long as the Interior Department is paying him $2,500 a year salary. He has been given leave of absence with salary in consideration of the military services that he is able to render and that he is being called upon to render. Where the salary is as large as it is in this case, the question of the value of Col. Rogers' military service might very well come up for consideration on the part of the department, from this point of view, that, if Col. Rogers is not rendering the most valuable military service, he might very well be permitted to depend upon his military pay. So long as he is satisfactory to the military authorities, we have no fault to find with him, but if he is not rendering valuable military service, it seems to be a little out of the way that he should be drawing such a handsome salary from the Interior Department in consideration of the military service that he does not render. This is not a pleasant matter to speak of; but, as a matter of fact, Col. Rogers was placed in command of a battalion at Valcartier, displacing the colonel who had raised the battalion, and I am given to understand that, on his arrival in England, it was found necessary to displace

him, because he was not found to be efficient, and that he has been in what is called the reserve battalion ever since he arrived in England. I have no criticism to offer of the military arrangements; but I do submit that an employee of the Interior Department, having in good faith, of course, offered his services, and these services not having been found to be of serious value, the Interior Department is entitled to consider whether it is warranted in giving him further leave with salary.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think I would be justified in selecting Col. Maynard Rogers and assuming from what the hon. gentleman has stated that he is not performing sufficient military service to entitle him to double pay. He has been treated exactly in the same way as every other civil servant who enlisted prior to the first of November. The general Order in Council, under which all civil servants enlisting prior to that time were allowed their civil pay, is the one governing in this case, and the pay allowed to Col. Rogers is exactly in accordance with it. I take it that as Minister of the Interior I have nothing to do with Col. Rogers' military service, be it satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and I am not going to butt into the Militia Department to find out whether it is or not. I think it would be unreasonable to ask me as Minister of the Interior to inquire whether Col. Rogers' military service is satisfactory or not and I would not consider it my duty to treat Col. Rogers in a manner different from anybody else who has gone under similar conditions. I think the hon. gentleman will realize the reasonableness of the position I take.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to single out Col. Rogers or to make any special comment in regard to him. I have mentioned his case for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the minister the information that has been given to me—and this is not by any means an isolated case—of officials of the Government volunteering for military service and whose services have not been found to be of military value. The minister says that this is not any of his business as head of the department. I am going to take the position of disagreeing with him on that point. I think it is the business of the different members of this Government to find out whether the service that these officers are rendering is of military value or not, and to govern their dealing with these gentlemen with that information in hand. Certainly, if there is any considerable number of officials of this Government who ostensibly have volunteered for military service and are not now rendering military service while drawing salary from this Government, that amounts to a very serious scandal and certainly should not be allowed to continue. I am compelled, with all due respect, to disagree with the minister that it is no concern of his what military service officials of his department render when they are on leave. I think that unless they are rendering valuable service, their leave and salary should be stopped.

Dominion lands and parks—engraving, lithographing, printing, and preparation of maps, plans, and kindred publications of the Dominion, including necessary materials for same, $76,150.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I must congratulate the minister on the last atlas of the Dominion. It was an excellent piece of work.

Mr. OLIVER: Does this item include immigration literature?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask whether the atlases can be sent to the universities and high schools upon application to the department?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Dominion lands and parks—grant to Alpine Club of Canada, $1,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What does the Alpine Club do?

Mr. ROCHE: This club, formed some years ago, has almost a world-wide reputation. Its membership is steadily increasing, and consists of the most prominent people in all countries of the world. This grant is to assist the club.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the department has brought some guides from Switzerland?

Mr. ROCHE: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that some gentlemen have been brought out from Switzerland. Perhaps they are employed by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I ask the minister a question about the internment camp at Jasper park? Is it intended to utilize the labour of the prisoners interned there, and, if so, on what conditions, and for what purpose?

Mr. ROCHE: I understand that about two hundred prisoners are interned there, and that they are paid twenty-five cents a day for clearing up the park, building roads, clearing away the brush, etc. There are 200 prisoners at Banff, 200 at Field, and 200 at Jasper. The railways give us a very low rate for transporting these men to the camps. It was thought that it would be better for the men to be doing some work rather than eating their heads off.

11 p.m.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the Parks Department pay them?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the labour compulsory? Under what condition is the work done?

Mr. ROCHE: We have supervising officers to see that the prisoners do the work. The work is not voluntary on the part of the prisoners; they are taken there and put to work; foremen are put over them to see that the work is done properly. Of course, the prisoners will not have to do much work to earn twenty-five cents a day; but we thought that we could get a lot of work done in this way.

Mr. OLIVER: It strikes me as a very serious problem. These people have not committed any crime against the laws of the country, and, while I can quite appreciate the desirability of interning them and offering them the opportunity of employment, when it comes down to compulsory employment at twenty-five cents a day I am afraid that that involves principles which we cannot all subscribe to.

Mr. ROCHE: In view of the manner in which the British prisoners in Germany are being treated, I do not think there will be any international complications.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Referring to an item that has been passed, I should like to call the minister's attention to the latest publication of the Conservation Commission, which contains a very remarkable report by a representative of the province of Quebec on the better protection of our forests. The report is made by Mr. Piché, who is at the head of the Forestry branch in our province. Sir Clifford Sifton and the other members of the commission frankly admitted that probably the best plan to follow as regards protection against forest fires was the system adopted in the province of Quebec. That is so well recognized that the province of New Brunswick has already borrowed some of our officials to establish the very same system in that province. I am sure my hon. friend will be interested in reading that report. I was particularly struck myself with the unanimity with which all the interested parties declared that the province of Quebec was far ahead of all other provinces in the matter of protection against forest fires.

Mr. ROCHE: Similar representations have been made to me.

Mr. GRAHAM: As we have done a pretty good day's work I would suggest that we adjourn.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Wednesday, February 16, 1916.

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

REPORT.

Report of the Board of Inquiry into the Cost of Living.—Mr. Reid.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Does the Government intend during the present year to commence construction of a branch line of the Intercolonial railway in Guysborough county?

Mr. COCHRANE: Owing to war conditions, it is not proposed to undertake this work at present.

POWDER MILK FOR TROOPS.

*Mr. HUGHES:

1. Where is the milk obtained that is supplied to the troops at Charlottetown, P.E.I.?
2. Is it fluid or powder milk, and what price is paid for it?
3. How is powder milk made, and is there any cream in it?

Sir SAM HUGHES: 1. From J. Tobin & Co., Halifax, N.S.

2. (a) Powder milk. (b) 14½ cents per pound.

3. (a) By a superheated process. (b) Powder milk which is the solids of milk with the water evaporated containing 23·8 per cent of fat which returns to its original element by the addition of water. Powder

milk is being used in all our mobilization camps, because it is much easier kept than milk, does not sour, and can be made quickly by the addition of water and in such quantities as are required. Can be used with tea, coffee and porridge. The liquid milk is not used for the reason that it would all have to be sterilized before use and the difficulty in keeping large quantities fresh and free from contamination.

106TH REGIMENT—SUPPLIES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

From whom were tenders asked for supplies for provisions, meats, furnishings, stores and coal, respectively, in connection with the billetting of soldiers of the 106th Regiment at Pictou, Nova Scotia?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Tenders for coal and wood were invited, by instructions from the War Purchasing Commission, from the following firms, except Noonan & Davis: Peter Brown & Son, D. W. English & Co., Chas. W. Ives, Geo. McKay, Noonan & Davis, Jas. Brennan, all of Pictou.

Tenders for jam were invited, by instructions from the War Purchasing Commission, from the following manufacturers of jam: T. Upton Co., Ltd., St. Catharines; E. D. Smith & Sons, Winona; Dominion Canners, Hamilton. Also by the General Officer Commanding, Halifax, from H. Neville, A. Simon.

Tenders for other supplies were all obtained by the General Officer Commanding 6th Division, Halifax, and forwarded to headquarters for approval. The following firms, all of Pictou, were invited to tender:

For meat: Pope Bros., Michael Maher, John M. Murdock, T. Meagher.

For bread: Jas. D. McDonald, A. Simon.

For groceries: John Munro, J. R. McDonald, A. Simon, H. Neville.

For straw and forage: A. McG. Fraser, Jas. Grant.

For chimney sweeping: Michael McDonald.

CENSORS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who are the censors appointed at La Pointe au Pere, county of Rimouski?
2. What salaries do they receive?
3. Is the Government aware that one of these censors resides at Rivière du Loup?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No censors are now employed at La Pointe au Pere, the staff having been withdrawn on the closing of navigation.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What are the names of all parties employed as censors and decoders at Canso and Hazel Hill, N.S., and the respective amounts paid to each of said parties during the year 1915; also the home addresses and former employments of each of the said parties?
2. Are any of said censors or decoders, while acting as such, permitted to engage in any other employment?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Censor, H. A. Rice, $3,285, Canso, merchant.

Assistant censors—Major George W. Hart, $2,555, Canso, insurance agent; T. P. Hambling, $2,555, Canso, cable operator; George Self, $2,555, Canso, cable operator; E. P. Meagher, $2,555, Halifax, commercial traveller; Major G. W. Willis, $2,555, Halifax, insurance broker; J. McG. Rutherford; $2,555, Halifax, accountant.

Decoding clerks—Cecil Boyd, $1,228.50; Canso, cable operator; John Cousins, $1,228.50, Canso, clerk; Robert G. Fraser, $1,263.50, New Glasgow, journalist; E. Hadley, $1,228.50, Guysboro, N.S., clerk; F. H. Keating, $1,228.50, Mulgrave, foreman; A. H. MacDonald, $1,225.00, Sherbrooke, N.S., merchant; D. H. Sutherland, $1,228.50, River John, N.S., contractor.

2. The censorship staff work on an average of eight hours a day. The department has no evidence that these officers are engaged in any other duties than these.

GENERAL JOHN CARSON.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Does General John Carson, of Montreal, occupy an official position as representing the Government, or any member thereof, in England or elsewhere?
2. If so, what are his duties and salary?
3. What is the total amount that has been paid General Carson for salary and expenses to date?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1 and 2. Representative of the Militia Department of Canada in the United Kingdom in connection with supplies and other requirements for the Canadian Overseas Expeditionary Force. Salary fixed by Order in Council at $10 a day pay, $10 subsistence allowance, and $3 field allowance.

3. $32,232 from Sept. 23, 1914, to Jan. 31, 1916, including office rental, cables, stationery, etc., $8,241; pay office staff, $5,647; motor car, $2,920; travelling expenses, $3,285.

EMPLOYMENT OF DR. HAANEL.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Are Doctor Haanel and his son still in the employ of the Government?

2. If so, why have these persons been kept in the employ of the Government during the war?

3. Are there other Germans and Austrians employed in the Government offices?

4. If so, why are they kept on?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Yes.

2. Dr. Haanel, a naturalized citizen of the United States, came to Canada in 1873, in answer to a call from the Victoria University of Cobourg, Ontario. In 1901 he was called to occupy the position as Superintendent of Mines by the Federal Government of Canada, with the intention of organizing for the Government a Department of Mines, and he has been here ever since. His son is a British subject by birth. As both Dr. Haanel and his son are peaceable, law-abiding citizens, and perform the duties of their offices satisfactorily, the Government sees no reason to dispense with their services

3. An inquiry is being instituted as to the Germans and Austrians employed in Government offices, with a view of dealing with each case individually.

4. Answered by No. 3.

QUEBEC DAIRY INSPECTION.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What is the actual number of dairy inspection centres in Quebec?

2. What are the names of the inspectors or controleurs in the province of Quebec?

3. What are the dates of their respective appointments?

4. Did they undergo special examinations before being appointed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Ten.

2, 3. L. E. Coté, Montmagny, appointed January 1, 1914; J. S. Cinq-Mars, appointed April 1, 1914; A. Hamel, St. Hyacinthe, appointed February, 1911; R. W. Hodgins, Shawville, appointed February 1, 1913; J. E. Hudon, Metabetchouan, appointed March 4, 1914; J. A. Labonte, St. George, appointed April 23, 1913; A. Lavallée, St. Claire, appointed May 19, 1913; F. X. Trudel, St. Prosper, appointed March 18, 1913; A. Tremblay, St. Aubert, appointed April 1, 1914; F. J. Wilkinson, Ways Mills, appointed March 11, 1912. General Inspector, J. B. E. Trudel, January 1, 1914.

4. All of them hold certificates from the Dairy School, St. Hyacinthe, Quebec.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What was the number of dairy inspection or de controle centres in the province of Quebec on the 1st of October, 1911?

[Mr. Boulay.]

2. What is the number of experts to whom such centres of inspection have been confided in the province of Quebec?

3. What are the respective dates of their appointments, and what are their respective qualifications?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. One.

2. Ten, in 1915.

3. L. E. Coté, Montmagny, appointed January 1, 1914; J. S. Cinq-Mars, St. Raphael, appointed April 1, 1914; A. Hamel, St. Hyacinthe, appointed February, 1911; R. W. Hodgins, Shawville, appointed February 1, 1913; J. E. Hudon, Metabetchhouan, appointed March 4, 1914; J. A. Labonte, St. George, appointed April 23, 1913; A. Lavallée, St. Claire, appointed May 19, 1913; F. X. Trudel, St. Prosper, appointed March 18, 1912; F. J. Wilkinson, Ways Mills, appointed March 11, 1912; A. Tremblay, St. Aubert, appointed April 1, 1914.

All of these men hold certificates from the Dairy School, St. Hyacinthe, Quebec.

BRITISH COLUMBIA INDIANS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has the commission appointed in 1912 to investigate Indian reservations in British Columbia completed its work?

2. If so, has any report been made to the Government?

3. What is the nature of the report?

4. What has been the cost to the Dominion Government to date?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No; it is expected that the work of the commission will be completed at the end of the present fiscal year.

2 and 3. A number of progress and interim reports have been received.

4. $154,469.90.

COST OF LIVING COMMISSION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the commission appointed to investigate the causes of the high cost of living at work at the present time?

2. Has any interim report been made by said commission?

3. When will the final report of said commission be ready?

Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. The Board of Inquiry has made one report and a further supplementary report, both of which are now in print, and complete the work of the board.

3. The reports—volumes 1 and 2—were laid on the Table to-day.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND DREDGING.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. On what date in the year 1914 did dredge No. 9 commence dredging, and on what date in the same year did she stop dredging?
2. On what date in the year 1914 did dredge No. 10 commence dredging, and on what date in the same year did she stop dredging?
3. On what date in the year 1914 did dredge No. 11 commence dredging, and on what date in the same year did she stop dredging?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Commenced June 12, 1914; suspended December 9, 1914.
2. Commenced June 20, 1914; suspended December 1, 1914.
3. Commenced June 22, 1914; suspended October 26, 1914.

EASTERN HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

What amounts have been expended in dredging Eastern Harbour from 1878 until 1915, and in what years were such amounts expended?

Mr. ROGERS: $113,785.93, expended as follows: 1878-85, nil; 1885-86, $9,753.09; 1886-87, $4,361.50; 1887-88, $6,491.73; 1890-91, $1,360.43; 1891-92, $4,895.75; 1894-95, $1,801.85; 1895-96, $3,490.08; 1901-02, $9,655.22; 1903-04, $6,540.06; 1904-05, $2,395.64; 1909-10, $39,051.65; 1912-13, $8,726.27; 1913-14, $15,262.66; 1914-15, nil; 1915-16, nil.

INVERNESS EXPENDITURES.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

What were the amounts expended by the Public Works Department in Inverness county during the years, 1913, 1914, 1915 and 1916?

Mr. ROGERS: 1912-13, $85,242.56; 1913-14, $48,804.03; 1914-15, $47,459.81; 1915-16 to January 31, 1916, $10,149.56; total, $189,655.96.

THE SCHOONER BURLEIGH.

Mr. COPP:

1. Is the schooner Burleigh mentioned by Mr. N. A. Comeau in his report of his trip to Hudson bay, owned by the Government?
2. If so, was she built by the Government or purchased?
3. If purchased, from whom, when, and what was the purchase price?
4. Have any repairs been made to said schooner by the Government since she has been acquired? If so, what was the cost thereof?
5. What was the cost of the Burleigh expedition to Hudson Bay in 1914, as referred to in Mr. N. A. Comeau's report of said trip?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Purchased.
3. N. and M. Smith, Halifax, 12th July, 1911. $8,500.
4. Repairs including annual overhauling: 1911-12, $1,123.47; 1912-13, $696.33; 1913-14, 134.95; 1914-15, $2,344.99; 915-16, $850.06.
5. $14,275.43.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES AND HARBOUR AND RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. What amounts were expended in railway subsidies in Canada during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
2. What are the amounts by provinces, and the names of the lines to which granted?
3. What amounts were expended on the construction of Government-owned railways in Canada during the above years?
4. What was the amount expended in each province, and the name of the line of railway on which such expenditure was made?
5. What amounts were expended on harbour and river improvements in Canada during the above years?
6. What are the amounts by provinces and the particular places where expended?
7. What amounts were expended on the building of public wharves, public breakwaters, and public dredging in North Cape Breton and Victoria during the years 1905 to 1911, inclusive, including the expenditure on Government railways?
8. What amounts were expended for like purposes in the said county, during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

Mr. ROGERS: Questions 5 to 8 will be answered by this department, but questions 5 and 6 cover expenditures made by this department on all harbour and river improvements throughout the Dominion for the past four years. As it would take considerable time to prepare such a statement, covering probably 80 or more pages of typewriting, I would respectfully suggest that the question be changed to a notice of motion for a return.

Question allowed to stand as an order for a return.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams, exchanged between the Government, its resident engineer of the district, and all other persons concerning the construction of a bridge between Ile Perrot and Ste. Anne de Bellevue, and Ile Perrot and Vaudreuil.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams between the Government, the engineers, and all other persons concerning the building of the post office at Rigaud; also of the amounts of money paid to divers persons for such building, furnishing, the land, the care of the grounds and other works.

Mr. Boyer.—For a list of the permanent and other employees on the Soulanges Canal in 1910, with the salary of each of them; also a list of the employees, permanent or otherwise, in 1915, and the salary of each of them.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams, exchanged between the Government, its Inquiry Commis-

sioner, Mr. G. H. Bergeron, and all other persons, concerning the inquiry, the dismissal and replacing of the postmasters of the different post offices mentioned below; and of all correspondence relating to the appointments of the present postmasters who replace the former ones, who had been either dismissed or replaced for one reason or another:—St. Lazare Village, Vaudreuil station, Pointe Fortune, Val des Eboulis, Mont Oscar, St. Justine de Newton, Ste. Marie.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence, telegrams and reports exchanged between the Government, the resident engineer of the district, and all other persons, concerning the dredging work done at the places below named, and the amount of money paid to divers persons, companies, etc., for such work, as well as the statements already presented at my request, the whole since 1904:—At the wharf of Ile Perrot, North, South, and at the church; in Dorion Bay channel; at Vaudreuil village channel; at Pointe Cavagnale; at Como; at Hudson; at Hudson Heights channel; at Graham channel; in the Rigaud river channel; in the Ottawa river; Ile aux Poires channel; at Pointe Fortune, and at Ste. Anne de Bellevue channel.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence, telegrams and reports, exchanged between the Government, the engineers residing in the district, and all other persons, concerning the construction and repairing done to the wharves mentioned below, since 1904, and of all data and reports already produced at my request and relating to documents prior to 1904; also the amounts of money paid for such construction and repairing, and to whom paid:—The wharf at Ile Perrot, North, South, and at the Church; of the village of Vaudreuil; of Pointe Cavagnele; of Hudson; of Pointe Fortune.

Mr. Douglas.—For a return showing the location of all rural mail routes in the present constituency of Strathcona, the date of their inception, and the location of routes at present under consideration.

Mr. Copp.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any official thereof, and any person or persons in reference to the proposed retirement from office of the present keeper of the lighthouse at Cape Jourmain, in the county of Westmorland.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telegrams, letters and petitions, and of all docugrams, letters and petitions, and of all docugrams, letters, petitions and of all documents of all kinds in any way referring to the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail to Eastern Harbour and Pleasant Bay.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telements of all kinds in any way referring to the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail to Upper Margaree post office and Gillies post office.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telegrams, letters and petitions, and of all documents of all kinds in any way referring to the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail to Margaree Harbour and Cheticamp.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telegrams, letters and petitions, and of all documents of all kinds in any way referring to the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail from Inverness to Margaree Harbour.

[Mr. Boyer.]

Mr. McKenzie.—For a return showing the amounts expended in railway subsidies in Canada during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915; the amounts by provinces, and the names of the lines to which granted; amounts expended on the construction of Government-owned railways in Canada during the above years; the amount expended in each province, and the name of the line of railway on which such expenditure was made; the amounts expended on harbour and river improvements in Canada during the above years; the amounts by provinces and the particular places where expended; the amounts expended on the building of public wharves, public breakwaters, and public dredging in North Cape Breton and Victoria during the years 1905 to 1911, inclusive, including the expenditures on Government railways; and the amounts expended for like purposes in the said county, during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915.

Mr. Delisle.—For a return showing: The total number of government employees in the inside service in the month of September, 1911; the total number of Government employees in the outside service in the month of September, 1911; the number to-day in each department.

Mr. Hughes.—For a return showing whether the Government, or the Department of Militia and Defence has employed any parties other than the officers of the permanent force to obtain recruits for the overseas forces; if so, the number of persons so employed in each province.

EMBARGO ON OATS AND OATMEAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) asked on two or three successive days for information in regard to the embargo on the export of oats and oatmeal. I gave him some information, and now I will give the whole of it. Oats are prohibited to all destinations other than the United Kingdom and British possessions and protectorates, France, Russia (except Baltic ports), Italy, Japan and the United States for home consumption, or when shipped to designated consignees in the United Kingdom via United States. Rolled oats and oatmeal are prohibited to all foreign ports in Europe, and on the Mediterranean and Black seas other than those of France, Russia (except Baltic ports), Belgium, Spain, Portugal and Italy. Rolled oats and oatmeal cannot be shipped to Holland. Wheat, wheat flour, barley and rye may be shipped when consigned to the Netherlands Government or to the Netherlands Overseas Trust. There is nothing, however, to prevent shipments to a United States agent, and thence to Holland. The Quaker Oats people desired a permit to ship oatmeal to Holland, but they have not been successful.

THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to lay on the Table copies of Orders in Council passed between the 29th April, 1915, and January 12, 1916? Copies of these were laid on the Table early in the session, but I understand from the Clerk that they have been destroyed.

I also lay on the Table of the House a letter from the Port Arthur Board of Trade expressing sympathy on the destruction of the Parliament buildings.

I also lay on the Table a telegram from the President and Council of the Associated Chambers of Commerce expressing sympathy, and also a very eloquently worded resolution from the council of the city of Hull, expressing their deep sympathy with Parliament and the country in the destruction of the Parliament buildings.

DISTURBANCES AT BERLIN AND CAMPBELLTON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): I desire to place the following before the House:

Memorandum regarding disturbance at Berlin, Ont., on Tuesday night, February 15, 1916.

The oral report received from the Officer Commanding is as follows:

1. For some time the feeling of loyal and law-abiding citizens of both British and German extraction in Berlin and Waterloo and adjoining localities, have been more or less exasperated by the language and actions of a Lutheran clergyman—an American citizen named Cappert—and by a German born Canadian subject named Asmussen, who, whether with good or bad intent, have been semi-apologists for German atrocities and Kaiserism. It is asserted that one of these men has recently stated that 'the conduct of the British, in the war, has been about as bad as the conduct of the Germans.' It has not been specifically charged that these utterances have been made with disloyal intent, but merely as seeking not to justify German brutality as much as to condone it. These utterances, coupled with the general tension of mind throughout the country over the war, gradually wrought up a number of people to a high pitch of feeling.

2. On Sunday last, a young man who had been behind the German lines for some months, as a reporter for an American journal, and who had personally witnessed these horrible atrocities, spoke in Waterloo and Berlin, and in vigorous terms denounced the spirit and recent utterances of the two men above named.

3. The feeling already highly strung on the part of many, found vent on Tuesday evening when ten or fifteen young soldiers, heard that German flags were displayed in a hall in Berlin. They quietly assembled near the place about nine o'clock in the evening, and in the course of a very few minutes had torn the German flags to pieces, while a bust of the former Kaiser William I was carried along the street. There were five policemen within easy call on the street, but the affair seems to have been over so quickly that they did not get time to interfere.

4. Colonel Lochead, on receiving a telephone message at the barracks, immediately repaired to the locality, when order was promptly restored.

I may add further that an inquiry is being held. The civil authorities are also acting in the premises. The authorities have been fully informed that soldiers in uniform lose none of their rights or responsibilities as citizens, and therefore are entitled to all the privileges of the law, but are also subject to its penalties. On the other hand, it will be observed that alien enemies have been treated by the Canadian Government in the most tolerant and lenient manner; but utterances and conduct that even indirectly encourage sedition, treason, or disloyalty, will not be tolerated.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) brought up a matter concerning Campbellton to which I referred yesterday. I have the facts, as stated by the officer in command, Colonel Mersereau, who says that on no occasion since the troops have been in Campbellton have there been more than four men locked up or impounded, or under supervision, in any one day, out of 290 men present. I merely add without comment that we hear all sorts of stories about the volunteers. We hear that the men of the 77th battalion in Ottawa looted the Parliament Buildings the night of the fire. I am prepared to say this—I never thought it worth while mentioning it, but my attention was brought to it yesterday—that the men of the 77th, as well as the Engineers, conducted themselves in the most orderly and becoming manner on that night; they worked throughout the entire night, and many of them through the following day, performing guard duty, and removing furniture and other articles from the Parliament Buildings, and I have yet to learn of one specific instance of any thing unbecoming a soldier and a gentleman having been done by any soldier of the 77th or any engineer on that occasion.

Mr. MARCIL: I am very glad to hear the explanation that the minister has given as regards Campbellton. I am interested in the battalion there, as most of my recruiting work has been done in that district. I am glad to know that the information con-

tained in the Campbellton Graphic, which was my authority in this matter, is incorrect. My only object in mentioning the matter was to impress on the Government the necessity of keeping liquor away from these camps.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is a local option town.

Mr. MARCIL: The charge was made by this paper, that surreptitious means were employed to supply some of the boys when off duty with liquor.

WRECKING OF AMERICAN CLUB, TORONTO.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GRAHAM: I call the attention of the Government to a rumour which is prevalent in the city to-day, that the American Club in Toronto has been wrecked in some manner—presumably blown up—with the loss of several lives? Has the Government any information about it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no absolutely definite information. I saw the report to which my hon. friend refers on the bulletin board. I was informed by one of my colleagues that he had news confirming it, but personally I have had no confirmation of it.

Mr. MURPHY: Was there confirmation of the news?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One of my colleagues informed me that he had confirmation of the report. I have just been handed this despatch which has been received by one of the members of the Press gallery:

A press despatch has been received; American Club blown up; one killed and two wounded; one of the wounded is Capt. Minard, President of the Club.

FREE WHEAT.

The House resumed, from Monday, February 14, consideration of the proposed resolution of Mr. Turriff:

That in the opinion of this House, in order to secure to the farmers and people of Canada the advantages of the American market for wheat products and potatoes, steps should be taken at once to put these articles on the free list in the Canadian Tariff.

Mr. THOMAS MacNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, this question of free wheat, as it is called, is the second big question before the House at the present time. The object of the resolution is to obtain free entrance to the American market for our wheat. In order to get our wheat to the American market free of duty, all this Government has to do is to remove the protection of ten cents a bushel which the Canadian wheat grower is supposed to enjoy, but which he does not want. Of course, the supreme question before us at the present time is the war. This question of free wheat comes a long way behind, but at the same time it is a matter of great importance to the West; and, as it will mean greater purchasing power for our western farmers, it is of great importance to the country as a whole.

There are two or three points to be considered: First, would free entrance to the American market mean a better price for our farmers; and, second—and this is more important than the first—would it relieve the congestion which always obtains in the West whenever there is a big crop? Light crops the railway companies can handle very well; but when there is a large crop there is always congestion; heaps of grain are left in the fields during the winter, and not taken away until perhaps the following spring, when some of it is spoiled. But I am not going into that phase, as the mover of the resolution has already dealt with it very fully. Another question to be answered is: would free wheat affect the revenue of this country? I think we can answer that by saying that it would not, for very little wheat is imported into this country from the United States; a certain quantity, however, is always imported no matter how much we export. The United States is a great exporter of wheat, but there are different kinds of wheat. For instance, I think our Northwest is the only part of the world, with the exception of a couple of the Northern States, and perhaps Northern Russia, that can produce hard wheat. The United States exports no hard wheat. Our hard wheat is, therefore, at a premium, and will continue to be so, I think.

In spite of the facts to the contrary, an opponent of free wheat occasionally appears with the statement that, on the average, prices of grain are higher at Winnipeg than at Minneapolis. In order to remove any doubt on this matter, the following figures have been compiled, showing the cash prices of No. 1 Northern wheat at Winnipeg and Minneapolis on the last day of each week in November and December, 1911, and for the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, as given on the market page of the Guide from week to

week. These are not political figures, but are culled from the market reports. As they are rather lengthy, I would ask the permission of the House to have them placed on Hansard without being read.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All right.

Mr. MacNUTT then handed in the following:

1911.	Winnipeg.	Minneapolis.
Nov. 4	$0 99¼	$1 05¼
Nov. 11	0 98	1 04⅜
Nov. 18	0 99½	1 05⅜
Nov. 25	0 98¾	1 05½
Dec. 2	0 96¼	1 03⅝
Dec. 8	0 94¼	1 00
Dec. 16	0 94½	1 04
Dec. 22	0 94	1 05⅜
Dec. 30	0 98⅛	1 06¼
Average, about	$0 97	$1 04½

1912.		
Jan. 5	$0 94¾	$1 09½
Jan. 13	0 95¼	1 06¼
Jan. 20	0 96½	1 06
Jan. 27	0 96¾	1 07½
Feb. 5	0 97½	1 07½
Feb. 10	0 98¼	1 07⅝
Feb. 17	0 £6¼	1 03½
Feb. 24	0 96½	1 05
Mar. 2	0 98½	1 09⅛
Mar. 9	0 99	1 07⅝
Mar. 18	0 98½	1 07
Mar. 23	0 99½	1 08½
Mar. 30	0 99¾	1 07⅝
April 6	1 00½	1 07½
April 13	1 03½	1 09¾
April 20	1 04¼	1 13⅝
April 27	1 05	1 16¾
May 4	1 04½	1 16½
May 11	1 04½	1 18½
May 18	1 03¾	1 14⅞
May 25	1 04¼	1 15½
June 1	1 03½	1 12⅜
June 8	1 05¾	1 15⅜
June 15	1 06	1 11
June 22	1 08	1 12½
June 29	1 08¾	1 12½
July 6	1 06	1 10½
July 13	1 09	1 11⅜
July 20	1 06½	1 04⅝
July 27	1 07	1 05⅝
Aug. 3	1 07	1 07⅜
Aug. 8	1 07	1 05⅝
Aug. 17	1 06½	1 06¾
Aug. 24		
Aug. 29	1 05	0 98⅞
Sept. 7		
Sept. 14	0 96	0 90¼
Sept. 21	0 95½	0 91½
Sept. 28	0 90	0 88½
Oct. 4	0 90½	0 91
Oct. 12	0 92¾	0 91⅜
Oct. 18	0 90½	0 8£⅞
Oct. 24	0 90½	0 90½
Nov. 1	0 87¼	0 86⅞
Nov. 9	0 86½	0 88¼
Nov. 16	0 83	0 84½
Nov. 23	0 80½	0 83⅛
Nov. 30	0 79	0 82
Dec. 7	0 79½	0 83
Dec. 14	0 79¾	0 82⅜
Dec. 21	0 81	0 83
Dec. 28	0 81½	0 83⅛
Average, about	$0 96¾	$1 02

1913.		
Jan. 4	0 81⅛	0 84¼
Jan. 11	0 82½	0 87
Jan. 17	0 83½	0 85⅝
Jan. 25	0 81⅞	0 86⅜
Feb. 1	0 83½	0 87¾
Feb. 8	0 84⅛	0 88⅜
Feb. 14	0 83½	0 86⅞
Feb. 21	0 84⅜	0 87⅝
Feb. 28	0 85⅜	0 87⅜
March 8	0 85½	0 85⅝
March 14	0 85⅝	0 84¾
March 20	0 85⅞	0 85⅜
March 29	0 86⅜	0 86½
April 5	0 88⅞	0 88⅜
April 12	0 89¾	0 87⅝
April 19	0 91½	0 90
April 25	0 93⅜	0 91⅝
May 3	0 93	0 90½
May 10	0 93½	0 91¼
May 17	0 92½	0 90½
May 23	0 94¼	0 92½
May 31	0 94¾	0 94
June 7	0 96¾	0 91½
June 14	0 98¼	0 93¾
June 21	0 98	0 93
June 27	0 97½	0 93¼
July 3	0 97¼	0 93½
July 12	0 97	0 89¾
July 19	0 £6	0 90⅝
July 26	0 95½	0 89½
Aug. 2	0 96¼	0 89¾
Aug. 7	0 96¼	0 89¼
Aug. 16	0 94½	0 90⅜
Aug. 23	0 90	0 89⅜
Aug. 28	0 93¾	0 87
Sept. 6	0 88¾	0 89⅞
Sept. 13	0 87½	0 89
Sept. 19	0 86	0 87¼
Sept. 27	0 83	0 84⅞
Oct. 4	0 81⅜	0 85¾
Oct. 11	0 81½	0 86
Oct. 17	0 87⅜	0 82¾
Oct. 25	0 79¼	0 84¼
Nov. 1	0 81⅞	0 83⅜
Nov. 8	0 81⅞	0 83⅝
Nov. 15	0 84½	0 85⅜
Nov. 22	0 85	0 85½
Nov. 29	0 82⅞	0 84½
Dec. 5	0 84½	0 87½
Dec. 13	0 83¼	0 87¼
Dec. 20	0 82½	0 87⅞
Dec. 27	.....	.....
Average, about	$0 88⅛	$0 88

1914.		
Jan. 3	0 87⅛	0 88¼
Jan. 10	0 84⅜	0 88⅜
Jan. 17	0 85½	0 88¼
Jan. 23	0 86⅜	0 87⅞
Jan. 31	0 85⅞	0 £0
Feb. 6	0 87½	0 91⅜
Feb. 14	0 88⅝	0 93½
Feb. 21	0 90⅜	0 94⅝
Feb. 28	0 91⅛	0 94
Mar. 7	0 87⅜	0 92¾
Mar. 14	0 89⅞	0 93¼
Mar. 21	0 90⅜	0 94½
Mar. 28	0 90½	0 93⅜

	Winnipeg.	Minneapolis.
April 4	0 89¼	0 91⅜
April 11	0 89⅝	0 91½
April 18	0 89½	0 92⅞
April 25	0 91⅞	0 94½
May 2	0 91½	0 92½
May 9	0 93⅛	0 94⅜
May 16	0 95	0 95⅞
May 22	0 94⅝	0 93⅝
May 29	0 94¾	0 95½
June 6	0 96	0 95
June 13	0 93	0 97⅞
June 20	0 91¾	0 91
June 27	0 88¾	0 88⅞
July 3	0 89¾	0 91⅛
July 10	0 90½	0 90⅜
July 17	0 89¾	0 90⅞
July 24	0 92⅞	0 95½
July 31	0 95½	0 96¼
Aug. 6	1 09¼	1 08
Aug. 14	1 05¼	1 09⅜
Aug. 21	1 05¾	1 11
Aug. 29	1 12⅞	1 18⅞
Sept. 4	1 20¼	1 29½
Sept. 11	1 13	1 11¾
Sept. 16	1 11	1 12½
Sept. 25	1 09⅝	1 08¾
Oct. 2	1 04⅛	1 06½
Oct. 8	1 08	1 09⅞
Oct. 17	1 15⅜	1 13¼
Oct. 24	1 17¼	1 14⅜
Oct. 31	1 16⅜	1 14½
Nov. 7	1 20¾	1 17¾
Nov. 14	1 19	1 16½
Nov. 21	1 19⅞	1 18⅜
Nov. 28	1 16¼	1 15⅜
Dec. 5	1 17¼	1 19⅝
Dec. 12	1 17¼	1 19
Dec. 19	1 20⅜	1 22½
Dec. 24	1 21½	1 26½
Dec. 31	1 22½	1 26⅞
Average, about	$1 00¾	$1 02¼

1915.

Jan. 9	1 32	1 37½
Jan. 16	1 38	1 34⅜
Jan. 23	1 38⅜	1 42¼
Jan. 30	1 45⅜	1 49½
Feb. 6	1 55⅞	1 56⅜
Feb. 13	1 48⅜	1 49⅜
Feb. 20	1 56⅛	1 54⅞
Feb. 27	1 52½	1 49⅜
Mar. 6	1 40	1 39½
Mar. 13	1 51	1 52¾
Mar. 20	1 52	1 53⅞
Mar. 27	1 45⅞	1 46⅝
April 3	1 50⅞	1 25¼
April 10	1 50⅞	1 52¾
April 17	1 58⅞	1 61½
April 24	1 63⅞	1 64¾
April 30	1 62½	1 58⅞
May 8	1 59	1 56½
May 15	1 58½	1 57½
May 20	1 58⅞	1 61½
May 29	1 46¼	1 52⅜
June 4	1 38½	1 43½
June 12	1 22	1 30⅞
June 19	1 20¾	1 31⅜
June 26	1 30	1 34½
July 3	1 31¼	1 41
July 10	1 34¼	1 43
July 17	1 39½	1 48½
July 24	1 39¼	1 51½
July 31	1 27	1 45⅜
Aug. 5	1 32	1 50½
Aug. 14	....	.....
Aug. 21	1 00⅝	1 07⅝
Aug. 28	0 96¾	1 20½
Sept. 2	0 97	1 04⅜
Sept. 11	0 94	1 00⅞
Sept. 18	0 94¾	0 99¾
Sept. 25	0 94	0 95⅝
Oct. 2	0 89⅜	0 98½
Oct. 7	0 96½	1 06⅞
Oct. 16	1 04	1 09½
Oct. 23	0 95¼	0 97⅝
Oct. 30	1 00	1 00⅝
Nov. 5	1 04½	1 01⅜
Nov. 13	1 06	1 04½
Nov. 20	1 01	1 03⅜
Nov. 27	1 01⅜	1 02
Dec. 6	1 08¼	1 11½
Dec. 11	1 05¼	1 09⅝
Dec. 18	1 10½	1 15¼
Dec. 24	1 16½	1 23⅜
Dec. 31	1 15	1 21⅜
Average, about	$1 27⅜	$1 32¼

Mr. MacNUTT: During some months of the year 1912 the Winnipeg prices were a little better, for the reason that in the middle months of the year the farmers as a rule have very little to sell. Another reason for this is given in the following extract from the Manitoba Free Press of January 6, 1916:

In the early days of the crop movement the spread between the cash price for wheat in Minneapolis and Winnipeg in favour of the former market was very noticeable, but as the season advanced the heavy premiums for prompt delivery at the lake terminals gradually wiped out the difference and for a short time put Winnipeg in the premier position as to price. with the close of navigation, however, the spread reappeared, and it has been widening until yesterday No. 1 Northern was worth 8⅜ cents a bushel more in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg. It needs to widen only 2 cents a bushel more to wipe out the United States duty and thus open the United States market to Canadian wheat. During the wheat-selling season, except for short periods when an exceptional occasion arises owing to a demand for wheat for lake cargoes. Minneapolis wheat prices are always higher than Winnipeg prices. It is for those who resist the demand for free wheat to justify this state of affairs if they can.

In 1912, in the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, and July Minneapolis prices were higher than the Winnipeg prices, with the exception of one quotation. In August there were two quotations in which the Winnipeg prices were higher; in September there were three, but during the whole year only eleven out of fifty quotations were lower at Minneapolis than at Winnipeg. In 1913, in the months of January, February, and March the Minneapolis prices were all an average of two and three-quarters cents better than the Winnipeg prices. In April, May, June,

July, and August, in almost every quotation, the Winnipeg prices were a little better. In September, October, November, and December the Minneapolis prices were again better, and these were the principal selling months. This, however, brings, for the whole year, the average price to pretty much the same figure for both points. In 1914, in the months of January, February, March, April, and May the prices at Minneapolis were much better; in June there were two or three quotations in which the Winnipeg prices were higher, but altogether only sixteen out of fifty-two quotations were lower at Minneapolis than at Winnipeg. The average price, including these, was nearly two cents higher for Minneapolis. In 1915, in January, the quotations were all, except one, in favour of Minneapolis, but the difference was very slight; in February, all but two; in March, all but one; in April, all but one; in May, all but two; in June, the prices were all better at Minneapolis; in July, August, September, and October, the same; in November, all but two. In 1915, when the quotations were so nearly alike the prices were affected by war conditions, otherwise would have been much higher in Minneapolis.

I make the statement that the Winnipeg column of quotations should be headed "No. 2," and the Minneapolis column "No. 1." I am not going to read the Grain Act again, because the hon. member for Assinaboia (Mr. Turriff) has read it already, but I will read the descriptions of Manitoba No. 2 and Minneapolis No. 1, and hon. members will see that our No. 2 is better than their No. 1, making the spread still greater.

No. 1 Northern Spring wheat shall be dry, sound, sweet, and clean, may consist of the hard and soft varieties of Spring wheat, and weigh not less than fifty-seven pounds to the measured bushel.

No. 2 Manitoba Northern wheat shall be sound and reasonably clean, of good milling qualities, and fit for warehousing, weighing not less than fifty-eight pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least forty-five per cent of hard red Fife wheat.

That is, No. 1 Northern Minneapolis Spring wheat does not require to have any hard wheat in it, and it may weigh one pound less than Manitoba No. 1 Northern. There is a foot-note here in regard to Northern Spring wheat that further widens the difference, and shows the anxiety of the American millers to have Northern hard wheat. The note is as follows:

Hard, flinty wheat, of good colour, containing no appreciable admixture of soft wheat, may be admitted into the grades of No. 2 Northern Spring wheat and No. 3 Northern Spring wheat, provided weight of the same is not more than one pound less than the minimum test weight required by the existing rules of said grades, and provided further, that such wheat is in all other respects qualified for admission into such grades.

The variety of wheat known as "Humpback," owing to its inferior milling quality, shall not be graded higher than No. 3.

The inference is very strong that the Americans cannot produce sufficient hard wheat and are consequently ready and willing to pay a good premium for the hard wheat grown in the West.

Now, I want to speak for a few minutes in regard to freight congestion. Since I have been in the West, in every year that we have a good crop there is always a great deal of congestion, suffering and loss; and it seems to me that free access to the market to the south of us would alleviate that condition of things to a very large extent, because I would imagine that the railway companies there would immediately provide in some way for transportation of our wheat to the South. At the present time our Canadian railways are not able to handle all the grain that is grown, and they should not be dogs in the manger and expect that the grain will be held at the expense of the farmers and the country generally in order that they may have the hauling of it. A good deal of the wheat, by being held in that way, would be spoiled, although, of course, as the weight would remain the same, the railway companies would get the same freight on it. As the country develops, as we hope it will do, and produces more, the railways will not be able to increase the transportation facilities in the proper proportion, and therefore it will be no detriment to them if the market to the south of us is thrown open. No doubt, however, the profits of the great milling concerns would be affected; but evidently they are making quite enough money at the present time, and I think that the Minister of Finance, under the 25 per cent clause in his Budget proposals, will find that enormous profits will have to be disgorged by the Canadian millers. They can, however, stand the loss of a certain amount of their illegitimate profits, and they will not have to pay more for their wheat than it is worth.

Although grain is put on the American market on grade, the Americans buy, not on grade, but on sample. Unfortunately I lost some statistics which I had, showing that quantities of No. 1 and No. 2 in car

lots were purchased at different prices on the same dates, thus proving that they were bought on sample. Therefore, Canadian wheat would be sold in the United States on its merits. Now, there is always a great deal of grain of inferior grades, which does not receive the price which it should receive in the Canadian market. I will just take the liberty of reading the description of one more grade, American No. 4 wheat, which is evidently a milling wheat, because it is officially graded. In the West it would not even be called chicken feed, but still the millers in the States seem to want it. The description is as follows:

> No. 4 Northern Spring wheat shall include inferior spring wheat that is badly shrunken, or damaged, and weigh not less than forty-nine pounds to the measured bushel.

In our markets that wheat would not receive the price for No. 1 feed. I have raised some of that quality of wheat myself, and I have been offered 23 cents a bushel for it when good wheat was selling at 65 cents. There is no good reason why this Government should not open the market to the south of us, and they could do so easily. If the manufacturers decided that their protection should be removed, no doubt it would be done away with at once. Now, the farmers are asking, almost demanding, that their protection shall be taken away, and still it seems as if their request were not to be considered, when the only possible interest that might be affected would be the millers who are well able to take care of themselves.

Another argument advanced is that the dairymen of the East would have to pay more for their bran and shorts. That is no argument at all; but, even supposing it is, as flour is put on the market cheaper in Minneapolis than in Canada—according to the statistics, it is some sixty cents a barrel cheaper—it follows that bran and shorts ought to be cheaper, and in that case the dairymen of the East could obtain their bran and shorts from the United States. I do not consider that a good argument anyway. We cannot possibly get more for our wheat than it is worth, but are indebted to its full value. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is, very properly, endeavouring to open markets throughout the world for Canadian manufactured products. But there is a market immediately to the south of us for wheat that will open almost automatically at a word from this Government.

The opening of that market could not do harm to any interest, and there is every reason to believe that to the great bulk of our people it would be a decided advantage.

There are some Conservatives who have been impressed with the soundness of this proposal. The Toronto News of the 15th of October, 1913, said—I suppose "in a moment of weakness":

> No doubt the Western grain growers desire to have the Canadian duty removed. Probably it would be unwise to resist the demand. * * The grain crop of the West, however, will steadily increase, and in consideration of the action of Washington the farmers may fairly demand that the American market be opened. The Canadian mills, which manufacture chiefly for foreign markets, may not be greatly prejudiced, while possibly freight rates may be favourably affected. If the trade agreement three years ago had covered only free wheat, it is not likely that the Conservative parliamentary party would have resisted the proposal. Removal of the duty under existing conditions involves no contract with the United States, nor any limitation of the fiscal or legislative freedom of Canada. * * * It is most undesirable that any legitimate appeal from the West should be rejected, or any grievance perpetuated which can be removed without endangering national interests * * * But since the West clearly demands free wheat, it would probably be unwise to continue the Canadian duties which prevent free shipments to American milling centres.

I do not know what argument can be successfully used to refute the opinions thus expressed.

I wish again to say a word on the subject of grain congestion in the West. We had a visitor here from Alberta recently, Mr. McColl, a member of the Alberta Legislature, and a large farmer. He represents the constituency of Acadia, which is on the Saskatchewan boundary and in the Goose Lake country. I understood from him that his mission was to try to arrange some way by which cars could be brought in so that the wheat could be taken out of the country. There are millions of bushels there yet unshipped. It is a magnificent country for the growing of grain of all kinds—and there has been a splendid yield this year. But the grain is still on the farmers' hands and much of it is in danger of being spoiled. The only response that Mr. McColl could get was the statement that all that was humanly possible would be done. It would be unreasonable to expect more than that. But at the same time conditions could be changed so as to give a much greater effectiveness to that action, and there would be a great change in relieving the situation if our wheat were admitted free into the United States. There can be no doubt that

it would have the effect of bringing into play greater facilities than we now have for the marketing of the grain. If the West is to be made productive in the way of grain-growing it is more than ever necessary that it should be possible to realize the greatest return from the crops. There is no benefit whatever in raising a lot of stuff unless you can put it on the market. It is one thing to produce and quite another thing to turn the product into money. The very object of production is to get as much money as possible. In the interest of settlement and of future grain production for the benefit of the country at large, every available market should be opened at once. To gain free entrance for our wheat into the United States certainly cannot do any harm, and we have every reason to expect that it will be of great benefit. If you are going to ask people to go to the West and to settle and become producers, you must make the country attractive to those people. There is no use in telling them merely that the country will grow all kinds of grain; you must be able to show them also that that grain can be turned into money. Many farmers have the grain to-day who are not able to turn it into money. And as time goes on this condition will grow worse, except when we have a lean year, as we sometimes do in some parts of the country.

There is no need for me to go over ground that has already been covered so ably by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and so I conclude with the hope that the Government will take this matter into their most serious consideration and will deal with it favourably at once.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): I have listened to-day, as always, with close attention to the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt). He is a man of practical judgment who puts forward his argument moderately and temperately, and is always heard with interest in this House. The question involved in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is one which has on many occasions during the past few years engaged the attention of the Government. Many representations have been made, both for and against the proposal. As Minister of the department immediately concerned with tariff matters, and recognizing the importance of the question and of the discussions which have proceeded regarding it, especially in the West, I have given the subject a great deal of close personal attention. I have caused a record to be kept of prices of grain both in Canada and in the United States, with a view to thoroughly familiarizing myself with the merits of the question in order to reach a sound and just conclusion in the national interest. When I say in the national interest, I need not say how important a factor in the national interest I consider the interest and material well-being of the three great grain growing provinces of the West. It is in that spirit that I have approached, from time to time, the consideration of this question.

The provisions of the Underwood Tariff, to which attention has been directed by my hon. friend from Assiniboia, are not generally understood. I do not mean to say that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), or my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) does not understand them. I think they do; the wording of the resolution indicates that the hon. member for Assiniboia understands the provisions of the Underwood tariff relating to this matter, but it is a fact that the provisions of that tariff are not generally understood throughout Canada. Even my hon. friend from Assiniboia, the other evening, made what I may regard as a slip in his speech. At page 829 of Hansard he said:

> Two years ago the United States put wheat on the free list to any country that adopted the same policy with regard to their wheat. All we have to do to secure the American market for the Canadian farmer is to put our wheat on the free list.

I prefer to regard that as a slip, because that is not in accordance with the facts. The Underwood tariff does not provide for the free entry of Canadian wheat to the United States upon condition of Canada admitting wheat from the United States free.

Mr. TURRIFF: I stated in another part of my speech that wheat and wheat products and potatoes are all in the same category.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I desired to do my friend no injustice, and I stated that I did not think he was misinformed. I have quoted this to show that even he is apt to make a mis-statement about the matter, and there is a very considerable body of opinion in Canada which believes that if we admit wheat free from the United States our wheat will then automatically be permitted free into the United States. That is not the fact, and in order that we may lay a proper foundation for the discussion of this important subject, I will

place upon Hansard the provisions of the Underwood Tariff relating to it:

Item 644. Wheat, wheat flour, semolina, and other wheat products, not specially provided for: Provided, that wheat shall be subject to a duty of ten cents per bushel, that wheat flour shall be subject to a duty of forty-five cents per barrel of 196 pounds, and semolina and other products of wheat, not specially provided for, ten per centum ad valorem, when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on wheat or wheat flour or semolina imported from the United States.

I desire to bring to the attention of the House, as it has a bearing on my argument and the proper discussion of this question, especially as to the matter of price, what are known as the drawback provisions of the American tariff. These provisions are to the following effect:

1. Wheat may be shipped through the United States to other countries without payment of duty thereon;

2. In the case of flour exported from the United States which has been manufactured in that country from imported wheat, a drawback of ninety-nine per cent of the duty upon such wheat is refunded, the American miller therefore obtaining the by-products, bran and offal, free of duty upon the wheat from which they came. In other words, the duty payable on the wheat so used is $1 per thousand bushels, or one-tenth of one cent per bushel.

3. Upon wheat imported for consumption in the United States, the duty is ten cents per bushel.

I have given the provisions of the Underwood Tariff so far as they relate to the free entry of Canadian wheat to the United States. Their effect is, that in order to get our wheat, to say nothing of our flour or semolina into the United States, we must admit into Canada free of duty, American wheat, American flour and American semolina. The question at issue of course is: is it advantageous in the national interest and as a most important factor in that national interest, is it in the interest of the wheat growing provinces, to bring into effect the provisions of this Underwood Tariff. The deduction which I draw from the provisions of the Underwood Tariff which I have placed before the House and the drawback regulations in the American Tariff is that, so far as concerns Canadian wheat shipped through the United States or Canadian wheat manufactured in the United States into flour for export, no tariff change would materially alter the position so far as the Canadian grower or exporter of wheat is concerned. Let me repeat that: So far as concerns Canadian wheat shipped through the United States for export, or Canadian wheat manufatcured in the United States into flour for export, no tariff change would materially alter the position so far as the Canadian grower or exporter of wheat is concerned. The question can only arise in the case of wheat imported into the United States for consumption there. It is contended by those who favour this legislation that the Canadian farmer would obtain the benefit of the higher prices prevailing at Minneapolis. I have pointed out that the change would only be necessary if it should be considered advisable to supply the home market of the United States, because of the drawback provisions which I have mentioned. To-day the American miller at Minneapolis can buy Canadian wheat and pay the duty of ten cents per bushel upon it; he can grind it into flour and he can export it from the United States and get a drawback of ninety-nine per cent of the ten cents per bushel duty which he has paid. So, as I have stated, the question narrows itself down to this: Is it in the interest of the Canadian farmer and of Canada, that our wheat should find its way to the great milling centres of the United States, to be ground into flour there for home consumption.

I desire to point out in this connection that the United States has a continually increasing surplus of export wheat, which is exported either in the form of grain or flour. The surplus wheat for export in the United States from the last crop is no less than 390,000,000 bushels. The exportable surplus from Canada will be 264,000,000 bushels; so that the situation on the face of it, althought I do not put this forward as a conclusive argument, but subject to qualification, that the United States presumably has not only sufficient wheat for its own domestic requirements, but sufficient to enable it to export, either in the form of wheat or of flour, 390,000,000 bushels, while Canada has a surplus of 264,000,000 bushels, which she can export in the form of wheat or of flour.

The outstanding fact, therefore, with regard to the two nations in respect of their production of wheat, is that they are in competition in the wheat and flour markets of the world. Canada and the United States are two of the keenest competitors in the export markets of the world for their surplus production of wheat, either in the form of the grain itself, or of flour. It is not as if the United States consumes all her wheat; she has this large exportable surplus. It was pointed out by the hon.

gentleman (Mr. MacNutt) and by the hon. member for Assiniboia, that there is at times a substantial spread in favour of Minneapolis and Duluth as against Winnipeg and Fort William. I think these are the proper points of comparison because, as they contend, the price is higher at Minneapolis than it is at Winnipeg, or higher at Duluth than it is at Fort William, my hon. friends assume that if the existing tariff were changed the Canadian farmer would be able to get the higher price prevailing at Minneapolis. I desire to point out the fallacy that underlies the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacNutt) and it is this: he has placed upon Hansard figures which show a spread at times under the existing tariff situation, and he has not, and of course could not, place figures upon Hansard showing what would be the result, in regard to the prices at Minneapolis and Duluth, if the present tariff situation were changed. I purpose developing that argument a little later.

One would think, Mr. Speaker, that as the United States has an exportable surplus, and that Canada has an exportable surplus, the export price would govern; and yet it is a fact that at times—and it is alleged, although I do not concede it, that more frequently at Minneapolis than at Winnipeg—the price is in favour of the American market. I need not tell the House, because this question has been up for discussion on many previous occasions, that the reason for the higher price which prevails at Minneapolis in the fall, and sometimes at other periods, is that Minneapolis is a great milling centre, and that the milling industry requires hard wheat to grind with the softer varieties from the southern and western States for the purpose of making flour. In other words, a local demand exists at Minneapolis which is, in a measure, independent of the export price. That is the substantial outstanding fact with regard to the Minneapolis price of wheat; that it is dependent upon a local demand which is, as I have stated, in a measure independent of the export price. There is truth in the statement that the Minneapolis price is higher than the Canadian price. Since last September I have caused statistics to be gathered, and the spread in price has been from three to eight cents a bushel, or even more, in favour of the American market. A little later, I shall mention some exceptional features of the economic situation of the past year which would account, or tend to account, for the continuation of that spread. There is some truth in the statement, but as they say in the law courts, it is not the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It is that we desire to get at.

I intend to maintain that the supposed advantage which the Canadian farmer is being led to believe he would obtain at Minneapolis, is largely, if not wholly, illusory. That is to say, I contend that if the tariff were taken off by the United States to-day, the price of wheat at Minneapolis would fall to the export price, or very close to it. Personally, I believe it would fall to the export price.

Mr. MacNUTT: There is some room for it to fall.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would fall, and my hon. friend knows that the greater distance you fall the greater the drop and the greater the shock.

Mr. MacNUTT: It could not fall lower than it is at Winnipeg.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would not fall lower than the Winnipeg export price, but it would fall to the Winnipeg export price, or very close to it. I believe it would fall to the Winnipeg export price, because the export price would govern. Freights are precisely the same from the United States to the great market of the world in Liverpool as they are from Winnipeg or Fort William. The freights are equalized, and therefore I maintain that the export price would govern. In that connection I desire to read an extract from the Wall Street Journal, which is a very reputable and well known financial organ in the United States. The extract was copied in the Montreal Gazette of November 8, 1915, and I quote it simply to show the point of view of that Journal. The article reads:

> The Canadian farmer believes he would get at least five cents more for his wheat were he free to ship direct to Minneapolis. He does not stop to think that were the American markets free to him and he chucked 200,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat on the American markets in the first three months of the harvest, the price of wheat in America would utterly collapse. The American millers and the American railroads, as well as American bankers and merchants naturally desire to see all Canadian grain marketed through Chicago and Minneapolis.
>
> But such a process would most certainly demoralize prices, and both the Canadian and American farmers would get lower prices for their grain. Were all duties on grain and flour eliminated from the tariffs of the United States and Canada the millers would be the

chief beneficiaries. The American millers would draw on the Canadian prairies for the brands of wheat they lack for mixing purposes, and the Canadian millers would buy cheaper than they are getting.

I put that forward, not as endorsing it, but simply as the view of a reputable financial journal in the United States. I put forward, also, not as endorsing it, but as a western view, an article from the Regina Evening Province of January 15.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I put it forward as showing a western point of view, because what we are really arguing is the question, not so much of the spread that exists between Minneapolis and Winnipeg, but whether or not a spread would exist if the tariff wall were down. This extract from the Regina Province is:

If a favourable result on this resolution—

he is speaking of the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff).

—resulted, does any one doubt what the effect would be? On a mere rumour that Canada intended to remove the duty on wheat, last fall, the price of wheat in Chicago broke sharply, going several points downward, and it did not recover until the free wheat rumour was discredited. If free wheat were actually put in force the result would be to lower immediately the price the Canadian farmer is now getting for his wheat at Winnipeg.

—I have been trying to deal with this matter fairly and judicially, and I think there is a very great deal of merit in the argument put forward in these articles, and for this reason: The price of an article depends upon supply and demand. If there is more than enough wheat to supply the local demand what will happen to the price of wheat? The price of wheat will fall. I am dealing with this question on general business principles, and it is inconceivable to me that, if the American tariff were down, and there was ready to descend upon Minneapolis a tide of hard wheat from our prairie provinces, the price of wheat at Minneapolis would not fall. It must fall.

Mr. KNOWLES: Under such circumstances would it not necessarily follow that the millers of Canada would not have to pay any more than they now have to pay?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not yet dealt with the milling question; I will come to it in due course, and I hope to be able to deal with it to the satisfaction of my hon. friend. The question of free wheat did not arise actually last year. Why did it not arise last year? Because, as a matter of fact, the Canadian price for wheat during last year was very much better than the American price. Let me place upon Hansard a memorandum prepared by my office, where, as I have stated, a careful record is kept of the comparative prices of wheat. The memorandum is as follows:

1914-1915 Wheat Prices.

Wheat for December delivery was quoted at Winnipeg during the three months starting with October 1 and ending with December 31—seventy-four business days at Winnipeg. During that period there were only three days when Minneapolis delivery was quoted higher than Winnipeg, and seven days in Duluth, while the average of the official closing quotations for that period was $1.16.3 for Winnipeg, $1.13.3 for Minneapolis, and 1.14.8 for Duluth.

May delivery was quoted between 1st October and 31st May—a period of eight months, or 189 business days at Winnipeg, and during that period there were only two days when Minneapolis sold higher than Winnipeg, and only on thirteen days was Duluth above Winnipeg, while the average for this delivery during this period was $1.40.6 for Winnipeg, $1.35.9 for Minneapolis, and $1.38.1 for Duluth.

July delivery was quoted from 1st January, 1915, until 31st July—seven months, or 165 business days at Winnipeg, and only on nine days in Minneapolis and twenty-eight in Duluth were those markets higher than Winnipeg. The average for this period was $1.45.6 for Winnipeg, $1.38.4 for Minneapolis, and $1.42.5 for Duluth.

This means that the average prices for the three deliveries of December, May and July were:

Winnipeg..	138.3	138.3	Difference 4c.
Minneapolis	132.9	134.3	
Duluth..	135.7		

In other words, that Winnipeg was 5⅔c. higher than Minneapolis, and 2⅔c. higher than Duluth, or 4c. higher than the average of both Minneapolis and Duluth.

That was the record of the year before last—1914-15.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is my hon. friend quoting No. 3 wheat in Minneapolis against No. 2 wheat in Winnipeg?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand what my hon. friend has in view. These are the figures on the same grades. I understand the difference which my hon. friend pointed out the other day. The Winnipeg and Fort William markets were better than the Minneapolis and Duluth markets for the year 1914-15, but not this last year.

Mr. TURRIFF: For the corresponding grades?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: For the corresponding grades.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that he is comparing two

absolutely different kinds of wheat, that No. 3 Canadian wheat is better than No. 2 Minneapolis wheat and in many cases better than No. 1 Minneapolis.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I read what the hon. gentleman said the other day as to that, and while attaching some weight to it, at the same time the figures which I have given here afford a fair basis of comparison. I may say to my hon. friend further that, allowing his argument, there is enough margin to spare in the difference of five cents between Winnipeg and Minneapolis in favour of Winnipeg, and two and three-fifths cents in favour of Fort William as against Duluth.

Mr. TURRIFF: In these days we would not sell in Minneapolis; we would sell at home.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have handed to me a chart prepared by Mr. Sanford Evans as to quotations of grain prices, and I propose to lay it on the table of the House. I think any hon. gentleman will find this chart interesting. It shows the variations and fluctuations in the prices of grain on both sides of the line. Sometimes the price is higher on one side and sometimes on the other, but this is to be said, and it is a point to which I intend to revert later, that when Canadian wheat is being pressed forward for sale the tendency is for the Canadian price to be lower than the American.

Mr. KNOWLES: What period does that chart cover?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: 1912-13-14-15. It is said that the price is more frequently higher at Minneapolis, but, as I say, that begs the question. The real question is not whether the price is higher at Minneapolis under existing tariff conditions, but the question is: what would be the state of affairs if the present tariff situation were changed?

I desire to again emphasize that the Underwood tariff does not provide for the free entry of wheat in exchange for free wheat, but the Underwood tariff provides for the free entry of three products in exchange for the free entry of three products. I now proceed to deal with that aspect of the question. Why did not the Underwood tariff, as in the case of potatoes, provide for free wheat in exchange for free wheat? What object had the framers of the American tariff in view when they provided, not for the free entry of wheat from countries which afforded free entry of American wheat, but provided that three products should be admitted to that country in return for the admission of the same three products from another country? It is perfectly obvious that the framers of the Underwood tariff desired to gain for their flour free access to markets of the countries whose wheat was admitted free. I do not blame the framers of the Underwood tariff for that; I think it was wise from their standpoint to make that provision when dealing with the question. In substance, what they say to Canada is this: If we allow your wheat to come in free, we want to grind it, and sell it back to you in the form of flour. That, in a word, is the idea that the framers of the Underwood tariff had in mind when these provisions were enacted. I am not finding any fault with that policy; it was for them to determine what the provisions of their tariff should be. The framing of a tariff is essentially a domestic matter, and each country has to provide as seems best to its legislators in the interests of the country which they represent. It is to be pointed out that the United States is one of the great milling countries of the world. The United States has 7,500 mills, with a daily capacity of just about 1,000,000 barrels. Minneapolis alone, the great centre that I have been speaking of, has a daily capacity of 73,800 barrels, representing a consumption of 330,000 bushles of wheat. The object of the Underwood tariff was to secure a great export business for the American flour merchant. Now, what about the capacity of Canada. Canada is a great flour milling country too. The flour milling industry in Canada has been encouraged by all Governments, and just here I should like to point out that when my right hon. friend's Government framed the provisions of the reciprocity agreement they insisted that there should be a protection of fifty cents a barrel on Canadian flour; so do not let it be said that the Government of my right hon. friend, when in power, overlooked the question of protection to the Canadian miller. The flour milling capacity of Canada is as follows: Canada has 550 mills, with a capacity of 100,000 barrels per day, or one-tenth of the flour capacity of the United States mills. I have given the flour milling capacity of the United States and of Canada, and it is to be pointed out that if we bring into effect the provisions of the Underwood tariff the Canadian milling industry will at once come into compe-

tition with the highly specialized flour milling industry of the United States, which, holding its own home market, would at the same time seriously injure the Canadian milling industry.

Now, I do not contend that if it appeared to be clearly in the national interests that one industry should be hampered or crippled, that that should not be done; but I do say that before any such action should be taken it should appear to be clearly in the national interests, and in the interests of those who think they would be advantaged by the legislation in question. I contend that the advantage should be sufficiently wide to constitute a national advantage, and further, that it should have the element of a permanent advantage before any steps should be taken which would have the effect of crippling or even destroying a great Canadian industry.

Mr. KNOWLES: Can the minister say what proportion of the flour made in Canada is exported to the markets of the world?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not the figures, but one of my colleagues informs me that the export business is comparatively small. The figures are very easily obtainable. Let us assume for a moment that the position taken by my hon. friend from Assiniboia is correct.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is quite correct.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Sometimes we make very far-fetched assumptions in this House. Let us assume that he is correct in supposing that our wheat would flow down to Minneapolis if the duty was removed. It is obvious that if our grain did flow down to Minneapolis it would not remain in Canada to be ground by our mills, nor would it be carried from Canada by our transportation systems to the markets of the world. If free wheat will be a real, and not an illusory, advantage to the farmers of the West, that is what would happen. My hon. friend put forward the argument, with a great deal of force I must say, that the Canadian millers would not be injured because they would have open to them the American market. Now, in that connection it is to be pointed out that it takes a very considerable time for any industry to establish itself and develop in a foreign country. The question of brands, for instance, is one of great importance. In order to develop their business in the United States, the Canadian millers would have to spend large sums of money in the United States, and they would have to do that—and I desire to emphasize this point as strongly as I can—in the face of the utmost uncertainty as to the continuance of the provisions of the Underwood tariff. My hon. friend from Assiniboia said that the farmers of the Northwest States were restive with regard to this question, and did not like the idea of Canadian wheat being admitted. Is there any certainty as to these provisions of the Underwood tariff? How far will business interests be justified in spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of developing their trade in a foreign country, if they are confronted with a possibility, or a strong probability to the minds of many of them, that tariff changes may be put into effect in the not far distant future which will shut them out from that market? I desire to say again that I do not contend that if the change appeared clearly in the national interest, and in estimating that national interest the interest and welfare of three great provinces have to be taken into consideration—the interest of one industry should be determinative. If it was perfectly clear to me that it was in the interest of the country that the milling interest should take its chances, I know the view that I would take; but it is not clear to me and it is not clear to any member of this House that, with the tariff down, there would be any substantial advantage to the Canadian grain grower to have the Minneapolis market. It is not clear that there is any element of permanence in the provisions of the Underwood tariff which we have now under consideration, and therefore from the milling standpoint and from the standpoint of the grain growers themselves, it would seem to me that we should be very sure of our ground before we take a step which may have irrevocable consequences.

Now, I have dealt with the matter from the standpoint of the milling industry, but there are other standpoints. This country has a great mixed farming industry and I suppose that in no part of Canada has the mixed farming industry made greater strides in the past few years than in the western provinces. I stated the other day, and I state now, that I always assume that farmers know the class of farming which it is best for them to carry on, having regard to all the conditions. Suppose a homesteader takes up land in the Northwest; it is all very well to talk about his going into mixed farming, but the immediate problem that presents itself to him is how he can

get a crop in and get a profit from it. Having regard to the conditions with which homesteaders and settlers generally are confronted, I say it is reasonable to assume that they know the class of farming which it is best for them to engage in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And the class of markets too.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Therefore, as I stated the other day, I have never written essays nor delivered lectures as to the class of farming which should be carried on by the intelligent farmers of this country or of any part of it, and I do not propose to do so. I am going to be pragmatical and assume that the farmers in any particular section of this country know what is best for them so far as the carrying on of farming is concerned. in the section in which they are engaged in agriculture and under the conditions in which they find themselves. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaks of markets. This question has been made a political question, but if it were discussed dispassionately by hon. gentlemen opposite, and if the farmers were told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, I do not believe that the farmers of the West, en masse, or in any large majority, or in a majority, would be desirous of seeking the illusory market at Minneapolis. This is more a political question than an economic question to-day. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), on page 829 of Hansard, made a rather extraordinary statement with regard to the export price obtained by the Canadian farmer. These are his words:

> But what do we find when the wheat got to Liverpool? Instead of the Manitoba farmer getting seven or eight cents less a bushel than the American farmer, he received from the Liverpool merchant from six to eight cents a bushel more than the American farmer, and that cannot be denied by any one who knows anything about the grain trade.

Mr. TURRIFF: If the hon. minister will allow me, I was not correctly reported there, and I changed that portion of my speech when I got the copy of Hansard. I did not say those words at all, nor say words that meant anything like that. What I said was, that while the Canadian wheat was seven or eight sents a bushel lower, when that wheat got to Liverpool, it sold for seven or eight cents higher than the corresponding Minneapolis grade.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Now let us see what follows from that. The Canadian wheat brings more at Liverpool. The transportation charges are precisely the same. Who gets the six cents or eight cents?

Mr. TURRIFF: That is for the Government to explain.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: All right. Who buys the grain from the farmer in the Northwest? Who is the greatest grain buyer in the Northwest? The Grain Growers' Grain Association. I ask my hon. friend to go to the source of authoritative information in this matter, and ask the Grain Growers' Grain Association why it is that his statement is correct, as he states it is correct, and when he has explained that to the farmers of the West, let him come down and give us also the benefit of the explanation.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think the Grain Growers' Grain Association export any wheat.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But they buy it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Certainly.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, that is the point I am making. I am told by the Solicitor General that they are great exporters.

Mr. KNOWLES: I would not rely on the Solicitor General's experience in the matter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend from Assiniboia has got himself into a dilemma from which he cannot extricate himself.

Mr. TURRIFF: Not at all.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He says that Canadian wheat sells in Liverpool at from six cents to eight cents more a bushel, and that charges are equal. Well, who gets the difference? The buyers. And who are the buyers? The principal buyers are the Grain Growers' Grain Company. One useful result of this discussion may be that my hon. friend who, I have no doubt, will say he approaches this question conscientiously and judicially, will interest himself in finding out why the Grain Growers' Grain Company does not pay more.

Mr. TURRIFF: I can tell the hon. minister that I took the very information I gave to the House from the Grain Growers' Guide.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not doubt it. I do not blame my hon. friend for taking

information from the Grain Growers' Guide, but I cannot help expressing surprise that he should be so unsophisticated as to put it forward here as a conclusive argument in favour of bringing our tariff into conformity with the Underwood tariff. If my hon. friend got that information from the Grain Growers' Guide, I think he had better ask the Grain Growers' Guide for an explanation of it. He made another observation:

> But during September, October and November, the farmers of the West lost over $10,000,000 in not being able to have the American market for their wheat.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is right.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend, as we used to say in the old school days, is begging the question.

Mr. TURRIFF: I never do that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think he is begging the question. He finds a quotation of wheat in Minneapolis, and at once assumes that if the tariff were down our farmers could get that quotation. But if the tariff were down, the quotation would drop with the tariff, and instead of the farmers gaining ten million dollars the only effect would be that the price in Minneapolis would be equalized with the price in Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman proceeds:

> The Government would not give them the American market, they sent their wheat to the old country, and the farmer is paying from 40 cents to 45 cents a bushel to take his wheat from tide water to Liverpool.

Just to show the unfairness—I will say the unintentional unfairness of the hon. gentleman—

Mr. TURRIFF: Do not be so particular.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will take him at his word then, and say, just to show his unfairness, I will quote a little further:

> For the munition manufacturers who were able to charge this and the British Government four prices for their goods, they could get a rate which was practically the same as the rate before the war, but the rate for carrying wheat which, before the war, was from 5 to 7 cents a bushel, went up to from 40 to 45 cents a bushel. The Government were either powerless or careless, or they did not have the interest of the farmers at heart to the same degree that they had the interest of the manufacturers, they did not give them the American market and they allowed them to be robbed on this last year's crop to the extent of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 in excessive freight rates.

Now, my hon. friend has a conscience, and how he could cause a statement like that to be put on the wire to be sent to the people of the West, I cannot understand. I think he underrates the intelligence of his constituents and of the people of the West generally if he thinks that they will believe any such statement. It is true that freight rates on wheat have been seven or eight times what they were. But I can tell the hon. member, as a matter of economics, that the Canadian farmer does not pay those freights. If the freights could be put down to normal, the price would drop in Liverpool. He takes the freights from Canada or New York. But consider also the freights from Argentina and Australia. If we consider the whole situation, there is no conclusion possible except that the consumer in Great Britain pays, almost in entirety, the increase in the freight rates.

Now, I have dealt with this question from the standpoint of the farmer of the plains, and I have dealt with it from the standpoint of the milling industry; I now propose to deal with it from the standpoint of general Canadian policy. There is no man in this House who does not know the policy that has ruled in this country. That policy is this: that as far as practicable Canadian raw material should be manufactured in Canada, transported over our railway systems, and sent out through Canadian ports to the markets of the world. That has been the national policy of the Conservatives, and, despite what may be said to the contrary, it has also been the policy of the Liberals. That policy has been followed with the object of building up our industries. I said a moment ago that we were charged with being solicitous about the millers. I do not think I was very solicitous about them yesterday. I think we should be regardful of all great interests. Even in the reciprocity pact of the late Government of which my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was a distinguished and important supporter, the Government were so solicitous—would my hon. friend say over-solicitous?—about the millers, that, in order to protect their interests, they insisted on a duty of 50 cents a barrel.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is what defeated us.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I can tell my hon. friend what among other things, defeated them. For one thing there was no advantage to the Canadian producers in the pact And for another thing, there was the fact of the pact itself, the fact that it was an agreement, an interlocking of our tariff with the tariff of the country to the south. I

have been an attentive listener to debates in this House ever since I had the honour of becoming a member, and I believe I have heard this theme of manufacturing within Canadian boundaries, transportation over Canadian rail and water routes, and the development of Canadian harbours, for the export of our goods to the markets of the world more frequently discussed than any other subject. Let the question of transportation come up and what are the Maritime Provinces interested in? Ports. Our canal system is one of our most frequent subjects of discussion. Money has been poured out by hundreds of millions of dollars to develop our transcontinental railway systems. No subject has been discussed so extensively in this House as this of manufacturing our own raw material, building our own transportation systems, and improving our harbours for extension of our trade to the markets of the world. Now, I ask this House, is that a sound national policy, or is it not? I do not believe that any member of this House dare rise in his constituency and say that we should reverse this policy, which has been followed by all governments in this country practically since Confederation, or, at all events since 1879. This involves a departure from that policy which has been followed by all governments and which has commended itself to the people of this country. I made it plain in my Budget speech of 1914 that if it were clearly in the national interest that that policy should be departed from in some respect, I would not say it would not be the duty of the Government to depart from it. I would be disposed to say that would be the duty of the Government, because national policy is based upon national interest; and if it was clearly in the national interest to change any part of it, why, of course, the Government would be wise in making the change. But I contend that the advantage must be clear and unmistakable. If it is contended that an advantage will be gained from the American market for Canadian wheat secured through our adopting a policy which involves a departure from the principles which have governed the Conservative Governments of the past and the Liberal Government of the past, I say that the advantage should be clear, that it should be substantial, and that it should have a character of permanence. I have shown that it is clear that this is going to be of no substantial advantage to the grain growers. I have stated that the supposed advantage is largely illusory, and I think I have proved it. At all events, it is not substantial. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) admitted the other night that the prices would equalize, that the Canadian growers would not get the whole advantage of the Minneapolis price, but only a part. I think they will get such a small part, if any, that the advantage would not be substantial. At all events it is not clear to me that it would be substantial.

Now, what about permanence? Is there any man in this House who can say that the provisions of the Underwood tariff will be in operation two years from now? Whether we change our tariff under the terms of this resolution or not, a tariff is a domestic matter. The Underwood tariff makes an offer which can be accepted by the Canadian Government in its tariff, but there is nothing to hinder the American Government, this fall or a year from this fall, from radically changing its tariff in this regard and rescinding the provisions of the Underwood tariff to which I have referred. Therefore I contend that the supposed advantage is not clear, that it is not substantial, and that it has not the character of permanence. I say that all those three elements should be present, and present unmistakably, before we should depart from what has been regarded by the people of this country as a sound, national policy. Is there a man in this House who believes that with a production of hard wheat such as we have in our Northwest, increasing from year to year, that if the tariff were taken down and a tide of fifty or one hundred or one hundred and fifty or two hundred million bushels of wheat was ready to descend on Minneapolis, the price would not break? Every one of us knows that the price would break.

There are other aspects of this matter which I touched upon in the Budget speech. I summed up the arguments pro and con. In connection with the discussion of this subject and the agitation for the change in our tariff which would bring into effect the provisions of the Underwood tariff, I have received from certain railway employees a petition urging that their interests would be very seriously affected, that if the wheat went south—and the assumption of my hon. friend is that the wheat will go south or else there is no point in his argument—serious injury would be done to them. I do not say that any of these grounds that are put forward against this proposal are

conclusive; I have only put them forward to show the doubt which exists as to the result which would accrue from taking this very radical step and changing this policy which has been in the past regarded as national.

Then we have had petitions from mixed farmers. The mixed farmers say that bran and offal are more expensive in the United States than here and that consequently, if this went into effect, both in the Northwest and Ontario the farmer would have to pay more for his bran and offal. It is put forward also that if we took the step contemplated by this resolution the milling industry would certainly not be extended into the Northwest. I have given that matter as careful consideration as I think I ever gave a question in my life, and I have come to the conclusion that if this were done the Canadian milling industry would not be extended further into the Northwest for this reason, that the markets lie to the east and south and while the milling would be done in Canada east of Winnipeg, to the extent that our millers might be able to carry it on with American competition, there is no likelihood, so far as we can judge at present, of an extension to the Canadian Northwest of the milling industry. I need not tell hon. members that upon the milling industry mixed farming largely depends for its well being. The offal, the bran which the farmers use for the rearing of their livestock, is of supreme importance to the farming community and this proposed change would have an important bearing upon the supply of bran and offal for the rearing of stock by those engaged in the mixed farming industry. I think the small miller would probably disappear and that the business of the large millers would be very seriously affected if not crippled, and that the extension of the milling industry in the Northwest would be prevented.

I have pointed out that in the year preceding this last year's crop, 1914-15, the prices were better at Winnipeg and Fort William than at Minneapolis and Duluth. Now we come to this year. This year has been an extraordinary year. In the first place, we have been engaged in a very terrible war. Ocean transport has been interfered with as never before in the lifetime of any one in this Chamber. All the conditions have been abnormal, and to add to the abnormal conditions brought about by the war, we had the further condition that rains set in in certain parts of the United States and that wheat which was expected to be marketed at a certain date was not available for market until a later date. What resulted from that? There resulted speculation in the great American grain centres. The Canadian farmer might well contend, if he believed, as my hon. friend does, that this would be an advantage to him, that he does not care if there is speculation or not so long as he gets his price. I think that is a proper position for him to take. But I am pointing out that this is an exceptional, an unusual, an abnormal year, and that consequently this is not a year upon the record of which we should take a step involving so radical a departure from the policy which has been followed in the past by both Liberal and Conservative Governments.

There was another feature this year: It was expected that the Dardanelles would be opened and Russian wheat released. Hon. gentlemen know that that was expected for a very considerable time and this expectation had an important bearing on the price of wheat; it tended to facilitate the speculation in the large grain centres of the United States. Another feature I think is well worthy of the consideration of this House, with a view to seeing if there is any way in which it could be overcome, and it is a problem to which I have given a good deal of thought and intend to give a good deal more.

If it could be overcome, I think conditions would be much better for the farmer in the western provinces; that is, that the grain movement is hurried too much. I have no fault to find with that situation. I assume that if a man rushes his grain to market it is his own business; he is the judge. But as a matter of fact it is when our grain is hurried to the market in immense quantities that this disparity exists in a larger degree between the markets in our country and the markets of the United States. It is when we have a big load that the Canadian grain usually stands lower than the American grain. That statement may not be quite accurate, but I think it is sufficiently accurate for the purpose.

Great Britain purchases grain as she needs it. She does not purchase in advance, and consequently, if you have immense quantities of grain seeking a market, and grain being purchased in Liverpool or the other grain centres of Great Britain, or of Europe, as required, you have of course an excess supply and a limited demand, and consequently a fall in price. I desire

to put on record here the remarks which I made in my Budget speech of 1914 with regard to this subject. In that speech I summarized the arguments, both pro and con, as fairly as I could, and at the conclusion of my remarks I indicated the position of the Government upon the subject of free wheat so called. After putting forward the arguments which I have advanced here to-day, and, I think, all the arguments put forward on the other side by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt); after pointing out that we were engaged in the construction of transcontinental systems of railway, of the Hudson Bay railway, and in the development of our ports; that the Panama canal was about to be opened, and that we might expect that Vancouver would be an outlet for Canadian wheat going by the Panama canal to the markets of the world, I made these observations:

> Having regard to all these considerations, we have been unable, after having given the question most painstaking attention, to bring ourselves to the view that so great a change, involving by possibility such serious consequences, should be favourably considered until at least we are more certain as to the outcome of our vast railway development and the result to the western grain grower of the opening of the competitive routes which will be afforded by the Hudson Bay Railway and the Panama Canal. It is surely the part of wisdom to await the outcome of the developments rather than to take a step now which might involve the risk of grave and irreparable injury to our milling industry and by consequence to our live stock industry and to our transportation systems through the diversion of traffic to routes other than Canadian.

That was the attitude of the Government at that time upon the arguments and considerations put forward on this question in the discussion of this resolution.

There is a further consideration which I regard as of supreme consequence. We are in the midst of the greatest war, as has been said, of all history, and we are part of an Empire which, I believe, is sustaining the largest burden of that war. A national debt is being piled up by Great Britain to an amount which a few years ago would have staggered the imagination of the financiers and statesmen of the world. We are in the midst of this war. Are we half way through? How much further have we to go? What will be the debt of the United Kingdom when this war is concluded, as we hope and pray, in a lasting peace? What will be the fiscal burdens of the United Kingdom? How will these fiscal burdens be met? Will the same system that has prevailed, continue to prevail, or will the statesmen of the United Kingdom, and possibly the statesmen of the Empire, have to sit down altogether, either alone or with Allies, and consider what is the wisest fiscal policy to adopt to meet the altered situation. Will that have to be done? So far as I can see, it is expected that it will be done; it is inevitable, it must be done. I do not pretend to say—he would be a presumptious man who would guess—what the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom will be after this war, but I feel perfectly satisfied in my own mind that it will not be the fiscal policy that prevailed before the war.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That will be sad for England.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If it will be sad for England, I have no doubt the wisdom of British statesmen, if they agree with my right hon. friend, will find some other way. But I am expressing my own view, and I have great respect for the view of my right hon. friend, when I say that, having regard to the obligations that are being incurred by the United Kingdom, that will be incurred, and must be incurred before this war is concluded, I do not believe that the same fiscal policy can prevail in the United Kingdom as prevailed before the outbreak of this war. I do not believe further—although I do not desire to interfere in the domestic affairs of even the Mother Country—that the policy which has been adopted is the wisest policy for a nation which has as powerful enemies as Great Britain has had during the last few years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does that include Mr. Runciman?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend can include him if he desires; I do not know to what he refers. What is to be the fiscal policy of Great Britain and the Empire? I do not know, but I would hope that the question of a preference within the British Empire is not a dead question. I would hope that it is a live question, that it will be a live question. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is, I think, on common ground with me here, because it is only a few years ago since he desired a preference in the British market; so that unless he has changed his views since, and even if he has changed them, he is not likely to admit it in this House, we are practically at one in the desire that there should be a preference within the British Empire. The Empire will have to cuddle up after the war is over. What is the point I am making? Suppose that we bring into effect the provisions of

the Underwood tariff, is a preference possible without going back to the position which we now occupy? History is sometimes interesting and I want to place upon the record of this House, because it may be useful, if not in this debate, in some other, and it is sufficiently pertinent, a matter of historical interest which has a direct bearing upon the question of preference. I have in my hand the copy of:

"An Act for reducing the duty on wheat and wheat flour, the produce of the province of Canada, imported thence into the United Kingdom" (6 & 7 Vic., cap. XXIX, 12th July, 1843).

And I am going to read the recital in order that the House may see my point:

"Whereas on the Twelfth Day of October One thousand eight hundred and forty-two an Act was passed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the province of Canada, and reserved by the Governor General for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure imposing a duty of three shillings sterling money of Great Britain on each imperial quarter of wheat imported into Canada, except from the United Kingdom or any of Her Majesty's Possessions, and being the growth and produce thereof: And whereas it is recited in the said Act that it was passed in the confident belief and expectation that upon the imposition of a duty upon foreign wheat imported in the province Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to recommend to Parliament the removal or reduction of the duties on wheat and wheat flour imported into the said United Kingdom from Canada: And whereas, in consideration of the duty so imposed by the said Act of the Legislature of Canada it is expedient that, if Her Majesty shall be pleased to give Her Sanction to the said Act, the duties imposed by an Act made and passed in the last session of Parliament, intituled "An Act to amend the Laws for the Importation of Corn', upon wheat and wheat flour, the produce of and imported from the province of Canada, entered for Home Consumption in the United Kingdom, should be reduced as hereinafter is mentioned:"

In other words, Great Britain was about to give a preference to her colony, Canada and, what was the condition precedent? It was that Canada should adopt a duty as against corn—the generic term for grain—imported from any other country except the United Kingdom. Why? Canada could not get a preference in the British market for her wheat if wheat from a foreign country could find its way into Canada without paying duty and could be exported as Canadian wheat.

While I am on that point, let me refer for a moment to a matter that I overlooked. It is conceded that if we adopted the principle of this resolution, and acted upon it, our grain would be mixed with the inferior grain of the United States and would lose its identity. My hon. friend from Assiniboia said himself that our grain is worth six to eight cents a bushel more in Liverpool and how he can come to the conclusion that this change is in the interest of Canada, admitting that our grain is worth six to eight cents more in Liverpool, if it involves the mingling of our wheat with American wheat, the de-grading of our wheat and the loss of its identity, passes my comprehension. Then this measure goes on and enacts the necessary legislation to carry into effect the idea embodied in the preamble. I have here also the Canadian Act—

Mr. MURPHY: Why not the Lord's Prayer?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, the Lord's Prayer is always in order and sometimes I have thought it would do my hon. friend good if it were said in this Chamber, especially that part of it in which we pray to be delivered from evil.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And lead us not into temptation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have here the Canadian Act in which it is recited that:

And whereas the introduction of foreign wheat, into the United Kingdom free of duty, after the introduction of the same into Canada free of duty, would be in manifest violation of the said intention of the laws of the said United Kingdom; And whereas the chief objection to the free admission of wheat and wheat flour into the said United Kingdom from Canada, arises from the free admission of foreign wheat into Canada—

I will put these recitals upon Hansard.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the date of that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is before my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) was born, and when a wiser generation lived. The result was that they got a preference.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend remember that there was a movement for annexation in Canada at that time after the repeal of that preference by Great Britain, and that reciprocity which followed cured the evil.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let me ask my hon. friend another question—I want to teach him some of the history of those early times: What happened in 1865 when reciprocity came to an end? Canadian trade with the United States had been developed under the Reciprocity Treaty, and the United States abrogated that treaty in 1865—

Mr. LEMIEUX: 1866.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: 1865 or 1866; let us say 1866—we will not quarrel about a year. In 1866 the treaty was abrogated, and what happened? As a matter of fact we all know what happened. It took about ten or twelve years before the country got on its feet, and when it got on its feet the people said: We are going to have a Canadian policy, the result of which is Canada as it is to-day. If my hon. friend wants to exchange views on history, I am quite prepared to meet him on his own ground. There is another feature of this question, and then I am done.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Oh, I know our friends are tired, but they have often tired me, and as they believe in reciprocity they should not complain. There is another feature of this matter, not to be set up against the clear national interest, if it is clear, but important in the consideration of the question. I do not believe it is a wise fiscal policy to fit your tariff into the notches of another country's tariff, because any action on their part relating to a matter in which your tariff interlocks with theirs causes you to change your tariff. In other words, you react to their action, and if you have not the element of certainty then you had better have your tariff stand on its own basis. Even if you have the element of certainty, it does not follow that you should enter into a tariff agreement unless you are sure that your doing so is in the interest of the country.

What may be the result of this change if we founded our autonomy upon it? To be effectual the grain would go south, with the interruption of our present economic system and with no certainty of permanency. I think this is one of the most important factors in the consideration of this question.

I have dealt with wheat, and my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) is anxious about the potato question. I think there must be some Irish in him, but he wants to know about potatoes. The Underwood Tariff provides that potatoes shall be free.

> Provided, that any of the foregoing specified articles shall be subject to a duty of 10 per centum ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on such articles imported from the United States.

I do not believe there has ever been a better market for our potatoes than exists in the home market of Canada to-day.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: That is on account of the crop shortage.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Crop failures are not confined to any one portion of the hemisphere. Let me ask my hon. friend a question. If the Canadian prices were lower than the United States prices would the crop shortage prevent him from putting forward the figures? I know how strongly he would argue that, crop failures or no crop failure, we ought to take advantage of the Underwood tariff provision. So it works both ways. I desire to give some figures on the potato. It is a homely subject, but the potato is an honoured vegetable, and we might spend a worse five minutes than in considering the tariff with regard to it. The Canadian prices are taken from the Labour Gazette, an organ that I know will command the confidence of the former Postmaster General, and the American figures from the Monthly Crop Report of the Department of Agriculture, Washington::

Potatoes.

Retail prices per bushel 15th November each year.

City.	1914.	1915.
Sydney	$0 60	$1 00
Halifax	0 50	1 00
St. John	0 70	1 00
Quebec	0 50	0 65
Montreal	0 56	0 83
Ottawa	0 56	0 80
Toronto	0 47	1 00
Hamilton	0 55	1 00
Winnipeg	0 93	0 67
Regina	1 26	0 86
Calgary	0 80	0 50
Vancouver	0 60	0 33
Maine	0 33	0 33
New Hampshire	0 60	0 70
State.		
Vermont	0 47	0 81
Massachusets	0 71	0 94
New York	0 44	0 82
Pennsylvania	0 58	0 75
Michigan	0 30	0 56
Ohio	0 53	0 70
Indiana	0 56	0 56
Illinois	0 61	0 59
Wisconsin	0 30	0 45
Minnesota	0 32	0 39
North Dakota	0 42	0 41
Idaho	0 49	0 56
Montana	0 64	0 50
Washington	0 55	0 53
Average all States Union	48·9	61·6

The prices above given were those paid to farmers.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes), who wants our potatoes admitted free to the United States in exchange for free entry of their potatoes to

us, will observe that the price at Sydney, Halifax and St. John in 1915 was $1, whereas the highest price in the same year in the United States was 95 cents, and the average only 61·6 cents. First, then, because it is not clear that there will be any advantage, and secondly, because if there will be any advantage it will be but a very minor advantage, and thirdly, because there is no element of permanence in an arrangement such as is contemplated in the resolution of my hon. friend, and because it involves a departure from the established national policy of this country, a policy which has been followed by all Governments in the past, and because we are in the midst of a war and its abnormal conditions, and further because of the possibility of a fiscal arrangement not only of the tariff policy of Great Britain, but of the tariffs of the Empire—on these grounds my view is that this resolution should be negatived.

Mr. MARCIL: We in eastern Canada are most interested in the price of flour. Can the minister tell us how it is that the price of flour is continually on the increase notwithstanding the increased competition in the West, increased railway facilities, and all the advantages of the national policy which have been so eloquently dilated upon by my hon. friend.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Prime Minister tells me that there has been laid on the Table this afternoon the report of the High Cost of Living Commission, which deals with the subject my hon. friend refers to.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the whole western country, if not the whole agricultural population of the Dominion, will feel a very keen sense of disappointment when they learn of the remarks of the Finance Minister. The more so, because by reason of his remarks on the Budget yesterday, they had every hope that a new era had opened, in which a new line of policy would be pursued by the Government by reason of those very conditions upon which my hon. friend has laid such stress in the speech he has just made. The Minister of Finance in his speech yesterday said:

> The future of Canada rests with the development of its great resources, of which the greatest and most fundamental is agriculture, and this development is in turn bound up with the question of increase in population of the productive sort and the facilities afforded it for the application of its intelligence and industry. It is probable that in the straitened financial conditions which may prevail for some years forward the question of capital for the development of agriculture may be of paramount importance, and it is our intention to inquire carefully during the coming recess into this most important subject, with a view, if desirable in the public interest, to supplementing by federal aid existing facilities in this connection.

I gathered from those remarks that at last our Government, and especially the Finance Minister, had awakened to the fact that agriculture was the basis of our prosperity, and upon the development of that industry depended the ability of our country to carry those vast burdens which are laid upon us by reason of the war. I remembered when he was speaking in this strain that the Government of which he is a member had put an embargo upon the export of horses to the United States, and upon the export of wool and of hay; I remembered that that Government had seized thirteen and a half million bushels of the farmers' wheat at a low price; I remembered that on every occasion previous to the minister making his remarks his Government had considered the farming industry as the industry to be exploited in the interests of every other interest there might be in the country, that might claim for a moment the favourable consideration of the Government. And so I must say it was with pleasure I heard that the Government not only realized the importance of the farming industry, but that they proposed—at some time in the future, I noticed—to come to the assistance of that industry with a view to increasing the results of the labour of those engaged in it. To-day when a question is brought up in this House the answer to which involves an increase in the earnings of the agricultural population, and which, by reason of that increase of earnings, involves an expansion and development of the industry of agriculture resulting from the prosperity of those engaged in it, I find my hon. friend spending two solid hours in proving, to his own satisfaction and with the enthusiastic support of his friends behind him, that this resolution should not be agreed to; that the farmer of the West should not have the opportunity for better markets that would come to him under the terms of the resolution; that instead of the Government being the means by which the farmer is to get more money with which to carry on his enterprise, the Government is to be the means to prevent him from getting that money; and whereas my hon. friend's proposal for assistance was for some time in the future, his action in pre-

vention of profit is in the immediate present.

My hon. friend paid careful attention to the question of markets in the United States for Canada's wheat. He saw, year in and year out, the market records which proved, as absolutely as the multiplication table can prove, that the market price in the United States was better than the market price in Canada; that if the Canadian farmer had access to that market, he would get the benefit of that price; but he argued again and again to prove that what was, plainly and evidently so, could not possibly be so. He reminded me very much of the elderly and unsophisticated agriculturist who had an opportunity of attending a wild beast show which contained, amongst other wonders, a giraffe. This ancient farmer, after examining the different attractions, finally halted in front of this giraffe and examined him carefully with his eye, looked over his height and width and spots and other peculiarities, and finally turned away and gave his verdict in these words: "There ain't no such animal."

Now, either there is a market in the United States for our wheat or there is not. If there is a market at better prices than we can get at home, it would be good not only for the farmer, but for the whole population of the country to have that market, because I have my hon. friend's authority for saying " of the resources of Canada, the greatest and most fundamental is agriculture." Therefore, if the farmer of the prairie West can have the market price for his wheat improved by access to the market of the United States, then not only does he benefit, but every industry and interest throughout the Dominion of Canada benefits; and if we argue on the ground of patriotism, the ability of the Canadian people to carry the burden of taxation necessarily laid upon them by and through this war can and will be the more easily borne. If any government of any country, at any time, ever had a duty that lay upon them more heavily than any other, it is the duty as set out by my hon. friend in the paragraph which I have read from his address of yesterday. If there is an opportunity of improving the markets for the produce of the West, our greatest industry, it is the duty of the Government to see that that opportunity is taken advantage of.

My hon. friend says: We must not sell our wheat in the States this year at a good price, because perhaps we shall not be able to sell it there at as good a price next year; that is, because we can get a dollar a bushel for our wheat this year, we should not take it, because next year we may not be able to get more than ninety cents. I commend the Minister of Finance to a study of the logic of his own expressions and I think he will agree that if he is to be taken at his word, according to his own argument, which, of course, he is not to be, the Premier made a mistake when he selected his Minister of Finance.

Either we better our position by reason of the American market, or we do not; if we do not better our position, then our wheat will not go South, and that danger feared by my hon. friend to the traffic of our railroads, that danger that was so remarkably brought to his attention by men employed on the railroads, does not occur. If the market is not there, the wheat will not go there, and our Canadian railroads will still carry the traffic. If the market is there, and the wheat does go there and the Canadian railroads do not get the traffic, it will be because the Canadian farmer gets a better price for his wheat. There is no escape from the condition. The difference between my hon. friend and his Government, and his followers, and us on this side of the House is this, that he is prepared, as he and his colleagues and his supporters have always been prepared, to set the interests of the railroads, or the millers, or the manufacturers or any other industry under heaven against that of the farmers. Again, I call attention to his statement that agriculture is the basic industry of our country.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is it not a fact that the Government of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) was a member was willing to bonus the millers under the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not arguing on the reciprocity agreement at this time, but I may say that that agreement would have given the Canadian farmer exactly that which we are demanding for him to-day, and which this Government could give him if it would; but it will not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it would not have given the Canadian farmer free flour, which the hon. gentleman considers important.

Mr. OLIVER: That is not the argument at all. This resolution relates to free wheat. The reciprocity proposal would have given the Canadian farmer free access to the American market for his wheat, which

would have been of great benefit to him, as was admitted by the Minister of Finance in the statement which he himself read. And this Government is able to give that to the Canadian farmer to-day, but it will not.

The Minister of Finance was deeply interested in the mixed farming industry. I do not recall a time, since I first took an interest in the public life of this Dominion, when the western settler was not advised to go into mixed farming, and when, from time to time, other sage and similar advice was not tendered him. I represent a constituency where the people are, and always have been, engaged in mixed farming. Let me suggest to the Minister of Finance and to his colleagues that approximately twenty-five to thirty per cent of the so-called Prairie West is, and always has been, engaged in mixed farming, and that possibly the people there are not so much in need of either information or advice as to their business as some of our friends seem to think. When the hon. gentleman suggests that the mixed farmer is opposed to the grain farmer getting justice at the hands of this or some other Government, then, speaking for the mixed farmer, as I am entitled to do, I say the hon. gentleman misunderstands the position. The mixed farmer of the West raises the requirements for his stock on his own farm, in large measure. It is because the country is more suited to the production of that class of product that the farmer there is a mixed farmer.

The hon. minister was anxious that the mixed farmer should have the benefit of the bran and shorts that would come from the grinding of wheat, and he warned everybody that if free wheat to the United States were granted there would be no expansion of the milling industry in the West. Perhaps he is under the impression that there is not any milling industry in the West to-day. Perhaps he does not know that the big end of the milling industry in Canada is in the West, that the West grinds more wheat than it consumes. So, there is no injury to be done to the West by reason of the non-expansion of the milling industry. The milling industry of the West, if it is to expand, must expand by reason of its export market and not by reason of its local market.

The minister warned everybody—and I think this was one of the great national evils of which he spoke—that if this resolution carried it would be possible for the millers of the United States to get possession of the hard wheat of the Northwest and they would be able to mix it with their own softer American wheat and put the flour upon the European market in competition with the products of our mills. He considered that to be an evil to be guarded against by voting down this resolution. But in the beginning of his remarks he told us that under the law of the United States to-day the American miller can import our wheat and, having ground it into flour and exported it, can get a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty. So, he was not fair to the House and the country when in his later remarks he suggested that if we passed this resolution the Canadian miller would cease to be protected against the competition of the American miller using Canadian grain in foreign markets. He was at that moment using an argument which was absolutely contradicted by the statement he made in the beginning of his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. member is entirely mistaken. The statement of the Finance Minister was that on wheat shipped and ground in bond the United States miller could get a rebate of 99 per cent of the duty, but he cannot mix that wheat with American wheat in grinding. It must go through with its identity preserved.

Mr. OLIVER: Then, the case is just that much worse for the Minister of Finance. The American millers are able to go on the foreign market, not with a mixed product, but with flour made entirely of our Northwest wheat, and so can compete with our millers on equal terms.

Mr. ROGERS: That is right; so they can.

Mr. OLIVER: So, I maintain that my interpretation of the statement of the Minister of Finance is absolutely correct, and again I say that the argument he made in the latter part of his remarks is absolutely contradicted by the statement he made in the beginning of his remarks. The fact is, that the Minister of Finance or any other man who argues, or tries to argue that it is in the interests of the Dominion of Canada that our farmers should be excluded from an adjacent advantageous market, is arguing against the facts and necessarily must be guilty of contradictions and lapses such as this.

The Minister of Finance is sure that if the United States duty were

taken away, either by action of this Government, or by action of the United States Government without action on our part, the result would be an equalization of the prices between Minneapolis and Fort William. It is our hope that that would be the case; what we wish is that the prices shall be equalized. We want to get the benefit of whatever milling advantages there are in Minneapolis. We are entitled to that if we can get it, and if the policy laid down by the minister in his speech of yesterday is correct. Why is he so insistent that the removal of the duty would not be of benefit to the Canadian wheat grower, when he knows that exactly the same argument was made in regard to the producer of Canadian cattle and Canadian hogs? I have no doubt that my hon. friend, when he was championing the cause of high tariff against reciprocity in 1911, used exactly these arguments. Since then the United States have taken off the duty on hogs and cattle, and prices have been measurably equalized. The result has been that the Canadian price has come up, and the Canadian producer is getting the benefit to-day of access to the American market for his cattle and his hogs, notwithstanding the fact that the United States exports both cattle and hogs to the European market in very large numbers. I fancy they export to the European market more cattle and hogs than Canada exports to the United States. But that does not concern us. If by reason of our conditions as to transportation or quality of products or as to proximity to market, we get a better price by sending our goods to the United States, what matters it where the United States send their goods? That is no concern of ours.

There is another product of the West that in our part of the country is more important than wheat, that is oats. Some years ago the American duty on oats was cut down to six cents a bushel. The duty before that time had been prohibitive. But when the duty was cut down to six cents a bushel, our measurable access to the markets of the United States saved the situation to the farmers of Alberta in respect to the crop of three years ago. We sold many millions of bushels of oats to the United States in that year, and this saved us from having practically to give our oats away.

In view of these facts, in view of the contradictions into which my hon. friend's arguments necessarily lead him, there is nothing to be said against the desirability of the Canadian farmer securing access to the United States market for his wheat free of duty. But we have the other side of the question.

My hon. friend has been frank with the House and with the country. While he has talked on behalf of the Canadian farmer and of Imperial interests and desires to convey the impression that it would be dangerous to the future of the Empire, in its consolidation after the war, to allow the farmer to get five cents more for his wheat at the present time, as a matter of fact he has informed the House and the country that the reason the Government will not agree to give the western farmer free wheat is because it is bound to maintain on behalf of the Canadian milling industry that protection which it enjoys at the present time. That is the reason he gives, that is the only reason he gives that can be understood—and it, of course, can be easily understood. The milling industry of Canada is an important and desirable industry. Many parts of the country are well adapted to that industry and we are glad to see it flourishing; but why should the milling industry flourish at the expense of the agricultural industry? If it has to be a choice between the two, if there is not room in the same country for both to flourish on equal terms, then certainly the agricultural industry, on the authority of my hon. friend, should be the premier concern of the Government of the day. Certainly if either one has to take second place, that which is minor should take second place, not that which is major. And yet my hon. friend has urged here that it is the minor industry that must be protected to the loss and cost of many millions to the major industry. How, I ask, is this country to achieve prosperity through the development of its agricultural resources by any such policy as that?

This country is well adapted to the milling industry up to a certain point. For the supply of our own demands, there is no country in the world better situated than this Dominion of Canada for the establishment and maintenance of a successful and profitable flour milling industry. There is no other country that has the wheat and the water powers in such abundance and railway facilities equal to ours. Then there is no reason why the Canadian milling industry should require an extraordinary measure of protection at

the hands of this Government. It is entitled, no doubt, to whatever measure of protection would naturally fall to it under a revenue tariff: I would not suggest at all that it should not have the benefit of that measure of protection. But that the great farming industry should be penalized to the extent of twelve and a half million dollars on its crop this year because of the milling industry, I say is not good business for any country by any Government. The milling industry is a good industry, but it is not worth the money.

Mr. WRIGHT: How does the hon. gentleman figure out the twelve and a half million dollars?

Mr. OLIVER: I heard the Minister of Finance say that we had 250,000,000 bushels of wheat for export. I also heard him read figures which would lead me to believe that the United States prices were at least five cents a bushel better on the average than our prices here. I figure that would work out about twelve and a half million dollars.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the hon. member for Assiniboia said the Canadian farmer would not get that.

Mr. OLIVER: Then I have to disagree with the hon. member for Assiniboia, because I think that, conditions being as they are, the Canadian farmer would get the benefit. I do not pretend that conditions are always as favourable as they are to-day. There is no doubt that the advantage of the United States market depends on the conditions as they exist from time to time. But it will be noticed in the figures that the minister read during the afternoon, that whenever the Winnipeg price was higher than the Minneapolis price, in any year or at any time of any year, it was a time when the Canadian farmer did not have any important quantity of wheat to sell; that whenever the Canadian farmer had a large surplus of wheat to dispose of, in any year, or at any time of year, then the Minneapolis price in every case was much better than the Canadian price.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That was not so about the 25th of September last year. For about three weeks wheat was higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis last fall. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there was no time or season when wheat was higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. OLIVER: I said there were times and seasons when wheat was higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, but that these were times and seasons when the Canadian farmer did not have the wheat to sell.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: He had this year.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh no, he had not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: At the end of September?

Mr. OLIVER: Oh no, his shipments were held back in September, he was not getting his wheat forward. That is why the price was different, and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Why could he not get it forward?

Mr. OLIVER: It was not threshed.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think the hon. gentleman is wrong on that point. I say that in September the price of wheat was higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, and the conditions were all right then.

Mr. OLIVER: I will stand by the position I have taken, and I think it will be agreed that the only times when wheat is higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis are the times and seasons when there is a minimum of Canadian wheat coming forward, and a maximum of American wheat going forward. There is no doubt about that. Does my hon. friend suggest that the fact that there was a period in September when the price of wheat was higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis is a reason why this resolution should not be agreed to?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I do not; I was simply correcting what I believed to be a misstatement, unintentional no doubt. If my hon. friend takes the three last months of last year, October, November and December, he will find that the price was higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, and certainly wheat was coming forward then.

Mr. OLIVER: Undoubtedly, but the fact that my hon. friend does not consider that as a reason why the resolution should not be supported is evidence, I take it, that he agrees with me as to the general condition, that the Canadian farmer would benefit by the adoption of this resolution.

I turn from the question of wheat to the question of flour. We have had a commission acting for some years in Canada. I do not know what it has cost, and I do not

know what it has done. But there has been a commission on the high cost of living. I have noticed that from month to month and from year to year—there have been exceptions to the rule, but I maintain that it is the rule nevertheless—the cost of living in Canada has been climbing, and nobody will say that the price of flour is not an important item in the cost of living. If we have enormous additional burdens of taxation to carry because of the war, and we have, it is surely one of the greatest of the national interests which should concern this Government to see that other burdens upon the shoulders of our people are lightened as much as posible. If we are going to tax the people to pay the interest on war indebtedness, as we must pay it, surely it is our business to so adjust our trade and our affairs as to permit the people to pay that tax by relieving them of as many other burdens as possible. To maintain the milling industry in its present position, not only the producer must be sacrificed, but the consumer must continue to pay. There you find the great objection that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance had to agreeing to this resolution; it would relieve the consumer in some measure of the burden that he carries at the present time, and would thereby enable him the better to carry the burden of governmental taxation that must necessarily be laid upon his shoulders. The producer on the one hand, the consumer on the other, and the miller between; he takes from the farmer, and from the consumer, and the Government stands behind him and says: Yes, we are going to stand behind him. And the minister suggested that he is doing this in the national interest. I do not wish to speak otherwise than with the highest respect for the Minister of Finance, but after the deliverance which he made yesterday in regard to the greatest interest that can concern us at this time, I say that his special pleading on behalf of the milling industry of Canada to-day was not worthy of the sentiments that he placed on Hansard yesterday.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance wanted to know who it was that fixed the market price of wheat in the West, and he used the name of the Grain Growers' Grain Company. He received vociferous applause from his supporters when he used that name, and he seemed to think that it supplied a convincing answer to every argument and statement of fact made by the hon. member for Assiniboia. If my hon. friend would look at the last annual statement of the Ogilvie Milling Company, he would find that a large part of the $1,600,000 of profits, which the company claims to have made last year, was made not out of milling at all, but out of the buying of grain. It is a fact that the great milling industries of Canada in large measure control the market price of grain in the West. Why should they not? They have the chance of working up their purchases in their mills as much as they desire, and of exporting the balance. As a matter of fact there is no doubt to-day that the great milling combines of Canada are combines to control the purchase of wheat in the West, just as much as they are combines to control the sale of flour in the East.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say that the milling companies in Canada buy as much western wheat as does the Grain Growers' Grain Company?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not say that, but I do say that the milling industry of Canada is not, in effect, a competitor of the Grain Growers' Grain Company in the buying of wheat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there a combination between them?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say that. I am satisfied that there is a combination amongst the millers and I am a little afraid that there is an understanding between the millers and the buyers.

An hon. MEMBER: Will you except the Grain Growers' Grain Company?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know why that name should appeal to my hon. friends. The Grain Growers' Grain Company is in the grain buying business, the same as the Ogilvie Milling Company is in the milling business.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is composed of grain-growers only.

Mr. OLIVER: It makes no difference what it is composed of, it is a business enterprise and it is carried on for the profit of the members of that enterprise. If a market condition exists, created by the legislation of this Government and assisted by the millers combine, which is also the creation of this Government, are the Grain Growers' Grain Company expected, because they are farmers buying grain, not to take some measure of advantage of the situation thus created? My hon. friend (Mr. Wright)

is a farmer himself and he does not claim to be an angel.

Mr. WRIGHT: This company was formed for the express purpose of coming to the rescue of the farmers of the Northwest.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not sure that they have not achieved some measure of success in the fulfilment of the purpose for which they were formed. The antagonism with which my hon. friends opposite receive the mention of the name from this side of the House would lead me to believe that they had. But never mind about that—I say that the Grain Growers' Grain Company is a business enterprise. They are taking, and they are entitled to take, whatever profits they can by reason of the conditions which this Government, and the combines existing under it, have set up throughout the western country. I believe that they have ameliorated these conditions, but it would be too much to expect that they had absolutely ignored them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman's argument, that the Grain Growers' Grain Company are really in a position to pay a much larger price for western wheat than they do, but knowing that they are in the position to make a big profit, they refuse to pay the legitimate value of the wheat?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know why my hon. friend should suggest these words to me. I have already given him the view which I hold in regard to the Grain Growers' Grain Company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the way I express it right or not?

Mr. OLIVER: I think my hon. friend will have to take the expression as I give it and not the expression he gives it. If he will be good enough to do that I will be satisfied and I hope he will. I do not wish to delay the House longer in this matter. The appeal made by the minister as an excuse for not dealing with this question, that at some time in the future, when this war is over, there will have to be a readjustment of inter-Imperial trade relationships, may have some bearing upon the matter in his mind that we on this side of the House do not understand. But I would respectfully suggest that any proposals, any claim for special consideration of inter-Imperial trade obligations and preferences, comes with rather bad grace from the Minister of Finance in a Government which only last session increased the duties against British products coming into Canada to the amount of 5½ per cent. It will be enough for this Government, and this Parliament, to consider the condition in which we find ourselves to-day and the condition that we will be called upon to face during the immediately following years. What will happen after this war is over may take care of itself. What we have to do is to see that the war is won, and that our country is in a proper position after the war is won. We have, as the minister said yesterday, to meet enormous obligations already accrued. We have to meet still more enormous obligations already in sight and we know not what further obligations we will have to meet before we will have occasion to consider what will take place after the war is over. Is this a time when tribute should be laid on the farmer, on the great producing industry of the West, on the one hand, and on the labouring man of the eastern cities, on the other, in the interest of a single industry in Canada? There may have been times and occasions in the history of our country when we could afford to sacrifice the larger for the smaller interest, but on the word of the minister himself, this is not such a time, this is not such an occasion. This is an occasion when the producer on the one hand, and the consumer on the other, should receive the benefit of every advantage that this Government, by its legislation, can confer upon them. No greater advantage lies in the hands of this Government to confer than to give, by acceding to this resolution, to the farmer of the West a better price for his wheat, and to the consumer of the East, a lower price for his flour.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, coming from western Canada, as I do, I naturally have a very deep and lasting interest in everything that can possibly appertain to the welfare of the people of that portion of our Dominion. I was a little surprised at the statement of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) regarding the export of wheat in bond to the United States. If my hon. friend has no clearer idea of the true conditions than that which he expressed in this particular case, then I am bound to say that he has a very limited knowledge of the grain situation. The case as stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) is absolutely correct. Wheat shipped in bond through the United States can be ground by any miller in the United States, the flour, the product of that wheat, can be exported to Great Britain, and the United States miller can get his drawback

of 99 per cent; or, in other words, the duty payable on the wheat which was used by the miller in the United States is simply one dollar per thousand bushels. That is the United States law as it exists to-day, but the proposed resolution before this House is a very different thing. It provides for the opening of the American market and the mixing of Canadian and American wheat, and thereby exporting it, after it is turned into flour, in competition with the Canadian farmers' wheat in the market of Great Britain. That is a sample of the arguments which have fallen from the lips of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House since the beginning of this debate. They are evidently not posted in any way whatever upon the conditions as they actually exist.

I am free to admit that the resolution before us concerns a question which in past years, especially in Western Canada, has excited a very considerable amount of interest, and I agree that any formal proposal from our neighbours to the south in regard to that question is entitled to our most respectful and careful consideration. But we must always remember that the Underwood tariff, on which the proposal now before us is based, was framed by those whose first and only duty was the preparation of a tariff which, in their judgment, would carry with it advantages in some form or other to the people of the United States, whom they were undertaking to serve. I am sure that no hon. member in this House would say that the provision in the Underwood tariff giving us free access to the American market, on certain conditions, was made for the purpose of giving the Canadian producer of Western Canada any special advantage. It, therefore, becomes our special duty to give this question most earnest and careful consideration, in order to ascertain whether there is justification for the statement that the acceptance of this proposal would carry with it advantage to the farming community and to the people of Canada generally. But let me first express my regret at the very extravagant and unreasonable statements that have been made on this subject during the course of this debate. In my humble judgment this subject should be discussed in reason and in fairness from all points of view. It is quite true that there have been occasions in the past when the farmers of the western provinces did not receive full value for their products. To my mind, one of the principal reasons for that is that in the early days we had the idea that we should set a very high standard for our wheat, and we carried that idea out. It is true that the farmers have lost a considerable amount of money in the past on that account; and in my humble judgment, it is equally true that they have lost a considerable amount of money by reason of the fact that we have not had a sample market. These, to my mind, are the two principal causes of monetary loss to the farmers of Western Canada in past years. In order to make myself perfectly clear on these two important points, and in order that the House may better understand the true situation, perhaps I cannot do better than read the opinions of a very important commission which was appointed by the Government of the province of Saskatchewan, and which reported in 1914. The purpose for which they were appointed is set out in the Order in Council as follows: "To examine into ways and means for bettering the position of Saskatchewan grain on the European markets." The commissioners made a very exhaustive examination of the subject; they spent months and months in Europe, visiting almost every wheat centre there, and in 1914, presented their report. This is what the commissioners say in regard to trading on sample at Winnipeg or Fort William:

> It is intended to create a sample market at Winnipeg and at Fort William. Considered theoretically and viewed from certain angles trading on sample is the ideal method. What the Saskatchewan farmer should ask, however, is: What will be the effect of sample trading on the price realized by the farmers for the crop of Saskatchewan? To consider the possible effect on a small proportion of the crop while ignoring the probable effect upon the general level of values would be shortsighted. Consider these facts:
>
> 1. The surplus of wheat over and above Canadian millers' requirements which must export determines the prices at which our crop will be sold.

Here the commission is in conflict with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver). The report continues:

> The competition of exporters forces the millers to pay at least export price for wheat, while, on the other hand, there is always enough wheat, and usually enough of each grade to render it unnecessary for the millers to pay more than a slight premium over export price for what they need. Therefore, the all important consideration is to maintain the integrity or standard of our export grades.
>
> 2. Any condition that creates or maintains confidence in our wheat abroad helps to raise or to sustain prices that are bid for our wheat from abroad.
>
> 3. Higher or sustained bids from abroad (relatively, of course, to the bids being made for the wheat of other countries) mean not only

a higher price for the surplus that is exported, but for all that is milled at home for which the millers must outbid the exporters.

4. In exactly the same way any condition that weakens or destroys confidence in our wheat abroad will lower the prices at which our entire crop will be sold, because lowering the prices that exporters can afford to pay for it.

5. At the present time Canadian wheat enjoys the confidence of the British and the continental trade, partly on its merits, but partly because it can be depended upon to be delivered as represented.

5. We should do nothing that will imperil that confidence unless we are sure that the financial gain to the producers that will result will outweigh the financial loss that would follow all impairment of foreign confidence in the integrity of our certificate.

I entirely agree with the views of this commission, because they represent, to my mind, the responsible facts of the case, and the commissioners give good reasons why, in their opinion, we should go slow in the establishment of that sample market. It is due to that, in my opinion, that the farmers of Western Canada have suffered great loss. When I was in Winnipeg some time last autumn, I happened to meet in the Grain Exchange a farmer who had just shipped in a car of flax. He had got his certificate from the grain inspector and his flax graded No. 2 whereas he thought it should have graded No. 1. He had eleven hundred odd bushels of flax in his car and he complained very bitterly about the grade which he had been given. Under the law he had a right to appeal to the survey board of the Grain Exchange as against the certificate handed to him by the inspector. He did this; the appeal was heard by the survey board, and they were just about to decide that the inspector was wrong, and that the farmer should have a higher grade for his car of flax when the inspector suggested that it might be well for them to weigh the flax in order to see if it came within the weight prescribed by this Parliament which would entitle him to a certificate of No. 1 for his car. When the flax was weighed it was found to be just half a pound too light to come under the standard as provided by law, and therefore that farmer lost that particular grade on his car of eleven hundred bushels of flax, which meant to him a loss of thirty cents a bushel or something over $300; whereas if he had had a sample market, he would have been able to sell that particular car at probably one or two cents a bushel less than the price of the particular grade which he had hoped to receive.

The same thing applies so far as high

grade standards are concerned. We in Western Canada for twenty-five long years have held the idea of sticking firmly to a high grade standard, believing, as the people and the farmers especially believe, that the day would soon come when they would reap their reward and when they would be able to establish in the markets of the world the great advantage that our wheat possesses as compared with the wheat of any other country that competes with us. A great effort has been made and a large amount of money has been lost in maintaining that particular position on behalf of the farmers. I would like to quote again from this report of the commissioners what they have to say on the matter of the high standards, and I am doing this simply in order to bring to the notice of the House the actual facts as they are understood by the farming community of Western Canada:

The Canadian certificate is highly thought of in the world's markets. It enjoys a better reputation than any other certificate. United States grain is exported under a variety of certificates emanating from different and unrelated sources, such as state authorities, boards of trade, chambers of commerce and port authorities. The reputation enjoyed by these certificates in importing countries is not such as to commend to Canadians any change in the source of the Canadian certificate. Seaboard inspections in particular are not popular among importing merchants.

Because it is imported on a dependable certificate, Canadian grain is dealt in on a smaller margin of profit than the grain of any other exporting country. Three-eights of a cent per bushel is the profit the importing merchants of Liverpool and London calculate on their Canadian business as compared for instance with as much as two and a quarter cents per bushel on Russian business owing to various elements of uncertainty connected with that trade. The importing trade makes little or no distinction in its bids as between grain shipped through United States ports in bond and grain shipped through all Canadian channels. Importers are satisfied that the integrity of the grades is preserved as well one way as the other. Liverpool prefers Canadian grain ex New York to that ex Montreal, if anything. Some markets claim that spring and summer arrivals are not of as high a standard as those of the fall and winter, but make no distinction as between routes. On the other hand, the trade does not like to purchase Canadian wheat with only a United States seaboard inspection certifying the wheat to be of some specified grade but of "Canadian origin."

Now, this is the position to which I wish to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, because it is a very important one and one that interests the people of Western Canada in particular. I intend to discuss this matter later on, but I wish to say a word before six o'clock to some of my

hon. friends who have been dealing with the question of the prices of wheat at Winnipeg, Minneapolis, and elsewhere. I am indeed more than surprised at the extravagant statements that have been made first of all by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and then by others who have followed him. He told us, the other night for example, that which was quoted by the Minister of Finance to-day, that wheat in Winnipeg was seven or eight cents cheaper than in Minneapolis and that when it reached Liverpool it was seven or eight cents higher. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he believes that the Grain Growers' Grain Association, which embraces thousands and thousands of the best farmers of the West, and which was formed for the express purpose of guarding the interests of the farmers of the West, is guilty of wrong-doing against the farming community. My hon. friend in his speech the other night when dealing with this particular point used the following language:

> But what do we find when the wheat got to Liverpool? Instead of the Manitoba farmer getting seven or eight cents less a bushel than the American farmer, he received from the Liverpool merchant from six to eight cents a bushel more than the American farmer, and that cannot be denied by any one who knows anything about the grain trade. Why should there be this difference? Why should every man who grows wheat in Canada be crucified to the extent of ten cents a bushel on his wheat?

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend will allow me, I pointed out to the Minister of Finance this afternoon—perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House then—that I did not use that language at all. It is a mis-quotation on the part of Hansard and I have corrected it, and my hon. friend will see in the Revised Hansard what I said.

Mr. ROGERS: Will my hon. friend deny that he used the word "crucified" with respect to the farmers of the West?

Mr. TURRIFF: No, that is the absolute truth.

Mr. ROGERS: Will he say that the Grain Growers' Grain Company are crucifying their fellow-farmers in Western Canada?

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not use the name of the Grain Growers' Grain Company in that connection. I said that my constituents, for ten or eleven months out of the year, could take their wheat across the line, if it were free of duty, and get from ten to sixteen cents a bushel more for it than they can get at home. That is the truth, and I stand by it, and state that under the present system the farmers are being crucified.

Mr. ROGERS: That has no bearing on the quotation I have been reading, which the hon. member says he stands behind—that the farmers are being crucified to the extent he stated. Will he say that Grain Growers' Grain Company are crucifying the farmers of Western Canada, for they are to-day the largest dealers and exporters of grain in the Dominion of Canada? They have shipped, I believe, something like 100,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does the hon. gentleman want an answer? The Grain Growers' Grain Company are more persistent than any other people in their demand for enabling our wheat to go into the American market free of duty. Both the Grain Growers' Association and the Grain Growers' Grain Company are demanding that. And if the Government will put wheat on the free list and let the Canadian farmer have free access to the American market they will satisfy the Grain Growers' Associations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the Grain Growers' Grain Company as well.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is trying to get away from the question. He made a distinct statement that the farmers of the West were being crucified in the sale of their wheat. Now the Grain Growers' Grain Company trade and deal in the wheat of the western farmer, almost in its entirety.

Mr. OLIVER: How did the Ogilvies make that $1,000,000?

Mr. ROGERS: The Grain Growers' Grain Company are handling over half of it in Western Canada to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the hon. minister deny the statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) as to the difference in the price as judged by the Liverpool market?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not deny that the price is higher in Liverpool. I say the price has been higher and is higher to-day. The prices that come into play and that we have to consider are the prices of cash wheat to-day. What does that represent when we compare the prices of cash wheat? These are the facts. Cash wheat to-day at Fort William and every other point in Canada is at a premium over the May option. Now, the option is regulated largely by the position of the wheat, the closer to the seaboard

the higher the premium, because the people of Europe want our wheat. It is true, the premium at Fort William may be only five cents a bushel over the May option to-day, But if you have that wheat at Buffalo or some other point east of the Great Lakes, the premium on Canadian wheat over the May option is over fifteen cents a bushel. But on the American side what are the conditions? On that side, at any port on the seaboard, you can buy cash wheat at a discount of over five and a half cents a bushel. Come with me to New York, and you can stand on the docks and see Canadian wheat going to Liverpool at a price representing from twenty to twenty-five cents a bushel more than wheat from the United States.

Mr. OLIVER: Did the Canadian farmer get twenty-five cents a bushel more for it?

Mr. ROGERS: The Canadian farmer is getting a good deal more for his wheat this year than the American farmer is getting for his, notwithstanding the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The extravagant statements they put forth do not agree with the facts. Every person knows that in trading in wheat there is no wide margin for the trader, for there are too many in the business and the profit is limited by competition. The fact is that Canadian wheat commands a price at the American seaboard of from twenty to twenty-five cents a bushel more than the American wheat. That is one of the reasons why I say this House would fail in its duty to the farming community of Western Canada if it did not reject the resolution of my hon. friend.

I have a good deal more to say, and it is now six o'clock. I hope to finish my remarks on this subject at a future sitting.

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

Thursday, February 17, 1916.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF CLERK ASSISTANT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid upon the table of the House on 15th instant, respecting the appointment of Mr. Arthur Beauchesne, B.A., K.C., to the position of Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, be concurred in.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. Beauchesne has been an officer of the Department of Justice, and it is proposed that he be transferred in this way, and at the same salary.

Mr. MARCIL: I have no objection to the appointment of Mr. Beauchesne; I think he is well qualified for the position; but I am sorry that the system of promotion has not been followed, and that some official of the House was not promoted to this position. The system of promotion should be followed as much as possible. With regard to his predecessor, the late Mr. Laplante, I know that the House realizes fully the value of his services. Perhaps I am in a position to appreciate them more than any other member of the House, by reason of the fact that I was Deputy Speaker, and afterwards Speaker, for a considerable time. I would suggest to the Prime Minister whether, in view of the unfortunate circumstances of his death, it would not be possible to do something for Mr. Laplante's widow. I understand that she is only to receive two months' salary as a gratuity. I hope the Prime Minister will see his way to deal with the matter, and try to secure some suitable provision for the widow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The appointment of Mr. Beauchesne does not involve promotion, strictly speaking, from amongst the staff of the House of Commons; but it is promotion, although at the same salary, in the Civil Service itself. I entirely agree with what my hon. friend has said with regard to the great value of the late Mr. Laplante's services. I always found him a most capable and most faithful officer, and, as I took occasion to say on a previous occasion, I fully realize that his death is a great loss to this House.

With regard to what my hon. friend has suggested, respecting some assistance to his family, I have not had that matter under consideration. There is a sub-Committee of Council, convened I think by the Minister of Justice, to whom such matters are referred, and I shall be very glad indeed to place the suggestion of my hon. friend before that committee with the view of giving it the most favourable consideration possible, having regard to the public interest, and to the precedents generally followed in such matters.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Correspondence which led to the convening of the Conference of Local Govern-

ments which took place in Ottawa in the month of October, 1915.—Sir Robert Borden.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, Part 3.—Sir George Foster.

THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE.

MESSAGES OF SYMPATHY.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to inform the House that the Hon. John G. Foster, Consul-General of the United States, called upon me this morning and gave me a message which had been communicated to him by the Secretary of State of the United States. The message is one expressing the very deep regret of the Government of the United States at the destruction of the Parliament Buildings, and their warm sympathy with the Government, Parliament and the people of Canada in the great loss thereby occasioned.

I must apologize to the House for not having at an earlier date conveyed to them an expression of sympathy from the Government of Japan which was conveyed to me by the Hon. Mr. Yada, Consul-General of Japan, on the day following the fire in the Parliament Buildings. That message also expressed the sympathy of the Government of Japan at the very great loss which had been ocasioned to this country.

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES INVESTMENT BILL.

Bill No. 35, respecting the investments of Life Insurance Companies.—Sir Thomas White—introduced and read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk].

PRICE OF GASOLINE.

Mr. WILCOX:

1. In what year was gasoline made free of duty?
2. Is the price of gasoline higher in the principal centres of Canada than in the corresponding parts of the United States adjacent to Canada?
3. Is there any gasoline produced in Canada? If so, how much, and by whom is the product controlled?
4. How much gasoline is imported into Canada, and from what countries?
5. Has there been any recent change in the refining of gasoline or in the test points, which would make the cost of production higher in Canada than in the United States?
6. Are the oil fields in the United States, and such oil fields as are being operated in Canada, showing such signs of exhaustion as would justify the enormous increase in the price of gasoline, which has taken place in Canada in the last three months?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. 1906; under the Customs Tariff assented to April 12, 1907.
2. Customs records do not show anything relating to this matter.
3. Yes; 15,265,380 gallons, amount shipped from the Canadian refineries; no information in the department except names of licensees.
4. From United States 26,504,649 gallons, valued at $2,828,383.
5. Customs records do not show anything relating to this matter.
6. Answered by No. 5.

HALIFAX TERMINALS.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

What is the total amount expended to date on the terminals at Halifax, and what amount is estimated to finish these works?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The expenditure on Halifax ocean terminals to December 31, 1915, was $4,745,-632.56. As detailed plans for the completion of these works have not been completed, and are subject to modification, it is impossible at this time to give the final estimate.

MR. S. M. GENEST.

Mr. BEST:

1. Is Mr. S. M. Genest employed by the Government at the present time?
2. If so, what are his duties, and how much salary does he receive?
3. Does he devote all his time to the work of the department?
4. Is there any other person paid by the Government to do part of the work pertaining to Mr. Genest's office?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. Clerk in charge of draughting room of the Mining Lands and Yukon Branch of the Department of the Interior; $2,800.
3. He is supposed to devote all his time during office hours to his departmental duties.
4. Mr. Genest has in his office one assistant, who is paid by the Government.

MR. T. R. FERGUSON.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM:

1. Is T. R. Ferguson still in the employ of the Government in the Department of the Interior or elsewhere?
2. If so, in what capacity? If not, when did his services cease?
3. How much has been paid to Mr. Ferguson to date as salary?
4. How much has been paid to date in connection with the expenses of his commission?
5. Is anything due Mr. Ferguson and not paid, either for salary or expenses?

Mr. ROCHE: As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned:

1. No.
2. 23rd December, 1914.
3. $27,800.
4. $36,951.52.
5. No.

SEED GRAIN PURCHASES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Did the Government purchase any seed grain from T. W. Dyer, of Bow Island, Alberta, in 1914 or 1915?
2. If so, when was the purchase made, how much was purchased, and what was the price paid?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes, barley.

2. April 2, 1915—to be delivered to twenty-six farmers at Bow Island, Alberta, 857½ bushels of barley, clean, good quality, and acceptable to settlers at ninety cents per bushel. May 6, 1915, to be delivered at Bow Island, Alberta, fifty bushels good, clean barley at $1 per bushel. April 10, 1915, to be delivered to thirty-seven farmers at Grassy Lake, Alberta, and Burdett, Alberta, 1,375 bushels of good, clean barley, acceptable to settlers at $1 per bushel.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Did T. W. Dyer, of Bow Island, Alberta, handle any of the seed grain distributed amongst the farmers in Medicine Hat constituency during the years 1914 and 1915?
2. If so, under what arrangement was he engaged, and how much was he paid for his services?

Mr. ROCHE:

1 and 2. There was purchased from T. W. Dyer, of Bow Island, Alberta, 857½ bushels of barley at ninety cents per bushel, and 1,425 bushels at $1 per bushel. The orders for barley specified that it must be of good quality, clean and acceptable to settlers, and to be delivered at Bow Island, Grassy Lake and Burdett to the sixty-four applicants holding orders for the same. Mr. Dyer received no pay for his services outside of purchase price mentioned.

QUEBEC LIVE STOCK.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many swine have been loaned to the agricultural associations of the province of Quebec for breeding purposes during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
2. How many sheep have been loaned to the agricultural associations of the province of Quebec for breeding purposes during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 1913, 30; 1914, 69, and 1915, 39 boars.
2. 1913, 40; 1914, 237, and 1915, 170 rams.

[Mr. W. Chisholm.]

The policy of loaning boars and rams to associations was not established in 1912. The associations to which these loans are made are associations of farmers organized under the direction of the Live Stock Branch of the Department of Agriculture. Pure-bred sires are not distributed to agricultural societies organized under the provincial Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many bulls and cows have been loaned to the agricultural associations of the province of Quebec for breeding purposes during the fiscal years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No cows were loaned to associations in the province of Quebec. Bulls were loaned to these associations as follows: 1912, nil; 1913, nil; 1914, 114; 1915, 167. The associations to which these loans are made are associations of farmers organized under the direction of the Live Stock Branch of the Department of Agriculture. Pure-bred sires are not distributed to agricultural societies organized under the provincal Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many stallions were loaned to the agricultural associations of the province of Quebec during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
2. What are the pedigrees of such stallions?
3. What precautions were taken in the purchase and inspection of such stallions?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 1912, nil; 1913, 2; 1914, 33; 1915, 6.

2. All stallions are registered in the stud books for the respective breeds, connected with the Canadian National Live Stock Records.

3. All stallions are purchased by experienced buyers subject to veterinary inspection by an officer of the Health of Animals Branch, Dominion Department of Agriculture.

The associations to which these loans are made are associations of farmers organized under the direction of the Live Stock Branch of the Department of Agriculture. Pure bred sires are not distributed to agricultural societies organized under the provincial Department of Agriculture.

WAR SUPPLIES—OVERSHOES.

Mr. OLIVER:

How many of the overshoes issued to the Canadian Expeditionary Forces have been issued to men when in service overseas?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Eighteen thousand pairs.

WAR SUPPLIES—SOCKS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Are socks supplied to soldiers on service overseas, on demand of the officers commanding units, as recently stated by the minister, paid for by the soldiers receiving them?

2. If so, at what range of prices?

3. Is there any reason to believe that a sufficient supply is not available, or that the quality is inferior?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No.

RAILWAY BONDS GUARANTEES.

*Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Did the Government pay by special warrant half yearly interest on Dominion and Provincial guarantees of the Canadian Northern railway? If so, what was the amount paid?

2. Did the Government pay by special warrant, the half yearly interest on the Dominion guarantee of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway? If so, what was the amount paid?

3. What interest payments on guarantees to railways have been made by the Government during the years 1914, 1915 and 1916?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. No.

2. No.

3. None.

ALLEGED DISTURBANCES AT EDMONTON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) if he has any report to make, or any information to give the House, in regard to the alleged disturbances at Edmonton.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have no information as to any disturbances at Edmonton. I have heard that threats were made at Edmonton, but I have no report of any disturbances whatever. Edmonton is a peaceful and law-abiding city.

Mr. OLIVER: If I might take the opportunity of placing before the House the facts in regard to the case, it may clear up some misunderstanding, and I think it would be to the general advantage. As there were reports current that there had been a disturbance in that city, it would be just as well for the House to be aware of how that occurred and what the nature of it was. I will take the opportunity of quoting from the Edmonton Bulletin of Saturday, February 12:

Citizens walking down town last night found the unusual spectacle of pickets of soldiers with rifles and bayonets, stationed at the corners where Namayo, Fraser, Queen's, McDougall and Howard avenues open on to Jasper, to protect property from violence at the hands of a crowd of their comrades.

Two buildings are understood to have been the objectives of the crowd, the Macdonald hotel and the Bulletin office—the hotel because of a report that alien enemies are employed there, and the Bulletin office because some misguided parties had circulated a false report that the paper had referred to the 51st, 63rd and 66th Battalions as "dogs."

The paragraph which was distorted into a cause of offence on the part of the Bulletin appeared in the editorial columns on Wednesday evening and Thursday morning, and was as follows:

"The dog is a very useful and estimable animal in his own place. And his place is a large one. But the street of a city is not part of that place. Child life in this community would be safer and parental life freed from a good deal of worry if the hides of about three battalions of good-for-nothing mongrels were nailed to the fence."

The plain meaning of the paragraph is clear to any one who does not read for the purpose of finding some hidden significance in it, and nothing of this kind, of course, was meant, and when it became known yesterday that some parties had seized upon it as a pretext to stir up antagonism among the soldiers, a protest against the gross misinterpretation was published in the evening edition. . . . To Lieut.-Colonel McKinery, commanding officer of the 66th; Lieut.-Colonel Harwood, commanding officer of the 51st; Lieut.-Colonel George McLeod, commanding officer of the 63rd; and Chief of Police Hill is due the fact that the evening's proceedings did not end more disastrously. Chief Hill, upon learning of the trouble that was brewing, at once telephoned the three commanding officers and apprised them of the situation, informing them at the same time that his men would be powerless without military assistance.

Lieut.-Colonel McKinery, of the 66th, immediately jumped into his auto, leaving Major Durrand in charge of the men at the grounds. The colonel upon reaching the danger zone put officers in charge of all the soldiers on leave, with instructions to prevent disturbance. At the same time the men at barracks, under Major Durrand, were marched into the city, and upon arriving at Jasper and Fraser, cleared the street of all soldiers not on duty, at the same time ordering civilians to disperse.

The other battalions responded with promptitude, pickets being sent from each, and stationed at McDougall and Jasper, Howard and Jasper, Queen's and Jasper, and Fraser and Jasper—the four points of vantage. Their arrival was not a moment too soon, a crowd of khakied men already having assumed a threatening attitude. They formed, of course, but a small proportion of the total number of soldiers in the city, but their number was sufficiently large to provide considerable excitement for the time being. The pickets remained on duty for some hours after the occurrence, and with aid of a squad of city police, both on foot and mounted, under Inspector Shute, barred the progress of all soldiers along Jasper, from McDougall to Fraser.

Lieut.-Colonel G. B. McLeod, shortly after eight o'clock, arranged for the manager of the Bulletin to address the soldiers who were con-

gregated at Queen's avenue. The manager, in addressing the men, explained that the article to which exception was taken had no reference to the soldiers, which explanation was perfectly satisfactory. The soldiers then dispersed with cheers for the colonel. Colonel McLeod also addressed the men earlier in the evening explaining that the article was not intended to refer to them.

A number of arrests were made while the excitement was at its height, the persons in question being taken to the city police station.

Part of my reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the minister and the House is to let the facts be known as they really were; and, further, to draw attention to the fact that the instigation of trouble came from outside the military, and not inside. We have some strenuous politics in the city of Edmonton at times, and I do not think there is any doubt that the misinterpretation placed upon the article in question was the deliberate act of some active and measurably clever politicians. I do not wish my hon. friends opposite to think I am associating them with these politicians at all; I am merely pointing out that in my opinion the trouble arose out of a deliberate attempt on the part of a certain set of men in the city of Edmonton, who are not soldiers, to turn to their own advantage the excitement that grew out of the occurrences in Calgary. At a time such as this, when the country is subject to excitement, there is always an opportunity for evilly-disposed persons who are not soldiers to arouse antagonism for the purpose of achieving some advantage or revenge for themselves. I think that that is a feature of the case which is absolutely proved by the occurrences in Edmonton, and one which may be found to be connected with occurrences of perhaps a more serious kind in other places.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): I had not the detailed information which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has given to the House, but I knew that this was nothing more than one of those little scares that occur from time to time in different parts of the country, the public mind being more or less excited. The policy for all wise men such as my hon. friend and others of us to pursue is to keep our heads level. If he will permit me to say so, I do not know that I would have gone quite as far as my hon. friend in attributing this scare to certain persons, whether in or out of the militia. Any one knowing my hon. friend to be the proprietor and moving spirit and genius behind the Edmonton Bulletin, would realize that a great family journal like that could not by any possibility be induced to say anything offensive to the boys out to do their duty for King and country; especially when it is known, not only in that locality but elsewhere, that nearly all the sons and relatives of the hon. member for Edmonton are out doing their duty under the colours to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: I should just like to draw the attention of the House to the promptitude and energy with which the officers of these battalions handled the situation. Their action certainly left nothing to be desired.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. TURRIFF: I should like to read a short paragraph from the Ottawa Free Press of last night:

> Pay of Soldiers in Civil Service.
>
> In reply to Mr. J. G. Turriff, who asserted that the Government should put an end to the practice of paying civil servants who are on active service their salaries, Hon. Dr. Roche, Minister of the Interior, in the House of Commons, yesterday afternoon stated that the Government felt it would be a breach of faith if it cancelled the pay of men who enlisted early in the war on the understanding that their salaries were to be paid.

I did not make any such remarks at all. What I said was this, as will be seen by Hansard:

> Mr. Turriff: On what grounds does the Government justify paying a man who enlists on the last day of October both his civil and military pay, and a man who enlists on the 1st of November only his military pay, and the difference between that and his civil pay? If that practice is followed there will be no harmony in the departments of the Government nor in the trenches. I am not speaking particularly against either system, although I think the latter system is the best; but I say that all the men should be treated alike; put them all under one system or under the other. I do not think the present system is fair.

I just wished to correct the impression given by the Free Press last night. I did not request in any shape or form that civil servants who volunteer should not be paid their civil salaries, but suggested that they should all be put on the same basis.

THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE.

ARCHITECTS' REPORT.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): I received this morning the report of the architects who have been making an examination of the Parliament

Buildings and, with the consent of the House, I will read it, as it is very short:

The Honourable Robert Rogers,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Re Parliament Buildings.

Dear Sir,—We have made a careful examination of the main building that was recently damaged by fire, and beg to report as follows:

The major portion of the buildings at present left standing, more particularly as regards the internal and external walls, have suffered no material damage.

The west wing, which was recently built on modern fireproof methods, is uninjured by fire and but slightly damaged by water.

From this point—viz., the west wing—travelling south to the southwest tower, thence east along the south front to the southeast tower, thence north to the northeast tower, thence west to the east wall, thence north to the north tower—all these walls which comprise the perimeter of the building are practically intact and uninjured; it will be only necessary to make repairs to a number of windows on the south front, where the flames have injured the Ohio sandstone trimmings.

Starting at the same point before mentioned—viz., the west wing—and travelling in the same direction: all rooms fronting on these elevations have been more or less swept by fire and burned out; the brick masonry in the internal longitudinal and cross walls, also the masonry in the external walls inclosing these rooms has suffered little damage—the stability of these walls has not been impaired.

The character of this masonry, both in material and workmanship, is first class. The external walls are faced with Nepean random rock-faced quarries, with Ohio stone trimmings to window openings; the walls are backed with rubble, and faced on the inside with brick carefully built and properly bonded into the rubble masonry. It is this facing of brick that has preserved the limestone rubble against damage by fire.

The floors throughout the building are constructed with 7-inch iron I-beam joists spaced eighteen inches on centres, filled in solid with lime mortar concrete, the soffits of the beams exposed.

That the walls have suffered so little damage from the fire, is due to the nature of this construction, which might be termed "semi-fireproof." The floors have not burned through; they have remained in position, and very materially stiffened the building and retarded the fire. But it will be necessary to take out the floors, remove the iron beams and replace with steel beams and fireproof material.

The walls of the main tower are backed up solid with limestone rubble, exposed on the internal face. The fire has done considerable damage to this limestone backing and to the Ohio sandstone around the window openings. It will be necessary to take down the spandrel walls between the four corner piers to the level of the sill of the large windows and rebuild.

The area in the heart of the building formerly occupied by the Commons Chamber and the Senate Chamber, from the north wall of the main corridor, "with the exception of the basement and foundation walls," is a total loss.

The building as it stands to-day represents an asset in labour and material in position, of fully $2,000,000, that can be re-used. The external walls require but few repairs, and when these are made all evidence of fire will be obliterated.

If more accommodation is required in the Commons Chamber and the Senate Chamber, these rooms could be placed on the east and west sides of the main building carried out in the same style of architecture, and the space they formerly occupied could be utilized in providing increased office accommodation and stack room for the library.

The Library building is a most dangerous fire hazard. The floor, shelving, and roof should be replaced with fireproof material.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) John A. Pearson.
(Sgd.) J. O. Marchand.

Ottawa, February 17, 1916.

CANADIAN SOLDIERS IN ACTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: May I ask the Minister of Militia whether there is any truth in the rumour which has been circulated to the effect that our Canadian troops have been in an engagement along the line near Ypres, and if so, what information he has on the subject?

Sir SAM HUGHES: We have no official information other than that an attack was made by the enemy on the British and Canadian lines from a point southeast of Ypres for a number of miles. The bombardment was very heavy, lasting for two days and part of the third day. Our troops do not seem to have suffered nearly as much as might have been expected. The first day five or six were killed, and the next day only one; there were fifteen or sixteen wounded. The Germans, following the bombardment, got into our trenches at many points, and my information is that those Germans are still there, but dead.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is reported that the Germans still hold some of our trenches.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have no information to that effect. Not a solitary foot of our trenches is in the hands of the enemy.

THE BUDGET.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Ways and Means, resumed from Tuesday, February 15.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, never perhaps in the history of Canada was a Budget speech looked forward to with such interest as that which the Minister of Finance delivered in this House on Tuesday last. Our financial posi-

tion presently and prospectively is one of gravity and naturally it demands a most serious and thoughtful attention on the part of the Government and of the people. It also intimately involves the immediate and prospective welfare of our people and our country. My remarks shall be of a general rather than of a detailed character, although I hope to deal with some matters of detail for the purpose of amplifying and re-enforcing certain general propositions.

The Budget speech of the Minister of Finance was characterized by lucidity and brevity, upon which I heartily congratulate him, although I fear I cannot hope to imitate him.

At the beginning I wish to say a few words in respect to our balance of trade, which has been a favourable one this year, not because it needs be an indication of unusually healthy trade conditions, but for its value in the settlement of international balances and in the stabilization of the exchange rates, which we have learned are so vital to our trade. For these reasons, the relations of imports to exports during the present year is, in the circumstances, gratifying. It must be remembered, however, that imports and exports are not solely determined by customs returns. For the nine months ending December 31 last, our imports, free and dutiable, amounted to $348,746,000, while our exports amounted to $511,334,000, showing thus far a favourable trade balance of over $160,000,000, and at the end of the fiscal year it will be over $200,000,000. When we borrow money we export securities, which is just the same as the export of wheat except that payment in the former case is deferred. The annual interest is an import exactly in the same sense that cotton is an import. The total of annual interest payable on Canadian securities to Great Britain amounts probably to $150,000,000, and to the United States $40,000,000, both of which must be calculated as annual imports. In addition to this we pay to foreign countries for services of one kind or another, such as brokerage, shipping and insurance, a very considerable sum. Keeping these matters in view, we must not conclude that we have become a creditor nation by reason merely of an excess in exports over imports in merchandise during the present fiscal year.

Neither should we be led astray in our calculations of the future by the trade figures and trade balances of this year. We had an abundant harvest. The trade activities of the United States were reflected here, and the export of war supplies reached unexpected levels, all of which largely accounted for the volume of our exports and imports. It is generally conceded that our exportable crops for the present calendar year cannot equal in proportions those of last year and consequently our exports and imports will be affected, for we can only pay for imports with our exports or by borrowing abroad. Neither should we rely too much upon the continuance of war supply exports. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) was quite frank last week in expressing his opinion about the duration of the war, and many are the evidences that it may continue even longer than he indicated. His statement, which I assume was not merely a personal opinion, was one of the most impressive and pregnant ever made to the people of Canada. It is well known that the strength of Germany's position at present is in the fact that she is not an importer, and consequently does not export gold except in negligible quantities. This will enable her to continue the war much longer than if she were an importing country with international balances to settle. The economic strain upon Great Britain is tremendous, and nothing produces greater problems than the exchange question, because in the main she must pay for her abnormal imports by exports of goods or securities and not with gold, and she is constantly devising means of limiting imports. For instance last year very high import duties were placed upon certain commodities which might be classified as luxuries, or, at least, were not actual necessities. These tariff rates were not imposed for purposes of protection or revenue, but to diminish imports in order to stabilize, if possible, the sterling exchange, or in other words to reduce the spread between imports and exports. A proclamation was issued in Great Britain on Tuesday last prohibiting the import, after March 1, next, of paper, paper pulp, periodicals, tobacco, furniture, wood and stone. Only last week Sir Alfred Booth, chairman of the board of directors of the Cunard Steamship Company, publicly urged individual thrift by taxation. That is, he urged such an increase in taxation as would minimise consumption and importation. What does this indicate? It is a warning that Britain, so far as possible, must be self-contained and that her war and other necessities must be manufactured within herself, so far as possible. In the event of a protracted struggle this will, in some degree happen, and war orders in

Canada will diminish as will our exports, unless possibly we are able to accept British securities in payment of the same, which is unlikely. If this adversely affects the United States we shall also share in the adversity. What then will be our position? I need not say to honourable gentlemen it will be serious. Manufacturing for other allied nations is always susceptible to shocks, through the condition of the exchange rates which are liable at any moment to severe changes. In that event we cannot manufacture profitably unless we are able to accept payment in foreign securities and it is doubtful that this will be possible. I refer to these matters at this length to point out to the House that the present trade conditions are liable to rapid changes, and soon we may be confronted with a changed situation. I refer to it also in order to impress upon the Government and the country the necessity of rigid national economy and the abandonment of many practices in our financial affairs in which we now engage, but to which I shall later refer.

In respect to the domestic loan of $100,000,000, I have just a few words to say, all of which I very modestly submit. I think undoubtedly the Minister of Finance was justified in making the loan a domestic one, and all Canadians were proud of its success. Doubtless by this time a substantial portion of it has been purchased for United States account, and we have thus been relieved in part. The time was a favourable one for a domestic loan, on account of our magnificent crop and favourable trade balance, and another opportunity for a domestic loan equally as favourable may not soon appear again. The investing capacity of the Canadian public is limited; consequently there is a limit to Government domestic loans. Unless Canadians are impressed with the necessity of economy, and make investments in domestic loans from savings, our national financial position is not much improved by subscriptions to domestic loans. If subscriptions for domestic war loans come largely from our banks and financial institutions, directly or indirectly, no benefit accrues to the country; although, of course, the immediate credit required is obtained by the Government. Now, wealth cannot be created in this manner. All funds disbursed on account of war loan subscriptions by banks soon return to the banks, who have the securities as well; so that there is a tendency to inflation. Again, banking capital and reserves in Canada play too big a part in our business affairs to be absorbed appreciably in war loans. The banks, in any event, can retain only such portion of the war loan as they actually desire, and must dispose of the balance; so it is better in the first instance to have the loan placed in the investor's hands. Too great a proportion of this loan was subscribed for by our banks, which seem to have subscribed upon some uniform basis, giving their subscriptions the appearance of having been involuntary. True, the loan was a success from the Government standpoint, but not from the national standpoint. It was a success only because a large number of people accustomed to investing subscribed from business and patriotic motives, and because large financial institutions subscribed heavily. It was not a success in the more important sense, however, that subscriptions came from the small investor and represented savings and permanent investment. The sale of high interest-bearing government securities afforded a great opportunity to cultivate the spirit of investment and economy among the people of small holdings; this class were not properly considered in connection with the loan. This was the first opportunity that ever came to Canada to encourage national thrift and investment among persons of small means; a splendid opportunity for an educative campaign was neglected. The prospectus issued was stereotyped and more intended for underwriters than investors.

I do not think the Minister of Finance made the proper preparations for this loan. A campaign widespread and enthusiastic by various mediums should have been undertaken. The services of hundreds of Canadians might, on request, have been enlisted to carry on a campaign for the Government in connection with this loan. Canadians are not exemplars, perhaps, in private economics; but I think they are ready, for economic and patriotic reasons, to forego much in order to ensure the success of Canadian war loans. I think they would be quite responsive to a campaign for this purpose, and the economic effect upon the nation would be visible for years. It would be most disastrous, I say, to have a series of large loans mainly subscribed by banks and financial institutions directly or indirectly. This loan, while widely subscribed, was not in the real sense a popular loan, and no proper effect was made to make it such. We must borrow on our own market for other purposes. In 1915 Canada bor-

4 p.m.

rowed on issued securities $340,000,000, of which $150,000,000 was supplied by Canada herself. Therefore, I say that in future some organized effort should be made well in advance to make subscriptions for government loans bearing high interest rates more popular and general, and, so far as possible, to have them come from savings. There are other features of this loan that might profitably be discussed, but returns asked for in respect to it have not yet been brought down, and later in the session we shall probably return to a discussion of its terms.

I wish now to refer to the financial statement just presented by the Minister of Finance in respect to the present fiscal year. The minister's statement that there was a surplus of $45,000,000 of revenue over ordinary expenditure was presented, quite adroitly though not too frankly, and received by hon. gentlemen opposite as a great financial feat. But it must be noted that, including all domestic or civil expenditure, the surplus will be, roughly, but $5,000,000; and that, inclusive of war expenditures, the deficit will be about $125,000,000. It is further to be noted that this surplus was procured by taxation, not by economies in expenditures. The surplus of $45,000,000 is a delusion and a fallacy, and hon. gentlemen know it. They did not reduce ordinary expenditure; the revenue came from the people, not from the Government. The Minister of Finance did not, I think, take sufficient pains to make it clear that capital expenditures were made from borrowed capital, which would wipe out the surplus over ordinary expenditures. Having in mind the method of accounting employed by the Minister of Finance, let me ask this question: if a surplus of $45,000,000 over ordinary expenditure was gratifying, would not a surplus of $75,000,000 or $80,000,000 have been even more gratifying? That would mean bringing the ordinary expenditure down to about $75,000,000, which it was in 1907-08. Is it not reasonable to say that this might easily have been done? There was an opportunity to produce such a surplus, because the gross revenue was the highest in the history of the country; but, unfortunately, our total ordinary expenditures practically reached the highest mark. The war has destroyed a great many systems and theories, and one, I think, which ought to become a thing of the past is our system of national bookkeeping. The Minister of Finance presented us with three different sets of accounts, consolidated fund, capital expenditures, and war expenditures; showing them all separately, one at a time. If they had been shown together, they would disclose an excess of total expenditure over revenue of $125,000,000. I think the people of Canada desire to know this, and not what happens to be the difference between revenue and what we call ordinary expenditure. They want the cards showing our financial position placed on the table face up, which I do not think was done by the Minister of Finance.

I submit that the proper system is to treat war expenditure in the budget statement as a current one, and on that basis we find that for the fiscal year ending March 31, next, we have a tremendous gap between income and outgo. We know such expenditures will be added largely to the debt, but, we had better look at it in the way I have indicated. There will then be no humbugging of the tax payer, and no political pyrotechnics in this House, or outside.

The Minister of Finance has informed the House that he is gratified with the result of the taxation measures of last year. In this I partially, but not wholly, agree with him, particularly with reference to his additional tariff taxation. It is regrettable that we have such scanty information in respect to the effect of the tariff taxation imposed last year. We were informed by the Minister of Finance in his last Budget speech, that the Trade and Navigation returns would contain the result of the war tariff rates, but no such information is supplied, and consequently it is difficult to deal with the matter intelligently, although a return submitted to the House furnished some general information.

Let me deal with the tariff taxation first. Undoubtedly the war tariff tax produced considerable revenue, nearly twenty millions of dollars up to January last; and, particularly, I would say the 7½ per cent tariff on articles formerly free produced considerable revenue, probably three-fourths of the total. The effect of the surtax of 7½ per cent upon the general tariff rates did not prove, I believe, a gain to revenue, and it undoubtedly restricted trade. Again, on account of the high prices ruling in respect to almost all commodities, the increased tariff rates added much to the cost and value of importations. There were very considerable importations into Canada of raw materials entering into the manufacture of war materials, and the additional tariff increased materially the prices. It

added to the cost of war supplies which we purchased ourselves, and to the amount which we must also pay to the British Government as our proportion. So while we received some additional revenue by reason of the war tariff taxation, yet it was paid out again, and more perhaps, in addition to cost of war supplies, and consequently we are little better off. In this respect the statistics do not disclose the full facts, and it is difficult to estimate the net results of much of the tariff taxation imposed last year. Again there were drawbacks upon exported war materials which will probably amount to six or seven million dollars for the year, so therefore I say that at least the extra 7½ per cent added to the general tariff yielded practically no revenue, and was an impediment to trade. We took the position, last year, that the indiscriminate application of 7½ per cent to free and dutiable goods was inadvisable and indefensible, and we still say so. It was not based on any sound business principle. It imposed unnecessary burdens upon trade, and was not a success in producing revenue in proportion to the burdens imposed; in fact, but for the tariff on free goods, little increase of revenue, if any, would have resulted. A considered and discriminating tariff measure for revenue purposes was possible, but this was not of that character. In framing that extra tariff taxation, the Minister of Finance took the easy course, not the businesslike one.

Last year when the minister imposed the new tariff rates, he expressed, amidst the acclaim of his friends, the belief that it would be efficacious in stimulating Canadian industry and agriculture, and in relieving unemployment. This sounded then to me more like the idle prophecy of the politician than the remarks of a capable financial administrator. We have not heard of that prophecy this year. After the passing of almost a year, I am sure honourable gentlemen opposite will agree with me that this prediction was idle, as was expected, and that any stimulation that came to Canadian industry, or any relief that came to unemployment, was not the result of the tariff taxation measure of last year, but one of the incidents of a world-wide calamity; and further, that any stimulation that came to Canadian agriculture was due to the efforts of men and the blessings of God, and not to the tariff of the Minister of Finance.

Now, I wish to refer with some particularity to our financial position, and in order that the House may apprehend the actual facts, let me present, in concrete form, the result of financial operations for this and last year, and the probable results of the next fiscal year.

Fiscal year 1915.

Revenue		$133,073,381 73
Ordinary expenditure	$135,523,206 54	
Capital and special expenditure	41,447,320 03	
War expenditure	60,750,476 01	
		237,721,002 58
Total deficit		$104,647,520 85

There are other miscellaneous expenditures and receipts which add to and subtract from this total deficit, but I shall not give the details. The Public Accounts for 1915 show that the net addition to the public debt for the year ending 1915 was $113,379,233.07.

Fiscal year 1916.

For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1916, the position of affairs has been presented by the Minister of Finance about as follows:

Revenue		$170,000,000
Ordinary expenditure	$125,000,000	
Capital and special expenditure	40,000,000	
War expenditure	130,000,000	
		295,000,000
Total deficit		$125,000,000

There will probably be, therefore, an addition to the debt of $125,000,000 and more for the year ending March 31, 1916.

Fiscal year 1916-17.

For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917, the following are the Estimates of the Minister of Finance, whatever be the actual results:

Revenue estimated		$170,000,000
Ordinary expenditure	$135,000,000	
Capital expenditure	30,000,000	
War expenditure	250,000,000	
		415,000,000
Estimated deficit		$245,000,000

Upon these Estimates there will be, for the next fiscal year, an addition to the net debt of about $250,000,000. I venture to predict the result, however, that the addition to the debt will be much larger.

Now, such, in concrete form, are the probable results for the fiscal years 1915, 1916, and 1917—an addition to the public debt of about $485,000,000 in three fiscal years; a total debt at the end of 1916-17 of

at least $825,000,000—I am sure I am well below the mark—and an increase in interest charges upon the debt from $12,893,000, in 1914, to the estimated amount of $39,649,000 in 1916-17. The interest charge, if expended next year, will be about 40 per cent of our total revenue from customs and excise in 1915, which debt interest charge is about equal to our total receipts from customs and excise taxes in the year 1900. The end of the fiscal year 1916-17 will not probably see the end of the war; we will have a debt of a billion of dollars or more, and following the end of the war there perhaps comes the period of reconstruction in Canada and the whole world, and a probable period of depression. Now that is the financial outlook presently and prospectively. Whether we like it or not, such are the facts. Lest I be misunderstood, let me say the increase in our debt is largely chargeable to the war.

Now, what was the true financial policy for the Government during the past two years in view of the war and the commercial conditions immediately preceding the war? What is the true policy for the future? I say it was and is rigid economy in civil expenditures, the elimination of unnecessary capital expenditures, the elimination of wastes in war expenditures, and the utmost of proper and wise taxation to lessen the addition to the public debt. This policy has not been followed, and there is nothing to indicate an intention to follow it during the next fiscal year; but I shall refer to this later.

This is, perhaps, the most convenient place for me to make reference to the Estimates for the coming fiscal year, which are open to grave censure, and are out of harmony with public opinion. The Estimates of ordinary expenditure for the coming year amount to $158,958,000, the largest in our history. There is an increase of $16,000,000 for interest upon the public debt, and there are miscellaneous increases and reductions in the various services, leaving a net estimated increase for ordinary expenditure of over $8,250,000 more than for the present year. The Estimates are objectionable in that they do not show sufficient reduction. The Government reply that much of the money voted is but revotes, and will not be spent. My reply is that votes representing expenditures which are not to be made have no place in the Budget system. Further, the Minister of Finance estimates ordinary expenditures of $135,000,000 for next year, which, I say, are excessive. Further, the Government have no right to ask Parliament to vote money which they say they will not likely expend.

No other spending body is permitted to do this. If the budget system has any virtues, estimates should only contain actual necessities and should represent actual intentions. It encourages departmental extravagances and wasteful expenditure, it is an encouragement to the evils of patronage, it prolongs the hope for unprofitable expenditures in the minds of many people and localities, and postpones the day when we should and must revise our policy upon public expenditures.

Many leaders of public opinion are requesting economies on the part of the people. Should not the Government show capacity for leadership? Would it not very materially help our credit to show substantial surpluses over all civil expenditures? When the Minister of Finance made his loan of $45,000,000 in New York last July, I understand that Mr. J. P. Morgan & Company sent their representatives here to investigate the revenues and expenditures of the country. Street rumour has it that they were astounded at the vast sums of money expended in this country for unproductive purposes. The Minister of Finance will some day soon be seeking another substantial loan in the United States. Does he think our estimates for next year would strengthen our credit in the judgment of possible lenders? Would the estimates of expenditure on ordinary account tend to elevate the opinion of foreign lenders in our spending wisdom particularly after a perusal of the items referable to public buildings and harbours and rivers? Should not national credit, always based on revenue, be properly cared for and nursed? Would the defence avail that many items would not be expended? I submit that the estimates in the present form are indefensible, and Parliament should not be asked to vote them. Why should we be asked to vote supply in the sum of $158,000,000 for next year greater by $8,000,000 than last year when admittedly it is not needed? Only ten years ago our ordinary expenditure was $67,000,000. Why not revert to something like that basis of expenditure again for a few years? If we did so our estimates could be below or around $100,000,000 instead of $158,000,000, after making ample provision for an increase of $28,000,000 in the interest and pension accounts since that date.

For another reason I should like to see business and conscience introduced into our Estimate of expenditure. It is too true that in Canada large sums of money are spent by government which are not only unproductive in the material sense, but which in the moral sense are demoralising. It is the genesis of patronage and electoral corruption. Cobden once truly remarked that public economy is public virtue. I am not now engaging in the unprofitable task of accusing the present Administration of being more guilty than others. But when and where is it going to end? Is this not the time in our history when reforms should appear, and should not we who are here to-day as the people's representatives avail ourselves of this opportunity to do real service to the state, now and hereafter? I think all reflecting men have thought more of this during the past few months than ever before in their lives. Surely the fact that many of our citizens are sacrificing their lives for the nation and for principle should prompt us to adopt higher principles in public expenditures, to deal more justly with the taxes of the public, and save democracy from the corrupting influences flowing from improperly expended public moneys. Should not members of Parliament be leaders in the movement? Honourable gentlemen opposite will retort that it is easier for one in opposition to the Government to speak in this manner. I think that is quite true. I want to be frank. I must say that I never before realized the force of political patronage as I have since the beginning of the war. I do not say patronage enters into everything, nor do I mean to say that many men supporting the Government are not fighting against it. I mean only to say that as a fact it exists, and in disgusting proportions. I have seen the evil of political patronage in recent months in little and in large transactions. I know of some ministers who have resisted the pressure made upon them by their friends for improper expenditures, and I know of other ministers who have succumbed to these attacks. And I ask again, when is it going to end? Why not now? Is not this the time to commence? I think so, and believe that a large section of the public would rally to the support of any such reform. The revotes in this year's Estimates, however, is but a token of the continuance of past practices, and for this reason I say the Government is open to grave censure. Is there a better way, after all, to stay improper expenditure than to stop the sources of its origin? The Estimates of the Canadian Parliament is the book to read and to revise if we want to bring about reform in public expenditure, the reduction of patronage evils, and generally political and commercial corruption; for political life is not alone in need of regeneration in Canada. I need not, I hope, apologize for this diversion, for, after all, it strictly pertains to the budget, and the welfare of the country.

I must return to a discussion of the expenditure, and I should like to illustrate the position I have already taken in respect to expenditures by reference to the administration of a few of the public services.

I shall first refer to the administration of the Post Office Department, which in the past two or three years presents a most discreditable record. The decline in sound administration in this department commenced when Hon Louis Phillippe Pelletier became Postmaster General. He took general conduct of the department away from his officials, and handed it over to patronage brokers all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and his ears were always ready to heed their requests. The Post Office Department, for many years, had an honourable administrative career, but this has been deliberately destroyed, and an era of chaos established. The present Postmaster General apparently entertains his official duties but lightly, and has made no effort to restore sound business principles to the administration of his department. Since 1867 the revenue from the post office has yearly grown, and the expenditures, of course, as well. Since 1902 down to last year the department has always had a yearly surplus of about $700,000. In 1914 the surplus had fallen to the ominous sum of $134,000. For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915, we were made acquainted with a deficit of $2,914,541.90, being almost four hundred per cent greater than the greatest deficit known to the department since 1867.

It is difficult to estimate the probable deficit of the department for the fiscal year ending March 31 next, because it is difficult to allocate the total revenues coming to the Post Office Department from its own earnings and that of the war stamp taxes. I estimate that a strict accounting would show a deficit for the present fiscal year of $5,000,000, and perhaps more. It will be difficult, perhaps, to estimate with accuracy the exact postal revenue for this

year. From the postage on letters thirty-three and a third per cent belongs to war revenue; one-half of the revenue from postal cards and drop letters does not belong to the Post Office Department. The revenue coming from the use of stamps upon cheques, notes, money orders, postal notes, patent medicine packages, perfumery, and wines—and the amount in the hands of the Post Office Department is large—was dedicated to war and not to departmental incompetency and inefficiency.

In the fiscal year 1915 the expenditures were nearly three million dollars greater than revenue, without apparently any visible reason. The revenue had not fallen below that of 1914. There had been no notable increase in the services of the department; in fact, there were many declines. The increase in the expenditure was not due to the war, because the special services of the department in this respect were liquidated by capital account. It was due to the effect that the department has been sold to party patronage. Since honourable gentlemen have been placed on the treasury benches, mail contracts have been violated and transferred at higher cost to political friends; the system of tender and contract has been largely abandoned, and the administration of the department has become a public scandal, and it is a fitting subject for investigation by the Public Accounts Committee or by a Royal Commission. I quite understand why the Minister of Finance asked the public to lick an extra stamp during the past ten months, and I said so last year. He did not trust the Post Office Department and thought he could earmark war-tax stamps. But he failed. The Post Office Department kept the revenue, and it thought it was rich and grew extravagant and wasted the revenue from the stamp taxes of the Minister of Finance. That department will owe the Receiver General at least $5,000,000 at the end of March, but it will not be paid over.

Just a passing review of the administration of the Dominion lands, which branch of the Interior Department has been the victim of reckless partisan administration. In the last fiscal year we had a deficit of over $800,000 in this branch of the public service, and it was only the second deficit since 1885. Now, this condition of affairs was not due to unusual burdens thrust upon the Department of the Interior. The homestead entries made in 1915 were but 24,088 as against 33,699 in 1913, the acreage homesteaded in 1913 being 5,391,840 acres, as against 3,854,00 acres in 1915. This department of the public service has a declining business and it should have a declining expenditure. Still, we are asked to vote the large sum of $3,304,000 for next year. I submit that vote should be less by more than one million dollars. Not to reduce it is but paying tribute to departmental waste, and putting temptation in the way of a department already possessing a highly overloaded service. I protest against such a system of budget making.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Now, let me refer to immigration expenditures. The estimated expenditure for 1916-17 is $1,574,000, and the estimates erroneously state that this amount is $1,576,000 less than the amount voted for the current fiscal year. This is certainly an error, for the amount voted last year was $1,875,000, so that the decrease this year is not $1,576,000 less, but only $300,000 less. In 1911-12, we had an immigration of 354,257 with an expenditure of $1,364,993.93. Our expenditures for the current year will be well up to the expenditures of 1911-12, with an immigration of but 48,446 for the calendar year 1915, which, doubtless, will be about the immigration figures for the fiscal year 1915-16. Now, for next year we are asked to vote $1,574,000, with practically little immigration in sight, and at least not greater than last year. This is about the same amount as we spent in 1912-13, when we had an immigration of over 300,000, but I have not the exact figures.

I must now refer to the spending record of the Department of Public Works. Permit me to give the House the expenditures on current account of this department for the past few years, as they will be more impressive than I can be in pointing out how defenceless has been the spending record of this department during the past few years, and in a period of falling revenues and war. The figures are as follows:

1910-11	$ 8,621,431 25
1911-12	10,344,487 21
1912-13	13,468,505 20
1913-14	19,007,512 63
1914-15	19,343,532 35
Estimated, 1915-16	16,000,000 00
To be voted, 1916-17	18,685,366 50

Of all the departments of the public service this is the one which should show retrenchment, and let it be remembered that I am not referring to Public Works expenditure on capital account. I would most humbly suggest that the Estimates for Public Works for next year be reduced by twelve million dollars at least, and, after all, that is but the amount voted for

public buildings, harbours and rivers. More can be done. That reduction would bring the Estimates down to the expenditures made by the same department in 1904-05, namely $6,765,000. Is that not a fair proposition?

Who on the other side will say nay to that? Surely it is fair when we reflect upon comparative conditions say in 1904 and 1916. The Minister of Finance says that much of the total sum voted will not be expended. My reply is that he has, apparently, no control over the Minister of Public Works or any other minister with respect to expenditure. The Minister of Finance should inform other ministers what he can permit them to spend each year. The reverse is the practice. That is part of the duties of the Minister of Finance. He is not merely a tax collector. In fact, national finance has more to do with expenditure than with revenue. It is not difficult to obtain revenue if need be, because the people must obey the revenue laws, but it is a task of formidable dimensions to guide and control public expenditures. Then, if we turn to the Minister of Public Works and say that he should not have asked for a vote of $18,865,366 in 1916-17, his answer is, "Trust me, I shall not expend it all." My reply is, he cannot be trusted, his record is against him. His picture hangs in the gallery of administrative prodigals in Manitoba and in Ottawa. Really we do not want the temptation to unnecessarily expend placed before him, lest he fall. He is spending this year about $16,000,000 on ordinary account, whereas, say in 1910-11, only $8,600,000 was expended. Is there any real defence for that after all?

One might go through all the departments of the public service, and in none would you find evidence that the Government is impressed with the seriousness of our position. For instance, witness the large amounts disbursed last year for advertising and printing, to the press which support the Ministry. There you find the same tribute being levied by the party press as in times of peace and plenty. Most of it is unnecessary and useless. After the close of the last parliamentary session the Government very hurriedly spent a large sum in printing voters' lists, chiefly in the Maritime Provinces. This was about the time the Prime Minister commenced to gather extracts from Liberal newspapers to prove that public opinion favoured an extension of the parliamentary term. At the same time the Minister of Public Works and other members of the Government saw democracy on bended knee pleading for its inherent right of expressing itself at the polls, and proceeded to have the voters' lists printed, and practically announced a dissolution of Parliament. We thus paid many thousands of dollars to enable the Government to learn what was public opinion in respect to a dissolution of Parliament. I must admit that the method of the Prime Minister was cheaper to the country, although I think neither Liberal newspaper utterances nor voters' lists compelled them to withdraw from the decision that had been reached to dissolve Parliament.

I observe by the public accounts that during the last fiscal year expenditures were made on war account by departments other than the Militia Department aggregating over seven million dollars about which some explanation was needed. They are as follows:

Trade and Commerce	$3,003,005 06
Naval Service	3,096,125 35
Governor General Secretary's Office	4,330 93
Privy Council	13,637 91
Secretary of State	16,192 63
Secretary of State for External Affairs	4,214 14
Justice Department	254,945 85
Post Office Department	149,630 09
Dominion Police	132,763 89
Indian Affairs	81 72
Royal Northwest Mounted Police	397,126 44
Railways and Canals	78,845 20
Public Works	12,865 45

One might have expected that the Government would not load the war account with all expenditure indirectly due to the war. Surely those items outside of the Militia Department should have been liquidated out of current revenue. But no, it would have spoiled the story about the surplus. Was it too much to expect curtailment in ordinary expenditure sufficient to meet these amounts? If there was an indirect war expenditure of $81.72 made by the Indian Department—and the dear knows what it can be for—surely free and proud Canadians will not be pleased to learn that this amount was borrowed from the British Government with its present tremendous financial obligations and particularly when they know beyond doubt that millions were absolutely wasted that year in Canada in war purchases. The Privy Council charged to war account $13,637.91, and the same Privy Council ordered the expenditure of more than the same amount for unnecessarily printing voters' lists and soldiers' ballots just for the purpose of finding out

what public opinion was in respect to an election. I suppose the war account is similarly loaded this year with items which ought properly to be charged to current account, and which, under proper accounting, would absolutely destroy the imaginary surpluses of the Minister of Finance.

I cannot now occupy the time of the House in discussing war expenditures. In the Parliaments of the Allied nations war expenditures are most candidly discussed and criticised. They consider this a patriotic duty. But in Canada some rather stigmatise the same procedure, and in the name of a cowardly patriotism endeavour to stay the hand of the inquirer. We are prepared to be generous towards the Government in our view of much of the war expenditure. I do not accept all the rumours I hear of the improper administration of war affairs. Patronage should have no place whatever in these expenditures. But it has, and we all have had evidence of it. Long ago there should have been created such efficient spending organizations that exorbitant prices and exorbitant profits would be made impossible. A greater trust even attaches to these expenditures than to ordinary expenditures. Parliament has given to the Government—not to any one minister of the Crown, but to the Government—an unqualified and large vote of money for war purposes, and we naturally expect that the confidence so fully extended to the Government by Parliament shall be rigidly respected.

I wish to say just a word about capital expenditure. I realize that many contracts were entered into prior to the war, and that work in connection therewith had already commenced; in such cases possibly it would be difficult to make any great curtailment of expenditure. Parliament will judge generously upon matters of that kind. But it seems to me some reduction and postponements might reasonably be expected in some cases at least. Public opinion is, I believe, to-day strongly against the Hudson Bay railway undertaking. That work is not under contract; it is being performed by the Government, and I do not think that any national interest would suffer by its suspension. It is hardly a matter about which there need be any party differences, because as a matter of policy the project had the sanction of both political parties.

The Government preach public economy, but do not practise it; they preach private economy, but do not encourage it. The country looks to the Government for leadership in economies during the crisis through which we are passing. In the British Parliament, Committees of the Commons and Lords have been appointed to study means of promoting national economy, and of restricting civil and military expenditures. In these days the Government of this country might well ask Parliament, through a committee, to assist in making up the Estimates for the ensuing year. A special committee, or perhaps the Public Accounts Committee, might well have been assigned this duty. I am sure that the members of any committee entrusted with this work, animated by patriotic motives and proceeding regardless of party affiliations, would have blazed the trail for retrenchment and for the establishment of a standard in public expenditure that should guide us in the future.

Having said this much in connection with expenditure, it may be well that I should touch for a moment on the question as to what is the proper course to pursue in respect to our financial position, having in view the great gap which exists between revenue and expenditure. After all, there is not much difference between the position taken by the Minister of Finance and that taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House: we agree that we should make some payment upon the principal sum expended for war purposes. That being the case, any difference of opinion will be merely a matter of degree. But unless the Minister of Finance changes the policy pursued by his colleagues, he will not, as he has not in the past, make any payment on account of the principal sum expended for war purposes. We owe it to the cause for which we fight, and we owe it to posterity, that we pay something on this account. When the war is over and we start again on our career of national development, we shall wish not to be prejudiced in the eyes of intending immigrants or of foreign capital by a large national debt which we have not sought to reduce.

5 p.m.

How are we to decrease the gap between income and expenditure? First, let us conserve our present revenues by practising national economy. Unless this be done, newly imposed taxes will be objected to by the people. Further, we should obtain more revenue by taxation for application to war expenditures. This is the time for individual sacrifice and self-denial on the part of all Canadians, and I believe that loyal Canadians will readily

respond to the demand for a substantial payment on account of war expenditures.

This brings me to a brief consideration of the taxation proposals that the Minister of Finance submitted on Tuesday last. A proper discussion of these proposals involves a considerable amount of investigation and thought, which I at least have not been able to give to the matter since the proposals were brought down. I propose, therefore, referring to them only in a general way, anticipating that in Committee of Ways and Means we shall have an opportunity of discussing them in detail.

In respect to the proposed duties upon apples and certain kinds of oil, I have the general observation to make that if this proposed taxation is made for political effect, or for purposes of protection rather than of revenue, it is objectionable. The Minister of Finance said the other day that it was absolutely necessary for the apple industry of Canada that the additional duty should be imposed. In my judgment, in no province of Canada outside of British Columbia are the apple growers interested in this increased duty. To say that the proposed increase would be of any value to the apple producers of the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, is to state a manifest absurdity. I do not believe that the imposition of this duty will be of any advantage to the apple industry of British Columbia. It will limit consumption; it will not provide a market for the surplus production—and this, I believe, is the great difficulty which the apple industry encountered during the past season. This additional tax upon apples must be borne by the three prairie provinces; it must have been designed to that end. It must have been intended to limit the consumers of the three prairie provinces to one source of apple supply, namely, the province of British Columbia. Apparently the people of the prairie provinces receive very few, if any, favours or concessions from this Government in respect of tariffs or taxation. We expect the people of these provinces to increase production in order that we may pay for our imports, but we do little or nothing to encourage them to this patriotic end. Further, apples are a staple food; it is to be remembered that the staple foodstuffs of the country are to-day exceedingly high. I am not going to discuss the matter of tariffs, but I do submit that, having regard to the trade and revenue of this country, a limited readjustment of several items in the tariff, particularly those affecting staple foodstuffs, might have been expected this year. We are apt to think that most of the people of this country are extremely prosperous. I want to point out that, owing to war prices, the struggle for existence on the part of many people in this country is extremely serious. In the case of such a prime necessity as potatoes, for instance, the price to-day is almost prohibitive, and in view of the limited production of potatoes last year I was very much disappointed that the Minister of Finance did not, last fall, invoke the power given to him and by Order in Council temporarily at least remove the duty upon this staple foodstuff.

I have not made any special inquiry as to the effect of the extra duty on oil. If it was intended for protective and not for revenue purposes, I say it is objectionable. I am informed that it will apply chiefly to fuel used by locomotives and steamships. It appears to me that this is an inopportune time to add any additional taxation to transportation bodies. There is a rumor on the street that this tax was a concession to the coal interests of British Columbia. I trust that that is not the reason for it. We were given no reason by the Minister of Finance, and I think we are entitled to it; but I assume we will get it in committee. I think it would be quite interesting to know the reason for the imposition of a tax upon oil which is largely consumed by transportation organizations that are not in too favourable a position at present, and also by some farmers for power purposes.

I wish to refer briefly and generally to the taxation of profits on manufacturing and trading concerns. I admit that any system of taxation is unpopular and open to criticism from some source or another. In respect to the proposals of the Government to impose a tax upon business profits, I do not wish to be understood as saying that they are absolutely without merit. In my judgment, however, they are in many respects fundamentally wrong; they contain many inequalities which will work great injustice, and, in my judgment, they will not be so effective in producing revenue as the Minister of Finance estimates. The great obejction to the taxation of profits, as proposed, is that it is a tax upon business, and not upon accumulated wealth, or upon the income proceeding from accumulated wealth. I say that the proposal to tax profits on business is, at the best, but a temporary expedient

I think I can safely say that for some years to come, after the war ends, this country will have to resort for revenue to sources other than tariff, and we might as well, now as later, settle down to elaborate some comprehensive system of taxation which will afford this country the additional revenue required for its national needs, over and above that which we might naturally expect to accrue from tariff taxation.

In respect to the retroactive feature of the tax proposals, I would like to express a view, even if it be but a personal view, against the principle. I submit Mr. Speaker, that never, except in grave circumstances, and under grave necessities, should taxation proposals be retroactive. If, owing to lax administration by this Government, Canada or Great Britain was permitted to pay improper and unjust profits upon war supplies, it might be proper that we should seek restitution by the medium of taxation measures. That, however, is no defence of the principle of retroactive taxation, it is only a recognition of culpability on the part of the Government in the performance of their administrative duties. The Minister of Finance attempted the same thing in connection with his excise duties in 1914, and my recollection is that he absolutely failed to recover any substantial sum of revenue for removals from warehouses just prior to the imposition of the additional duties.

There is, further, this to say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this feature of the proposed taxation, that it will not, after all, produce very much revenue. You will find that the large transportation companies, and the large industrial organizations, for many months, probably for twelve months at least, after war was declared, were not earning profits, or if they were, they were very small profits. Perhaps they were borrowing capital in order to carry on their businesses. The only business concerns conducted with any possible hope of profit were the smaller business concerns of the country, and the retroactive feature of the tax proposals will, I predict, fall upon the smaller concerns; and in such cases the profits were long ago disbursed. Whatever be our necessities for revenue, I submit that it will be a grave injustice to compel payment of disbursed profits by these small organizations to the treasury under such conditions.

Further, I submit that these taxation proposals will disclose many inequalities which will operate unjustly, and will not properly distribute the burden of taxation as intended by the principle of the Bill. The capitalization of many of our large industrial and trading concerns to-day does not represent actual investment in capital or of earnings, but these concerns will be entitled to a profit of 7 per cent upon all watered stock before they become liable to the provisions of the tax bill. In many cases the larger corporations are paying no dividend upon their common stock. This proposal is in effect a premium upon improper methods of industrial finance and industrial inefficiency. It is not calculated to encourage fair capitalization methods. To show how it will operate, let us take the railways. It is probably the case that no railway company in Canada, outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, will be called upon to pay one dollar of taxes—I am not speaking of street railways —although it may be possible that by reason of the war the Canadian Northern, or the Grand Trunk may have earned very much more than did the Canadian Pacific railway from traffic directly traceable to the war. In the city of Ottawa there is a corporation, the E. B. Eddy Company, and I am told that they have a capitalization of $300,000 or $400,000. Their assets are enormous and their earning capacity very considerable. In that case the amount of taxation for which this company would be liable over the 7 per cent margin would necessarily be very great. Take the case of a corporation with a capitalization of $15,000,000, of which one-half, $7,500,000, represents the actual capital investment, the balance representing nothing but inflated capital; under the terms of the taxation proposal, $7,500,000 of this capital which did not represent any investment would call for a dividend of over $500,000 upon a 7 per cent basis before anything came to the revenues. You will realise how unjust this would appear to be when you consider how it would work out in the case of the E. B. Eddy Company, Limited.

Further, in this country, you will find many companies, partnerships, and private businesses, carried on where the capital investment may be small—below $50,000. It may happen that you will find one man in a community carrying on a line of business, who will be taxed because he has a capital investment of $50,000. In the same community he may have twelve competitors with a capital investment just slightly less, and they will escape taxation altogether. You may find one class of storekeeper liable

to taxation and many other of the same class will escape. You are bound to find so many inequalities of the character I have described that the proposals are open to very grave objections. We can well imagine the case of a man carrying on an industry with a capital investment of $50,000, the most of which will be in the form of buildings and land, he not requiring very much machinery, and in the same block you may have a man owning $1,000,000 of real estate, which represents a small original investment, the unearned increment being large, and still he is not taxed, whereas the man with the property worth $50,000 is taxed because it happens he is carrying on business of some kind.

War supplies and munitions as sources of revenue were much discussed by the public long before the Minister of Finance brought down his taxation measure. Personally, I have not been very much impressed with the validity of the popular view justifying such taxation. It was always suggestive to me of the idea that we are deliberately permitting those who manufacture or supply war material to the Canadian and British Governments to take an unjust profit. I have always thought, and I now think, it would be wiser, from the standpoint of the Treasury, instead of depending upon the doubtful method of restitution by ordinary taxation schemes, not to permit these unjust profits to go to the manufacturer of war supplies. There may be very good reasons for allowing a manufacturer of war supplies more than an ordinary profit. We all can conceive of good reasons why he would be entitled to more than seven per cent profit. I say allow them, in the first instance a just profit; do not allow a profit which is unjust and unfair, and then take it back from them by taxation routes. What is a fair profit should be easy to determine. When a manufacturer proceeds to fill a specified and guaranteed order he should be able to determine production costs very much more accurately than a person who manufactures for stock, and who must assume all the risks and responsibilities until that stock has been sold, marketed and paid for. It should be quite easy now to enter into contracts for the supply of war materials at prices which would be fair to the manufacturer and to Canada or the United Kingdom. Therefore, let us pay just prices for our war supplies, and let us not make a readjustment of prices by a system of taxation. In other words, good administration is much more profitable to the treasury than any taxation scheme the Minister of Finance can devise.

Another objection which I have to make against these taxation proposals is that they will militate against foreign and domestic investment in railway and industrial enterprises in Canada. Perhaps I may be unduly alarmed about this, but I fear such a consequence, and if so it is a serious one. Last year, outside of Government and war loans, we borrowed for railway and industrial purposes $60,000,000, and I imagine that practically every cent of it came from the United States. Many industrial companies in Canada will borrow additional capital for many years to come. I fear that this tax upon industrial profits, for a time at least, will prevent the flow of capital from the United States. Is this the time to discourage the investment of capital for industrial purposes? Is it the time to put a tax upon business profits? Our industrial enterprises in Canada will want further capital from abroad. Conditions are not to be found in Canada as they are in Great Britain, for instance, where most of the industrial institutions are old, have sufficient capital, and where a great majority of them have long established reserves. That is not the case in this country. There is this to be remembered too, that money invested in industrial enterprises naturally and properly looks for a greater return than seven per cent. There is too great a risk in industrial enterprises to satisfy capital with a return of seven per cent. Business concerns retain out of profits only what they require for the purpose of capital and the proper conduct of their business; the greater portion of the earnings of all industrial companies is disbursed in the form of dividends. Business without the necessary capital is not a desirable thing in this or any other country. If the two premises I have stated are correct, the profits which any business makes are paid out, and could therefore be taxed under any general income tax scheme. Besides, such a scheme would be a more equitable and just manner of taxation, and would not involve the invidious discriminations that the present proposals will likely entail.

There is this further to be said against the proposals of the minister: they do not reach the great bulk of inherited and invested wealth. They do not reach, for instance, the vast aggregation of secured investments in industrial enterprises, or property of one kind or another. I do submit that it is hardly fair that the holders of invested

wealth should escape taxation, as they will under the proposals of the minister. Many other classes are exempted, which appears invidious, though I cannot detain the House now in discussing them.

It might fairly be asked whether the taxation proposals of the Finance Minister might not be modified so as to be more just and less discriminatory. I should like to read to the House what the Finance Minister said on Tuesday last in regard to the taxation of industrial companies:

> Now, Mr. Speaker, there are in time of war many businesses and industries which for one reason or another are able to maintain profits above the average return to capital in time of peace.

—that is, in times of war, the Minister of Finance remarks, it is the good fortune of many business concerns to be able to maintain profits above the average of peace times. If it were these profits which the minister sought to tax, he has failed to accomplish that end by the terms of the resolution which he submitted to the House. It is perfectly obvious that there are scores of companies in this country which, during the war, have been making profits much in excess of peace time profits, and under the proposals of the Minister of Finance these profits will not be taxed. It is hard to understand why, in my province, for instance, the Nova Scotia Steel Company should pay a tax upon its profits, and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company probably escape, although it might make very considerable profits also. I could cite many probable instances of such unequalities. If the minister desired to secure a portion of the war-time profits which were above the average of the profits of peace time, there would be some equity in that, and I could understand it. That is the principle involved in a British Tax Bill introduced last year. There they tax a proportion of the profits made in war time which is above the average of peace time profits; and in order to procure the average peace time profits, they take a period of three years immediately preceding the war. I say it is unjust and discriminatory to tax the profits of a portion of the manufacturing and business concerns, and allow a great many others to escape taxation. The minister could easily prevent that by disregarding capitalization entirely, and taxing war time profits which are in excess of the average of peace time profits; there is a good deal to be said in favour of that principle.

There might, of course, be a great deal more said upon the taxation measures which the minister has submitted to the House, but they will doubtless be discussed by other hon. gentlemen of the House; and, furthermore, we shall have another opportunity of discussing them, and with greater satisfaction perhaps, in Committee of Ways and Means. It seems to me that, in view of the many weak principles which are obviously contained in the proposals of the Minister of Finance, in view of the many inequalities and discriminations, in view of the fact that hereafter in this country we shall for many years require more revenue than we can possibly secure from Customs and Excise, we might as well begin now and adopt a broad system of taxation based upon income, which would reach all persons in equitable proportions and without any discriminations. By such a method, we should reach the very business concerns which the minister is attempting to reach by his proposals, but in a much better and more just manner. The minister will probably find that next year he will have to invoke some system of direct income taxation. He has always objected that it was a system of taxation already employed by provinces and municipalities, and was not now open for federal purposes. Theoretically, the income tax is in operation in some of the provinces; but theoretically only. In my own province we have the income tax; but, practically speaking, there is no income taxation. I am informed that the revenue from income taxation in British Columbia is quite substantial, but taxation is taxation no matter under what name it is imposed. I am unable to perceive that there is very much difference between paying a federal tax on income, and a tax in equal amount known by some other name. I do not think the reasons which the minister urged last year, and to which he briefly referred again this year, are sound objections against the immediate imposition of a federal income tax.

In conclusion, let me say that Canada is participating in this great European war with a zeal which I think is quite remarkable. For us, this is not a war of aggression, nor a war of self preservation even; it is a war for the preservation of human liberties and civilization; and it is because we are fighting for such high ideals that we are willing to contribute most

generously of our resources. But while we are seeking to accomplish these very commendable ends, we must not recklessly dissipate our resources and revenue in doubtful and dubious expenditure. We should place national expenditure on a sound and businesslike basis, and upon a level and up to a standard which heretofore it has never reached. We are engaged in a contest of great magnitude which will undoubtedly entail heavy burdens upon ourselves and posterity. I think that we ought now to bear our just proportion. With the war over and the battle won, our future depends much on our ability to provide the capital that is necessary to proceed with the development of a large and new country, which in all human probability will be receiving but a very limited immigration for many years. Our ability to do that will largely depend on the financial course which we pursue to-day. Now, does the Government's financial attitude of the last few years, particularly in respect to expenditures, indicate a full appreciation of present circumstances and a proper perspective of the future? In all frankness, I think the Government have not realized their responsibilities in that regard, and that, I believe, will be the judgment of the future, if there be any doubt about it to-day.

It has been my purpose during my remarks, which have occupied far more time than I had intended, to impress upon Parliament these two points, namely: the desirability of national economy, the proper conservation of the revenues of the country, so as to limit the taxation which must be imposed upon the people, and at the same time the desirability of placing upon the people that volume of taxation which they can reasonably stand, in order that we may do our duty towards the cause for which we are fighting and towards posterity by paying a reasonable proportion of the war expenditures which are to-day being incurred and which are being added to the national debt of the country.

Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the moderate and somewhat careful review made by my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) of the proposals which were submitted by the Minister of Finance on Tuesday last. In some things that he has stated, I agree with him; as regards others, I would express a mild dissent. There may even be some points in reference to which I would be inclined to make a rather decided and emphatic protest, but that does not take away from my first remark that I have appreciated and been interested in his line of thought as expressed in his remarks on the Budget.

In the first place, and before going further, I think I may take it upon myself to say that, in so far as I can judge, the spirit with which the Canadian people have met the taxation proposals of last year and of this year is in eminent accord with the spirit in which they have supported enlistment with the colours, and the prosecution of the war. Taxation, whenever it comes, is apt to hit someone harder than another; it is a thing which most poeple would rather not encounter, but I am convinced that, in so far as the prosecution of this war is concerned, either by the active one hundred thousand, or the two hundred thousand, or the ultimate three or four hundred thousand that go to the front, the seven million five hundred thousand who remain at home are prepared to cheerfully pay what is necessary in order that the men at the front may do their work.

My hon. friend took up, first, the balance of trade, and he rather belittled the statement that the balance of trade in this country in the last two years, and notably in the last year, has been so changed that from a large adverse balance of trade, as shown by the imports and exports, we have to-day a large and gratifying favourable balance of trade. It does not depreciate that result in the least to cite the invisible imports and exports, and to endeavour to detract from the favourable nature of the present balance of trade by declaring that it does not express the true state of the exchanges between Canada and outside countries. These invisible imports and exports have been factors in these interchanges during every year that we have existed as a country; they have been increasing factors in these interchanges during the last fifteen or twenty years, and they have been rapidly increasing factors owing to causes which we all understand. But what we can feel thankful for is that, along with the existence of about equal factors of invisible imports and exports, the situation has so far improved that we have a favourable balance of the imports and exports as shown by the customs returns, and that we have reversed the old situation. Therefore, if there is

any advantage in a favourable balance of trade, that advantge has accrued to Canada during this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: That "if" is the point.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) made some remarks in reference to borrowings in Canada. I apprehend that he favours the people of Canada and the resources of Canada being called upon to give an equitable amount towards the present support of the war, and towards the diminution of that great borrowed sum that shall remain as a burden on our successors; but he seems to think that the loan which the Minister of Finance took from the people during the last few months was not advisable for two reasons: in the first place, because it perhaps went so far as to diminish the resources of the country which are required for carrying on our normal and present current business, and in the second place, because it was not a popular loan, and therefore took rather from those possessed of accumulated funds than from the general savings of the less wealthy classes. My hon. friend is scarcely correct in his views. If he will look into the particulars of that loan he will find that there were 25,000 subscribers, which is a very large percentage of the population of Canada. Another fact he will find is that if the original limit of the loan had been adhered to, the banks and the insurance companies, and the other large accumulators of the deposits of the people, would not have received a single scrip, because the loan would have all gone into the hands of the smaller investors. He will also find that of the $100,000,000 that were ultimately accepted, $75,000,000 came from the lesser investors and only $25,000,000 from the banks, the insurance companies, and the larger investors of accumulated funds. I think the desires of my hon. friend have really been met in that loan, and if not in that loan, they are met in the provision of the proposed legislation for the issue of debentures, in small sums, in order that the person who has one hundred dollars saved out of his earnings can put it into the war fund and thus help to carry on the activities of the war, and, at the same time, make an investment for himself which will bring a fair interest return. The prosecution of this plan with energy and discretion, throughout the length and breadth of Canada I regard as being an eminently fair way, and I hope it will prove a successful way, of interesting the people of small savings to take their part in the support of the war and at the same time to make wise provision for their own future.

My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) then spoke of the tabulation of expenditures. He believes that as the expenditures all come out of the one pocket, and all go to the carrying on of the affairs of the country through the different branches of administration, it is simply vexatious and unnecessary, and perhaps misleading as well, if all are not grouped under one head. If this were done, he says, we should have no disputes about surpluses and deficits. Well, I imagine that there was a reason why, in the denomination of expeditures in our early history, a system was inaugurated which made a distinction between capital expenditure and ordinary expenditure. This was a young country, with almost unlimited area, but with very sparse population. It was agreed on all hands that the men of the existing generation were not able to bear the burden of all the expense of opening up the country, and that posterity, which would enjoy the improvements that were made, might well be called upon to pay their proportion of the expense of making these improvements. The effect was to show a little in detail and to keep before the people what I do not think is a very bad thing looked at in that light—that there are differences of expenditure, that some expenditures are for the present day and others are for the future, and that it was fair and desirable that it should be known how these were distributed. Let us look at the war expenditure for example. The people of the future will read our public accounts, and they will find under our method of summation that in the years 1914, 1915, 1916—maybe 1917, we do not know—there was a vast increase in expenditure that the expenditure ran up from tens of millions of dollars to hundreds of millions of dollars, making, in the aggregate, many hundreds of millions. If there were but one summation of expenditure, the men of the future would scarcely know how to rate and judge the people of these three or four years in their expenditure of these extraordinary sums. I think it eminently fair to have such a summation of expenditures as shall show that in these years a sparsely populated country tackled the problem of defence of liberty and justice for themselves and for the Empire, and that the interests of posterity justified the expenditure of these hundreds of millions of dollars and the

entering of that expenditure as a capital charge upon the country. So far I am not disposed to quarrel with this distribution of expenditures under different heads. But I will tell you where the moth and the rust do corrupt in a distribution like that. You do not have always a well-defined line to guide you as to what is ordinary expenditure and what is capital expenditure. And, in the diversion and change from one side to the other that has taken place in the history of our country many and many a time, you are led into error, and there is great temptation to keep the ordinary expenditure down by transferring to the side of capital expenditure, what ought, in right and in conscience, to be put down on the side of ordinary expenditure. I say that, so far as normal capital expenditure and ordinary expenditure are now concerned in this country, I, for my own part, would welcome the merging of both into one. This country has passed through its main period of capital expenditure. It has passed through it with sparse population. It is now at a state of advancement where it might very well place in one column all its expenditure and so prevent our continual juggling and dispute as to surplus and expenditures, and proper surplus and improper surplus.

The hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean) went on to speak of the expenditure and debt. He says the expenditures go up and have been going up, that the debt is increasing and will increase. That is true, and if the debt increases the payments for interest must increase. But what would the hon. gentleman have? The people of this country have made their decision. There is no wavering in it from Pacific to Atlantic. There never was a case in which unanimity was more complete. The few small and discordant voices that we hear now and then protesting, only serve to bring out the remarkable completeness of that unanimity, and to call it more prominently to attention. The people of this country are behind this war, and underneath this war and the prosecution of it. Expenditures may go up, debt may increase, interest expenditures may grow larger, yet it is the determination of our people to make this expenditure, to bear this burden, until victory is won and the cause for which we are fighting is triumphant. But there never was a time in the history of Canada; there never was a time in the history of any Administration, when the call came more clearly to those administering the affairs of the country to be careful in the matter of expenditures; to direct them properly and to administer them with absolute honesty; to be strong enough and brave enough to refuse unnecessary demands. When the trenches call for munitions and supplies; when the blood of the country is flowing from its veins in the struggle to preserve its ideals and its liberties; when those who are at home are contributing with generous self-sacrifice, and without murmur or repining, I say that to me as a member of the Government, to you as supporters of the Government, and to you gentlemen opposite, as a part of the great body which represents the people of this Dominion, the call comes to cut off every unnecessary expenditure, to refuse every unnecessary demand. It is our business to administer the funds of the people with perfect economy and to devote ourselves in so far as human beings are capable of doing it, to the sole purpose of prosecuting this war to its successful and final conclusion.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) made some observations by way of criticism in respect to charges made by the different departments to war account. He thought that, in the case of small amounts, that practice was " small potatoes " so to speak, and that in the case of larger amounts it should be charged up to the different departments. What is desirable, it seems to me, if we are going to put war expenditure in a column by itself, is that we should know our total war expenditure, so that we may realize exactly what the country has to bear on account of it. It is a fair proposition that all amounts expended, whether by the Militia Department or by any other department, the purpose of which was immediately to support and carry on the war, should be charged to the war. Otherwise it is unfair to the departments, by way of comparison. Our statistics run from Confederation to the present time. We compare administrations, and we also compare, year after year, expenditures in the same administration. It would be unfair, I think, if large expenditures are made by the different departments on war account, to have these charged up to the department as ordinary and necessary

expenditures of the department. It would be unfair to the department, during the term of these expenditures, and it would disturb the comparison, and indeed make comparison absolutely valueless in respect to criticism of expenditures.

Take for instance the large amount which was debited to my department, $3,000,000. That was not an expenditure chargeable to the Department of Trade and Commerce in any way at all. The $3,000,000 odd were expended upon the million sacks of flour which we donated to the British Government. Whether that should have been charged to war expenditure, or whether it should have been charged to ordinary account, and made a gift outside of war expenditure is a question open to discussion; but the Government thought that as such an expenditure would never have been made but for the war and in support of the war, and was a gift to the British Government which had the heavy burden of the war on its shoulders, it should therefore be charged to war account. Therefore, I do not think that my hon. friend's criticisms with reference to the war accounts are maintainable. Again, if a number of employees of a department enlist and take part in the war, they have to be replaced. The department pays the salaries, or a portion of the salaries, of these officers while they are engaged in the war, and yet has to put other officials in their places and pay them while the enlisted employees are absent. It seems to me that it would not be fair to charge these salaries to the ordinary expenditure of the department, but that it would be fair to charge them to war account. However, we will let that go for what it is worth.

Then my hon. friend found fault with capital expenditures in a general way. He referred to capital expenditures amounting to some millions of dollars this year, which he thought might well be dispensed with, so that the money could be saved for the present. He mentioned one in particular, the Hudson Bay railway, and his opinion was that as that work was not under contract, the same argument could not be made with reference to it as could be made with reference to the Welland canal improvements, which are under contract and where therefore it was a difficult thing to break contracts, as damage would be involved if the contracts were delayed or broken. His information is not quite correct with reference to that work, however. The Hudson Bay railway is not being built by the Government by day work, or by its own gangs. The Hudson Bay railway contract, for the first 200 miles, was let by the late Government, and the contract for the other 200 miles was let directly after we came into power, in order to carry the railway up to the bay, so as to secure, as soon as possible, access to the waters of Hudson bay and to effect economies in respect to the necessary expenditures for docks and improvements. So that that contract is in the same position as others.

Mr. GRAHAM: How about the harbour works?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are carried on by the Government, and might be subject to suspension, but the Hudson Bay railway certainly is not. Again, my hon. friend spoke with reference to the character of expenditures generally and as to the evils of patronage, and he instanced a class of expenditures which he thought might well be dispensed with. These were the expenditures upon harbours and rivers, and upon improvements along the coasts, and my hon. friend's characterization with reference to these was, as I understood it, that they were not very important at the best, that many of them were questionable at least, and, during the present time, might well be dispensed with, and the money saved devoted to the war. He also declared that those expenditures were mainly on account of patronage, and he made a rather vehement attack upon patronage as a practice—I will not call it a principle—in the Dominion of Canada. I am disposed to be perfectly frank with respect to both of these points. I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend in some of his strictures upon both of them, but his protest would have had far greater weight with me, and with the House, and with the country, if the practice of himself and his party, when that party were in power, had accorded with his professions at the present moment. That, however, is not the kind of argument which slays an opponent entirely. He might plead what was pleaded by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) with reference to the argument which was offered here the other night as to the 50 cents imposition on flour that was to bonus the miller. My hon. friend from Assiniboia found no fault with that proposal some few years ago; therefore he supported it, and he rather intimated that he supported it then on principle. Now he opposes it equally of course on principle.

The same remark applies to the question of patronage. I said I was disposed to be perfectly frank on both of these points. There are expenditures now—there have been expenditures from Confederation up —which have been put into the Estimates, passed and carried out in the country, that were neither useful nor expedient. There is no doubt about that; it has been done under all Governments; it probably is being done under this Government. My opinion is that until a different method is pursued with respect to our expenditures upon public works, in their authorization, we shall be open to these troubles and to that criticism. My view is that every application for a public work, or a public improvement, should go before a competent board of engineers and business men, should be reported upon by them for the information of the Government, and that every application should have to show some cause of necessity, of public benefit, or of future usefulness before it was passed and put into the Estimates. I do not believe that we will ever get down to a proper system of husbanding the resources of our country, as we are bound to do as trustees for it, or of confining ourselves to useful and necessary public works until we get some machinery of that kind.

Now, as to patronage, I have been thirty-four years in public life; I have been a pretty close student of political parties and political history in this country, and I have simply this to say—I give it as my individual opinion—I have long felt it and I feel it now—that in the whole course of my political life I cannot point to a single instance where political patronage ever raised the status of the bench, ever promoted the efficiency of the Civil Service, ever helped to economy in administration or enhanced the status of public administrators, no matter what functions they performed, ever helped a member of Parliament in reality, or ever strengthened a Government in reality. On the contrary it almost always causes the dry rot and disintegration that break up government after government and party after party, and I wish now, in the white heat and light of this great contest and struggle and the self-sacrifice that we are called upon to make, that we might speak from the heart out, and make an agreement in this country between both parties, that hereafter patronage shall not be applied by political parties in the administration of our public services. Now, that is a frank admission. Some may say to me that I have no right to make it. I presume upon my grey beard and thirty-four years in public life, and I make that statement for what it is worth. I will just append to that one single sentence, and it is this: that if there is any laxity in the public virtue of this country to-day, if there is any canker of public corruption, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you can trace it to the baleful effect of political party patronage.

The hon. member (Mr. A. K. MacLean) then went on to discuss the Budget which was brought down for the raising of the necessary revenues for the prosecution of the war. Well, my hon. friend criticised, but it struck me that he was rather half-hearted in his criticism. He would not take the responsibility of saying that the proposals were utterly and absolutely without merit. That is very good from a member of the Opposition whose duty it is to criticise and who makes his criticism and speaks for his party therein. At the best, he says, it can only be justified as a temporary expedient. Very good; this is only a temporary expedient, as I understand it; it is limited to the autumn of 1917, or thereabouts. The criticism of my hon. friend does not hurt very much. He does not believe in its being retroactive. Well, that is open to debate, but what we were after were revenues for the prosecution of the war and what we tried to do was to make the getting of these revenues coeval, or contemporary, with the duration of the war. It may be that in particular instances hardships will be found. You cannot devise any system of taxation—I do not think you can—at least I have never known of one that was devised—that would work perfectly and absolutely scientifically and do no injustice to any man in the body politic. So, there may be details of this which may very well be ameliorated when we get into Committee of the Whole.

Another point my hon. friend made was that 7 per cent was not a sufficient dividend, a sufficient profit, to encourage industrial establishments. The resolution which has been brought down does not confine it to 7 per cent. It allows the industrial establishment to make eight, nine, ten, twelve, or whatever per cent it can, and it allows it to retain that profit up to seven per cent and then the Government shares in the proportion of one out of four over and above that. If 12 per cent is earned by an industrial

company and if it is necessary, or seems to be, in order to keep it up, that it shall get 7 per cent, it gets its 7 per cent. We then take the difference between 7 per cent and 12 per cent and we give the owner of that establishment three and three-quarters per cent while we take one and one-quarter per cent, so that he can have his 10 per cent of that industrial dividend.

My hon. friend explained to the House that he thought we should have taken income as the basis of our taxation. There is a great deal to be said in favour of income taxation. There is a good deal of truth in the statement that taxes have to be paid anyway and that, if they are cumulative as between the province and the Dominion, the man pays, you get from him and he does not pay more than he ought to pay. There is something to be said in favour of that, but I am of the opinion—maybe I am not correct—that in war time, and especially in these busy times that we are passing through, to go into a large scheme of well ordered taxation, to examine into every source of taxation and to come to conclusions as to what system should be adopted and put into force, is to undertake a task which requires more leisure than ministers have to give to it. Anyway, let us be thankful that the criticisms that have been made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) have been no more damaging or stronger than they have been. A democratic government is bound, and is always willing, to confer with the Opposition, and take its suggestions; and, if those suggestions are good, to embody them in its legislation. It is equally the duty of the Opposition to assist the Government with its best thought and its best conclusion, more especially in cases like this, where the cause to be sustained is so great, and where the burden of the support of that cause is also so heavy.

Other gentlemen on both sides of the House will have opportunities of speaking on the particular matter of my hon. friend's Budget in Committee of the Whole, where it will be exhaustively discussed in detail. Therefore, I do not intend to-night to occupy the attention of this House a single moment more along that line. I am going to ask the House if it will be indulgent enough to listen to me for a few moments on a subject that has not been very thoroughly discussed, which possibly has not been very well thought out or received any very great attention, but which is yet so closely interwoven with this great contest that we are now passing through that, although we do not want to divert the energies of Parliament or of the country from our main purpose of carrying on the war successfully, yet as prudent and thoughtful men we ought to be turning over in our minds, and getting ready for when the time comes for action along these lines; and that is, with reference to the economic situation, the business situation. I take it that, if we read history through from first to last, we shall find very few contests out of which spring such issues as those which hang upon and are to come out of the all-absorbing contest in which we are engaged. If that be true, it is the duty of Parliaments—and they are undertaking that duty—and it is the duty of this Parliament and of this country, while giving all the support in its power to the actual conduct of the war, at the same time to be thinking very deeply, very strongly, and very honestly upon the condition of things which we here in Canada, and the Empire with us, and the world taken as a whole, will have to face when the war is over and peace is assured. I take it that our great and supreme struggle—that which will try us most and tax our best powers—is yet ahead of us, has yet to be met, and will begin the day our soldiers are called off from war and the tremendous work of re-adjustment commences, in our Empire, in this country, with our Allies, and with the world. And it is just upon two or three phases of this matter that I am going to ask the House to listen to me; not because I think I shall teach them much, or that there will be anything new in what I shall say, but to stir up our minds by way of remembrance, that we may not forget these very weighty things which are just in front of us, and which we cannot avoid facing.

In the first place, I affirm that every man of us on each side of this House, and every citizen of this country, has one duty to perform; it is to put his thinking cap on, to examine into, and to understand those conditions which will confront us when this war has ceased; it is equally his duty to be candid and honest in his utterance of opinion, and give to the Commonwealth and to the Government the best that is in him of suggestion and of advice. I listened to the Finance Minister telling us the other day of the pleasant side of the past year's operations; of the large crops—a two year crop in one, thank Heaven for it—that have been gathered, of the good prices to the farmers for their

products, and for most other products as well. I am thankful, too, that as the war had to go on and munitions had to be made, it was so brought about that when other manufacturing industries languished we had an opportunity of making a large portion of the English munitions, thereby keeping our unemployed at work and paying them wages, and filling the gap which would have been an awkward one for us if we had not had that substitution. I am glad that things have been so brought about partly in the nature of things and partly by the good management of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, that this year we shall have a favourable balance of $200,000,000 as between our imports and exports. I am glad for all these things; they have buoyed Canada up; they have kept us in a position of vantage; they have made it possible for us to say that, in the by and large, no country stands to-day, after the first nineteen months of war, in a better and sounder position than does this country of ours. Now, admitting all that, I am bound to be honest with myself and to say that we should make a very great mistake if we took all this just at its face value, and concluded that to-morrow would be as to-day, only much more abundant; it would be a great mistake if we put away from us all care, all investigation, all fronting of what will be the real difficulties of the future, and thus when the supreme economic struggle comes find ourselves ill prepared, light-heartedly and without thorough examination entering into the greatest contest in our history, the greatest in the history of the world. That is what I say to myself, and that is what I tell the people with whom I come in contact. I wish the whole of Canada would enter upon the same line of investigation; possibly they are doing it; I think they are, more and more. We should be preparing ourselves for the time which is to come. The courage which comes from an inflated and mischievous optimism is but Dutch courage when you meet in the final struggle the difficulties you have to front. The courage that tells, and the courage that works out the solution, is the courage which a man has who faces every difficulty, who knows exactly what is ahead of him, and then with firm resolve and energy braced to its utmost, with the full power of mind and heart says: Yes, that is what I have to overcome, and by God's grace and my own steady work I will face it and overcome it. That is the kind of courage which I think tells. I have no love for the pessimist: the pessimist cuts right down into the hopes and confidence of the heart, and paralyses exertion and effort. I have not much more love for the over-optimist; an over-optimism I think may be more injurious to us than a tinge of pessimism. I meet with a great many people who use three common arguments. One man says to me—a friend of mine actually did say it to me: I have no compunctions or qualms of conscience, no fears at all as to the outcome of this great war in a financial and business and economic way; let the war go on; let the millions be spent; let the destruction all take place; there will be just as much money in the world at the end of it as there was in the beginning. Why, he says, take your manufacture of cotton and what is the system? Capital seeks out the raw material; gathers it together; transports it; puts it through the mill; brings it out into the finished product; sends it away to the customers and gets its pay, and then runs back again to the raw material and keeps up the round, dispensing its wages and its benefits to every class of labour concerned. So it is with the woollen industry and with every other great industry, and so it is with the manufacture of cartridges and cannon. Cartridges and cannon are being made now. Capital seeks out the raw material; brings it up to the state of perfection which is necessary for manufacturing the munition; puts it through that manufacture; carries it out to its completion; sells it to the war administration, and gets its money, and then goes back again hunting out raw material and keeping up the same round. What is the difference between the manufacture of cartridges and cannon and the manufacture of cottons and woollens? Do you not see that the money is all kept in the world and that it is all kept circulating? Why then do you have any qualms as to what is to take place when this war ceases? Well, I have just this to reply: That money is but an infinitesimal fraction of the wealth of the world, and, in so far as it is money, it is not worth shucks except for what it represents. Gold, silver, copper, bank-bills, letters of credit, cheques, anything that you please, are but the expedients by which the old and clumsy methods of barter have been replaced and by which we have adaptability of ex-

change and rapidity of distribution. The wealth, the capital of the world, is that which money represents; it is what is stored up from the earnings and savings of the people for countless generations, and the manufacture of cottons and woollens is characterized as a product by the ultimate beneficient use to which it is put. The product of cannon-making and cartridge-making is also characterized by the use to which it is put, and that is a destructive use, which destroys everything that it strikes, and not satisfied with material destruction, destroys the human actor, mind, body and spirit. Therefore when munitions of war are characterized and thought of in that way, whilst the manufacture of them is necessary in a war for principles and ideals, and whilst the war must be carried on to the finish, from an economic sense it is not true to say that the manufacture of munitions is just as beneficial to the country as the manufacture of cottons and wollens. That is where the world has to count up its almost unfathomable and incalculable loss, for there never has been a war in the history of the world where more of the wealth of the world, material and human, has been destroyed than in this great contest through which we are now going.

Another man says: Oh, you need not trouble yourself overmuch; the war will be over in a year or in eighteen months, and when peace comes, we shall have a period of unexampled prosperity. I would like to think so, but I cannot. Prosperity is based upon profitable production, on the demand for consumption and the power to pay the producer in order that the consumer may have within his hand to consume what the producer has produced. Looking at the matter in that light, we cannot look forward to the end of the war and comfort ourselves until that period on the false assumption that peace will bring with it unexampled prosperity.

One more point I must touch and it is this: in a paper which came into my office there was the following tremendous headline:

> Twelve to fifteen millions inhabitants in Canada three years after the war closes.

That is an exaggeration, but how mischievous it is to have that idea instilled into the minds of the people. It paralyzes any effort to secure what immigration we may be able to procure if the report is spread broadcast that willy-nilly we shall double our population in three years through immigration, and it prepares for us an immense disappointment and consequent depression when that period comes and our hopes are not realized. Immigration is needed. Let us ask ourselves the simple question: when war ends, where shall we get that immigration? Not from the millions of men who lie buried on the battlefields of the world; not from the other millions of maimed, blind, or bruised humanity that are able, it may be, to do something, but not to do the work that we require of well-grown and well-found immigrants in a country like ours. We shall not get them from Germany, because it will be many and many a long day before the German, coming from beyond the line of Belgium and Flanders, finds it to his comfort to seek a domicile in the Dominion of Canada. The Hun spirit has revealed itself too fully; the antipathies and hatreds, the loss of sympathy, the outcome of these feelings of humanity which rebel and revolt against the inhumanity of the Hun, will lie in the hearts of our people for this generation and will be taught to our descendants for generations to come. Not from that source then can we look for very much immigration into this country. I need not follow that argument further. Do not let us be deluded by any of these things, but let us put on our thinking caps and study where we can get the right kind of immigration. Let us invite those that we want; and then let us improve on the previous chapters of this country's history and train and direct, sympathize with, and help in their endeavours in the new country, those whom we bring from other lands to become cultivators in Canada.

The next point I wish to touch is this. I am not sure that we have not taken too restricted a view of this great conflict in which we are engaged. Is it or is it not true that we have been inclined to judge of this contest by the struggle of armies on land, fleets on the sea, submarines under water, and Zeppelins and aeroplanes above? Is it not possible that we have so regarded these phases of the struggle as to have lost sight of the fact that there is another side to it all? My belief is that there has been and long will be another side to this conflict. The war which broke out in flame and thunder on the first of August, 1914, was but one symptom of conditions which had long existed and which had long been nurtured. This contest began forty or fifty years ago when Prussia came out from the Mark of Brandenburg and began to impose itself upon the several states of Germany. The preludes were in Prussia's wars

against Denmark and Austria by which she added to her possessions. The first great act was in 1870, in that swift, marvellous campaign against France, when she subdued her enemy and took toll in money and territory. Thereafter was carried on the system of what I may call peaceful penetration which, carefully designed. elaborately organized and tirelessly prosecuted with infinite skill and tact, has been Germany's way of pushing forward to the ultimate dominion and hegemony of the world. Let me make that a little stronger. Germany lay contiguous to Belgium, to Holland, and to other countries on those seas, a dominating power, scientific, easily master in chemical research, pushing ahead in school, in college, and in university. In these and many other ways she began to penetrate the territories which lay nearest to her, and driving her lines farther and farther she at length ringed the world with her influence. Not until the war broke out did the revelation come to the minds of the people of other lands. Then, little by little, the eyes of the world's people opened—and are still opening and are not wide open yet—and they realized the relentless campaign along the line of peaceful penetration that Germany had waged against mankind with the intention of ultimately dominating the economic and political situation of the world. That economic war has been going on, and is still going on, and when this war of battalions and fleets is ended that economic war will still be continued. When you have finished with the military part of it you commence with the economic part, which must be prosecuted to its fulfilment.

Let me give you one or two instances. Germany spread herself into East, West, and Central Africa, along the borders of friendly countries. And every hour that she so spread herself she was preparing treason and revolt for those friendly countries. When the rebellion took place in South Africa, after the outbreak of this war, we found that treason had been hatched, that revolt had been consummated by the German authorities in Africa. It was found that throughout the Pacific in island after island there were the bases of Germany's operations—the wireless stations of the Germans, the pervasive agencies of the Germans. Theologically, scientifically, socially, politically, financially, every advantage that they could take in this way of peaceful penetration they had taken, until their influence ringed the world, strong and sinister. And this has been to them in this great contest of incalculable value as a support and help. Let me give you another instance. In 1914 the British Association for the Advancement of Science held its great world-meeting in Australia. To that meeting four prominent German professors were sent. They came as the accredited delegations of great scientific associations, and as such they took part in the proceedings. The association's meetings ended. War broke out. These four men, accredited in that way, made representations to the Australian Government that they were scientists who had come to take part in this great association and ought to be given passports to their homes. That looked reasonable to an unsuspecting people, and the Australians gave them the asked-for liberty. Two of them availed themselves of that liberty and left very quickly. The others wanted to stay longer and raised some cavil as to the time. Suspicion was engendered; the baggage and possessions of these two men were seized and it was found that they were absolutely German spies, that they had then in their possession military maps of all points of strategy and advantage in Australia. Immediately, the Australian authorities sought to apprehend the two who had left. One got away through Java, but the other was caught up with by a British cruiser, and when his baggage was examined it was found that he had the complete paraphernalia of the spying work he had done in Australia. These are two instances which show you the relentless, far-seeing, far-reaching and effective way in which this work of peaceful penetration on economic and political lines was carried on.

In things commercial and financial they acted similarly, until they acquired abnormal powers in different countries, and used them for the advancement of their own ends. To-day it is well understood in all the allied countries that this economic warfare will have to be finished as well as the warfare upon land and sea. To-day France is taking action, making investigation, laying plans. What is the first thing that will take place? Old treaties have gone; new treaties and new tariffs will have to be made. In Russia, Italy and Great Britain preparation is being made on the same lines. Do you suppose that Belgium, whose industries have been destroyed by the war, will be disposed to allow German trade to come uninterrupt-

edly, as formerly, into her country, to complete the ruin which the armies of Germany have begun within her bounds? No, that will not take place in Belgium; nor will it take place in France, in Russia, in any country of the Allies. So that, with the war on land and sea finished, there commences at once an economic campaign to develop within the allied powers what is best within them, first, for their own respective countries, then for the Allies in general, then for the neutral world; and to protect themselves against the economic onslaughts of the Germans of the future.

My next point is this: When the war is finished, we shall face a new world; or, rather, we shall face an old world under very greatly changed conditions. When the recall is sounded and the armies stop their fighting; when the white-winged dove of peace poises over the blood-drenched plains of Flanders, of Europe and of the world, there will have to be faced a set of conditions demanding closest examination and the most earnest thought of all the peoples who have been engaged in this war. What changes will have been wrought, speaking from a territorial and a national standpoint? If we are victorious, as we intend to be, we shall join in the world's work with one most important element largely eliminated. The Germany of that time will not be the Germany of 1912, 1913 and 1914. She will be a Germany chastened and restricted. She will be a Germany without a single possession in the world outside of her own limits. She will be a Germany with no outside posts of observation, no naval bases, no wireless stations, no system of spies and agencies to sow sedition, to raise rebellion and to give information to the country at home. She will be a Germany with a navy depleted, with a commercial tonnage dislocated and dispersed. She will be a Germany separated from business with the whole outside world, having arrayed against her loss of sympathy, positive hatreds and hostile tariffs, as potent and as powerful as the guns of the
9 p.m. Allies have been against her material forces by land and by sea. That will make a tremendous difference in the world. In Belgium, in Poland, in the Balkan States, and in all the countries of the Allies, the old treaties will have gone and new arrangements will have to be made. We shall have to face a set of conditions absolutely different from those that were encountered at the beginning of the war.

[Sir George Foster.]

But that is not the main change that we shall perceive. Economic conditions will be vastly altered. Up to March 31 of this year £5,200,000,000 will have been expended by the Entente Allies in the war. On the part of the Central Powers, £3,370,000,000, will have been expended. These sums amount to the amazing, incomprehensible total of $43,000,000,000. What does this fact signify to us? Mostly these large sums are in the form of debt which will have to be borne by these nations and by the world for generations yet to come. But that is only a small part of this aspect of the war. How many millions of human beings, the best of the physical and mental power of the peoples engaged in this terrible war, have been laid low and abstracted entirely from the producing power of the world? How many millions have been diverted from productive pursuits during these two or three years and debarred from adding anything to the wealth of the world or re-enforcing its earnings or its savings? What arithmetic is capable of calculating the value of the destruction of capital and property that has taken place during this war, all of which will have to be replaced? Whether it be in respect of the capital or the working power of the world; whether it be in connection with matters educational, moral or spiritual, the extent of the reconstruction that will have to take place almost passes the comprehension of man. It is so vast that we sit down before it, paralysed and confused in the attempt to get at its real sigificance. But that is not all. Look at the wreckage of humanity that must be taken care of: the pensions for soldiers, the hospitals for their treatment and cure, the homes in which they shall have to be treated and trained. Look at that still greater expense in the private homes of those who have been maimed and hurt in the war, which though a proud burden—a burden which the mingling of heroism and love helps to make supportable—is no less an economic burden. Then there is the rebuilding and rehabilitation of all that has been destroyed in the terrible conflagation of war. Last, but by no means least, there is the depleted physical, moral and mental force of the world which every great war, and this more than any other, inevitably leaves behind it. How many generations will pass before we recover this inestimable loss! These are the conditions which we shall have to face. One man says: Oh, as soon as peace comes we shall go about our businesses as usual. Shall we? There is a period of readjustment,

when the warring powers come to the point when they feel that it is best to stop war and to confer about the terms of peace. What happens then? An armistice is agreed upon, but an armistice as long as it lasts, is war in all its expenditure, except the loss of human life and of shrapnel and shell in the prosecution of active hostilities. The whole paraphernalia, men, munitions and all the great train of subsidiary services, is yet in the field, and must be kept there, for no one knows when an armistice may be ended by disagreement amongst the powers that are parties to it, and when hostilities may commence anew. Suppose that the armistice results in negotiations for peace. Then follows a long period of negotiation, a long period of the demobilization of troops, of millions of men, of incalculable tons of material that have to be gathered up from all the war fields of the world. There are millions of prisoners in every country engaged in the war to be carried and deposited in the country from whence they came. All these things will take long periods of time. International balances arrested by the war will have to be settled; the question of exchanges will have to be met. The long and somewhat tedious process of leading countries, which have made extraordinary paper issues, back to the gold basis, with all the disturbance that takes place meantime, will have to be faced.

Summing these certainties up, thoughtful men say that the year which comes with the introduction of conferences for peace will possibly be the most strenuous, the most dangerous, and the most fatal year of the whole period from a business point of view. So, we cannot look for anything less than those burdens, and those dislocations, and those difficulties of trade. We must make up our minds to face them, and we must frame measures which will enable us to face them. Then there will be the social changes that have taken place. In this war prince and peasant, rich and poor, have fought side by side, have eaten side by side, and have died side by side. Masses and classes have coalesced; naked, virile manhood has been the basis of valuation; old prejudices and rancours have passed away; old shibboleths of class distinctions have been forgotten, and you will have a different world in Great Britain, and in almost every other country that is engaged in this war, because of changes in social conditions.

Then there will be the settlement of lands, and the readjustment of methods of production. After the lessons that have been learned in regard to the mobilization of forces, economic and otherwise, it can hardly be expected that when peace comes those lessons will not be turned to advantage in the economic field. So we have before us a period of readjustment, of unrest, of dislocation, which we have to face and worry through as best we can, and we will face and worry through it all the better if we have our plans prepared beforehand. One last word. I think I have already tired the House too much.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have learned two lessons in this war. We have learned the lesson of unpreparedness in military matters. When one begins to think of what the British Empire means, of what its flag floats over, of what its boundaries encircle—one-quarter of the inhabitants of the world, wards without citizenship, dominions which are equal in citizenship, dependencies spread over the whole universe—one begins to realize the awful responsibility of the trusteeship of the British Government over that immense area, filled with such precious possibilities, and crowded with such mighty interests. To-day, and for nineteen months past, Britain has been mourning the fact that she was unprepared for the defence of those sterling and incalculably vital interests. That lesson of unpreparedness has been learned by every one of the Allies. The only country which did not have to learn it was Germany herself; she was not guilty of unpreparedness, so far as this war is concerned. She had prepared her weapons and chosen her time.

Another lesson of incalculable value that has been learned is the lesson of co-ordination and co-operation of all the parts of the British Empire, co-operation and co-ordination on the battlefield, at sea and on land; co-ordination and co-operation in the matter of supplies, of raw material, and of everything which tended towards the embarrassment of the enemy, and towards the support of Britain and her Allies. The ordeal of war through which we have passed and are passing has taught us that it is possible for an Empire so vast and stupendous as the British Empire to co-ordinate and co-operate, each part with

every other, towards the general good and general benefit. That is a lesson of incalculable value, and that lesson will be turned to account in the economic field, as well as in the field of military and naval exploits.

One word, not by way of full description, but simply to keep before our minds what is at present going on. The first thing that will take place will be a revision of the treaties and tariffs which govern trade. The old treaties have passed away with the war. The treaty of Frankfort, concluded after the Franco-German war, bound France, in some respects, hand and foot to German commerce and German trade. In 1869 the imports of Great Britain into France were 47 per cent of the total imports. The Frankfort treaty intervened, and in 1913 the imports of Great Britain into France had dwindled to 13 per cent. The commercial treaties and commercial methods of Germany won their way into Austria, into Russia, into Italy, and into the Balkans, and pressed upon every co-terminous country. That condition has passed away. The slate is clean, and the Allies, which have mingled their blood in the contest to defeat the Hun in his attempt to usurp the place of dominator and master of the world, will be disposed to unite their economic forces in order to protect their own peoples. And the last and least source of supply for manufactured goods, and the last and least point of destination for our raw materials—I am not a prophet, but I take it upon myself to hazard the conjecture—will be Germany until the German people have renounced their mad, wild dream of the superman, of the superstate, of the superrace, which has been their ideal and their delusion through this war.

The British Empire, I think, will get itself together. Australia woke up early after the war broke out, and, in its desire to make use of its metals, found that the German metal trust had its strong hand around every metal-producing industry in Australia, and had these industries tied up with long contracts. The Australian Parliament took its power into its own hands, broke off that iron grip, and to-day they are manufacturing and utilizing their own metals. The raw materials of the world were largely corralled by the Germans; German syndicates, German financiers, German commercial houses, had their hands upon much and sought control of all. That condition will never occur again. The Empire, I think, will see that its own raw materials, in all parts of the Empire, are utilized and developed, first, for the purposes of the Empire, and, afterwards, for the purposes of its Allies and of the neutral nations of the world. And so in this wise, without one single idea of the individuality, freedom, and independence of the overseas dominions being relinquished or trenched upon, the necessities and the example of the war will have brought about such a sentiment and blazoned such a path that it will be possible for the Empire to mobilize its economic forces for the good of all its parts, and the British Empire as a whole be able to join a league of good will with its Allies for their mutual advantage and development.

Canada herself must wake up and in many ways seek to strengthen her position. We must strive as far as possible to eliminate all waste, to stimulate thrift and combine our savings for investments which beside contributing to the support of the war may at the same time make a profitable investment for the people themselves.

We must also learn to practice economy in all expenditures, public or private, to improve the production of the country, both in quality and in quantity, to invite and direct immigration on sound and discriminating principles, and to reinforce efficiency in production by technical education and thus combine as far as possible the factory and the laboratory.

Canada herself has learned something from this war. Canada to-day is a self-reliant country many degrees higher than when this war commenced. Somehow or other, since we have put our shoulders under the Empire's burdens, we have developed greater confidence and greater strength. The sacrifices that we have made have melted out many of our parochial trivialities and unimportant differences, our minds work in an atmosphere of wider and broader problems of Empire possibilities in which Canada shall share as a part of the Empire, within it and of it. To-day the lesson of the struggle and of its sacrifice is finding its way into, and imprinting itself upon, every Canadian heart, and making of us a more self-reliant and resolute people. What we have done is an earnest of what we may do. But the thing that we especially need to do now in this country is to throw old shibboleths aside, forget—many of us—the theories and prejudices of our earlier days, face conditions as they are in this country, and work together, both parties and all the people, for a sane and systematic mobiliza-

tion of the best products and the best forces of Canada which in the future shall give us prosperity, development, peace, and happiness.

I am glad, Sir, to-night that Canada stands high and proud in the galaxy of nations and dependencies that make up the British Empire. Sacrifices have been made and burdens taken up for liberty, for justice, and for the best ideals of the world. Hereafter Canadians will not let fall so lightly and unthinkingly from their tongues the words justice and liberty, liberty and justice. They will come from the hearts of Canadians henceforth, and I doubt not that in our civic duties, in our provincial duties, in our Dominion duties, in our Empire duties, we will come to the work with purified hearts and enlightened minds, with higher resolves and with a great purpose, determined to make of ourselves citizens worthy of the reputation that our soldiers have made for us at the front, worthy of the reputation that our mothers, our sisters and our daughters have made for us here at the home base of operations, and worthy of the place that we have aspired to take as one of the potent, virile forces in the progress and development of the world.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a thoughtful speech characterized by broad vision and the expression of high ideals with which I desire to associate myself. We are told that the world is undergoing a change. I think that, not only is the world undergoing a change, but that, as individuals, many of us are undergoing changes too. I am not making that observation for the purpose of applying it to my hon. friend (Sir George Foster), because I realize that since this war commenced I have changed my viewpoint on many subjects. We are developing the highest ideals of citizenship, and out of this war will come a better Canada, a better Empire, and, I hope, a better world.

With what the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said about the war, and about the position that Canada should take in connection with it, I am in accord. I think our entire energy, our every thought, should be devoted to the winning of this war and that there should be the most active participation of Canada in the war with respect to both resources and men. We must abandon the petty things of partisanship, many of the things about which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has spoken. I come from a section of country inhabited by people who are from other lands, but who have taken this war seriously from the moment it was declared. You know the position that the province of Alberta has taken in the matter of recruiting, you know of its contributions to patriotic causes. In the section of Alberta from which I come there is a very large American population. They may not have heard the call to service at the beginning of the war, but they are hearing it as the days go by. They realize that the call is not only to Canadians born in Canada, but to Canadians of every class, because this war represents a fight for great principles; principles which are dear to the American people, and to-day they are prepared to do their part by contributing their money to patriotic causes, and by sacrificing their lives if need be. I should like to convey to the House the feeling which exists in the section of Canada from which I come. I know there has been a fear in Eastern Canada of recent years that the new population might not represent the best type of British citizenship, might not strive for those great ideals of British citizenship which are possessed by the Canadian people. Let me tell any member of this House who had doubts in that regard in the past, that he can put aside his doubts and be satisfied as to the character of our new western citizens. I have become intimately acquainted with that citizenship through addressing meetings on behalf of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. In the southern part of Alberta in 1914 there was, as everybody knows, a drought; people were almost without means of livelihood. I am thinking now of a constituency in the local legislature known as Taber; this constituency was drought stricken in 1914. When we met in Calgary to allot the amount to be raised from the province for the Canadian Patriotic Fund, we thought Taber would not raise more than $3,500. It must be remembered that a seat in the Alberta Legislature is sparsely populated, and not to be compared with a seat in the legislature of Ontario or Quebec: the number of people are few, and the territory is large. The southern part of the province of Alberta had been allotted $250,000, and we thought Taber was not in a position to raise more than $3,500. Mr. Speaker, that constituency, which had to come to the Government of Canada in 1914 for assistance, raised over $10,000 for the Patriotic Fund. That is evidence of the generosity of our

people; it is evidence not only of their generosity, but of their belief in the righteous cause for which Canada and the Allies are fighting.

I am sure the Minister of Finance will be anxious to learn the view of the people of that section of the country in regard to war taxation. The people there are prepared to bear their share of the burdens of this war, but they want the taxation placed upon the people who can bear it best, and I would say to the Minister of Finance that in fixing the taxation he should keep that fact in mind. In many respects I am in accord with the minister's Budget proposals this year. They can be criticised; I think he should have gone further and reached some people of great wealth who will not be reached under the present proposals. In my judgment that could only be done by an income tax. I have in mind communities in the province of Ontario, in which I once lived, where men of great wealth are not interested in business concerns of any kind; they are simply individuals of great wealth, and their wealth is placed in property. I know of one city in Ontario where in my time nearly every business block in the community was owned by two men. I believe that these wealthy men should be reached; they should be made to bear their share of the cost of this war. The feeling of the people, as I have interpreted it, is that the concerns engaged in the manufacture of munitions should be compelled to pay much more than they are being asked to pay under this taxation. I do not believe that any concern in this country should be allowed to make money out of this war, and I would have supported the Finance Minister in proposing that the Government take all profits over seven per cent; that is sufficient profit for a firm to make out of this war. No man should get rich out of this war. Some members of this House may have read an article in the Saturday Evening Post a few weeks ago, telling of the new war millionaires in the United States, of their spendthrift habits, of the waste of their new-gained riches, riches made out of this war. As I read that article I felt I should hate to see such men exist in Canada. But they will exist; perhaps they are existing at the present time. Many of these men who are making money out of the war do not seem to treat the war seriously, or even life itself.

I want to refer for a moment to the tariff changes. There is one change which seriously affects the Prairie Provinces. We in the province of Alberta are next door to British Columbia, and are anxious to have our neighbouring province develop. The Budget places a duty on apples. The Minister of Finance, in discussing the question of free wheat the other day, spoke of the national interest; he said that in the national interests he could not see that it was statesmanlike or the part of wisdom to place wheat upon the free list; it would simply benefit the farmers of three Prairie Provinces, and injure other interests of this Dominion. In this tariff I must confess that he has abandoned that idea. He has imposed an increased duty upon apples, not in the national interests, but simply in the interests of one of the provinces of this Dominion, at the expense of all the other provinces. I want to emphasize this point, because at the present time fruit in the Prairie Provinces is a luxury; it is already expensive to buy, and the cost is going to be largely increased by this duty; and the consumers of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba are those who will suffer. I do not want to introduce partisanship into my remarks, but I am inclined to think that the Minister of Finance, when he imposed this duty, was thinking not of the national interests, but of certain other interests which are very important in the province of British Columbia at the present time. There is a political interest in the province of British Columbia, and I have no doubt it was felt that this increase in the duty on apples would be very helpful during the coming months to the party of which my hon. friend is a member. But my hon. friend must not forget that in imposing this tax for the purpose of developing the apple industry of British Columbia, he is laying a fresh burden upon the people of the Prairie Provinces, and they have burdens enough to bear at the present time. We have been advised by the Prime Minister, and by others throughout this Dominion, to practise economy as individuals. The Minister of Finance also urged the same thing in his Budget speech the other day. I presume that he also meant that we should practise economy in the administration of the affairs of Canada. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) made mention of patronage to-night, and expressed himself as he believed. He expressed a view which I have held for a considerable length of time. I have even come to the conclusion that I

would much rather remain in Opposition than become a supporter of a Government and have to handle patronage. During the war at all events, I think the entire patronage system should be wiped out of this country, for it means that the money of the people of this country is being wasted. I know that, and I am going to be candid about it. I hope that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will induce the members of the Government to put into effect the ideas which he expressed in his speech to-night. The people of Canada are serious at this time. They may not have paid much attention to patronage in the past, but they are paying attention to it now. While I have a great deal of admiration for the Minister of Milita and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) I disagree with the statement he made in this House the other day that politics have nothing whatever to do with the administration of the affairs of his department. I say that politics have to do with the administration of that department; they have to do with the administration of the affairs of that department in my own city. Men of all parties are subscribing to patriotic causes and paying their war taxes; but when it comes to provisioning the soldiers or doing anything in connection with the militia of this country, a limitation is set to the men who shall have a right to tender for the supply of the articles required. I do not know whether that is the case throughout the Dominion, but it is the case in my own city.

Some hon. MEMBERS: It is the case throughout Canada.

Mr. BUCHANAN: If the Government wants to economize, it must give every one an opportunity of tendering for the furnishing of every supply to our troops. In that way we will get a business administration, and we will be able to get goods at a competitive price. There is at present a growing feeling of dissatisfaction amongst our people over the administration of patronage. I am not expressing my views on this point simply because the party to which I am opposed is in power; I believe that the system of patronage is a wasteful and unfair method and that it does not tend to business administration. The Minister of Finance was formerly engaged in business, and I am satisfied that he could not have retained his position in the company with which he was engaged if he had practised in the conduct of their business the same methods as we practise in the administration of the affairs of this country under the patronage system as I am acquainted with it.

I desire to emphasize a few points in connection with agriculture, which is the basic industry of this country. While our minds are at the present time largely centred on the war and the successful issue of the war, we must not forget to conduct the affairs of Canada so that our resources may be benefited and developed. Just now there is not complete satisfaction, at any rate amongst the agriculturists of western Canada, with the condition of affairs. Last fall we had in the western provinces the greatest crop in our history, and it must be remembered that a great proportion of that crop is still in those provinces. I have here the figures, given by an official of the United Farmers, for the southern part of the province of Alberta. He makes the statement that up to the present time 17,000,000 bushels of wheat have been shipped out of southern Alberta; 5,000,000 bushels are still in the elevators, and from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 bushels are still in the possession of the farmers. That wheat is in the possession of the farmers because, although the price is high, they cannot sell it for the reason that the elevators are full and they have no place in which to store it. There is also a congestion on the railroad lines in Alberta at the present time. In my constituency, on the Goose Lake branch of the Canadian Northern railway, which covers the territory from the Red Deer river east to the Saskatchewan boundary, up to the beginning of this year only slightly over 2,000,000 had been shipped out of a crop of over 15,000,000. Hon. members are aware that the farmers of that section of the country have been in more or less straitened circumstances for the past two or three years. This crop was a God-send to them, and they wanted to raise the money as soon as possible in order to meet their obligations, for which they were being pressed on every hand, but they cannot meet them because they cannot dispose of their wheat. Now, I know that the Government has had great responsibility since this war commenced, but I feel that it has lacked initiative in dealing with this crop situation. The members of the Government must have realized early in the summer that western Canada was to have a great crop, because the evidences were all there, but the preparation made was not sufficient; in fact,

we are suffering to-day from as great a blockade as we have ever suffered from in the past.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the position taken by the Australian Government in handling the marketing of wheat in a definite manner; and as I understand it, every farmer in the Commonwealth of Australia is in a position to-day, through the action of the Government, to secure an advance upon his crop, no matter whether it leaves the Commonwealth of Australia or not. I first came across the position taken by the Commonwealth of Australia in a report made to the Department of Trade and Commerce by Mr. Ross, the Canadian Commissioner in Australia. I do not want to read the whole of this article but I feel that the House is entitled to know the position taken by Australia on this important matter. The article, which is taken from the Monetary Times, is in part as follows:

A memorandum in connection with the wheat marketing scheme circulated with the Bill introduced in the Victoria Australia Parliament, to give effect to the scheme, is as follows:

The Government of the Commonwealth, and the Government of the four wheat-exporting states—New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia—have agreed upon the outlines of a scheme for marketing the wheat harvest of 1915-16.

The objective of the scheme is to secure to wheat growers in the states concerned equal individual opportunity of marketing their crops at "London parity" on the basis of a proportionately equal participation in the limited ocean freight available.

Each state undertakes to purchase or obtain control for realization from owners of wheat grown within or without its borders, such wheat as the owners desire to sell or to have sold at a price dependent on the ultimate f.o.b. average values at port of shipment after allowances have been made for dockages, railway freights, handling charges, and other incidental expenses. Owners are entitled to certificates authorizing payment by the banks, of advances on account of the final realization. (In Victoria this advance is two shillings sixpence per bushel.) The balance of the realization is to be paid not later than fourteen days from the closing up of the scheme. If practicable a further advance will be made as early as possible prior to final settlement.

Each state undertakes the work of receiving for purchase or for realization wheat from owners within or without its borders, and of weighing, storing, insuring, and transporting to ship's side and delivering to ship's slings. Each state will ship wheat for overseas sale as may be directed by the Australian Wheat Board which will allot charters to each state on the basis of the available exportable surplus of grain in each state.

Agents appointed in Victoria to handle wheat shipped, will be allowed for the complete work not more than one half-penny per bushel plus reasonable handling expenses, and in no case and under no circumstances are the total handling charges to exceed 3¼d. per bushel. For wheat not shipped the charges will be proportionately reduced for the benefit of the pool.

The Australian Wheat Board, consisting of the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Ministers of Agriculture of the states concerned is to control and direct all overseas sales of grain, and from time to time to fix the price at which grain may be sold by the states to millers for gristing for local consumption. The functions of the board will be discharged by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Ministers of Agriculture for the four wheat-growing states. The expenses of the board are to be ultimately met by the states in the proportions of the total wheat purchased by each.

The Australian Wheat Board will appoint, and may cancel the appointment of agents for sale of cargoes and parcels for export sales.

The Commonwealth of Australia did not confine its efforts within the limits of the Commonwealth, but provided for the handling of the wheat when it should reach the Old Country. Here is the statement:

London board, consisting of the High Commissioner and the agents-general of the several states are to be appointed to supervise the sales of cargoes and parcels in Europe.

On despatch of cargoes and parcels the customary complete shipping documents are to be handed by the Australian Wheat Board to the clearing bank of the state concerned, so that the banks may collect the net proceeds of the sale.

Interest at the rate of five per cent per annum is to be charged by the banks on the balances owing them from time to time. Should the owner not desire to draw his advance of 2 shillings 6 pence per bushel, he may arrange to draw interest at the rate of four per cent and the certificate, with accrued interest, will be payable on presentation. Details of the conduct of the banking business of each state are to be arranged with the banks.

The Commonwealth guarantees to the banks that each state will meet its financial obligations to the banks by December 31, 1916, and that the Commonwealth will promptly pay any shortage. Each state guarantees to refund promptly to the Commonwealth with interest any amount made good to the banks for such states' account.

The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia realized the situation in a country which has neither the acreage nor the crop of Canada, realized it early and dealt with it systematically so as to benefit the farmers of that country by putting them equally in a position to realize upon their crop. That is what we need at this time in Canada. For there are thousands upon thousands of farmers who have not been able to dispose of any of their grain, and consequently have not been able to raise any money whatever to pay their debts or meet ordinary farm expenses.

The Minister of Finance gave us some indication that he had in view a system of

rural credits. Of course, the lines of that system were not given. Rural credits concern every farmer in the Western Provinces. I read a statement by the Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba, that the farmers of Ontario were paying an average rate of interest of 5½ per cent while the farmers of Western Canada were paying an average rate of 9 per cent. As long as such a condition exists there will be a demand from our farmers for some alleviation. They are demanding and will continue to demand some change in our banking system. The farmer wants to be in a position to secure small short-term loans. He is not in that position at this time. True, the amendment to the Bank Act will assist in a small way. But the farmer wants that assistance in a large way. We cannot expect a great movement of immigration into the Western Provinces until this situation is relieved. We may talk about people coming to Canada after the war, we may imagine the thousands that will come, but they will not come until conditions are different in this country from what they are to-day. We must have a change in our banking system, and we must have larger markets for the products of our western farmers. We have been talking of larger markets for many years in this House, and I had hoped that by this time the Government and every member of the House would have realized the absolute necessity for a change. Consider especially the crop we had last year. Where is it to go, if we do not get larger markets? You know, Mr. Speaker, that the position taken in regard to the Grain Growers of the three western provinces is that they are bodies of agitators. That is true in a sense. But these bodies are not made up of one political party. In almost every case the majority of our farmers in the West are independent in their views on political questions, and what they express in associations like the United Farmers of Alberta is the opinion of the farmers, generally speaking, throughout the western provinces. I question whether members of this House realize the extent of this organization—that it embraces practically every man upon the farms in these provinces. And they represent farmers of great intelligence. If I could place in this House the farmers who take part in the meetings of the United Farmers of Alberta, you would find them displaying debating powers quite equal to those of most of the members of this House. They are able men, thinking men, and they know what they are talking about. I have before me the presidential address delivered at the annual meeting of the United Farmers of Alberta, within the last month, and I would like to read a part of it. It is written in free and easy style, but it tells exactly what the farmers of Alberta are thinking:

> Oh, Mr. Borden, we give you full credit for all the good things that you have done or are doing, we know that at the present time responsibility rests heavy upon your shoulders and that you are trying hard to do the right thing for the Empire, but when your Government tell us that you are giving us a square deal on this marketing proposition, we know that you are not sincere, and we know that you are controlled by powers that be "that are not working for the best interests of the people." We know that you are aware that the Canadian farmer is paying from 35 to 50 per cent more than the American farmer for his machinery. We know that you are aware that he is paying 30 to 50 per cent more for his gasolene and many other of his necessities. And we know that you are aware that American markets are better than our markets, that they are open to us if we want them, and yet you sit supinely back and fail to lift a hand to remedy the wrong.

That was the view expressed by the president in his address to the United Farmers of Alberta, a gathering, I presume, of seven or eight hundred farmers, delegates from unions throughout that country. These men are not Grits, neither are they Tories; they are farmers. The longer this Government delays meeting the needs of these farmers the longer they postpone the absolute unity of Canada. Let me speak plainly: the longer you delay the settlement of these problems the greater the opportunity you give for the creation of dissension amongst the people of that country. We do not want that condition; I do not want it, nor do I want to preach it; I want to avoid it. Nevertheless, it exists, not as the doctrine of politicians, but as the view of the farmers themselves. I quote further from this address:

> You know that Canada's railroad and urban facilities are built to accommodate a population of 30,000,000 instead of 8,000,000 people, and you know that these people must come to the farms, and you know that these people will not come unless the present farming community are made prosperous; and yet you are inactive on our behalf. How can you expect us to be quiet?

Mr. CURRIE: When was that written?

Mr. BUCHANAN: It was the annual address of the President of the United Farmers of Alberta at their last convention, held in Calgary in the early part of January of this year. These views, there-

fore, are up-to-date; they are a modern expression of opinion on the question of a larger market.

With respect to the establishment of internal storage elevators, I presume that the policy of the Government in that respect was designed with a view to assisting the farmers of Western Canada and providing some means of avoiding the criticism which is directed against the Government by reason of their neglect of the interests of the farmers. An elevator has been erected in my province, at the city of Calgary. If the Minister of Commerce had held the views that he holds to-night in the matter of patronage, that elevator would not have been located at Calgary. Any man who has visited the province of Alberta knows that Calgary is situated at the extreme western end of the province. West of the city of Calgary practically no grain is produced. North of the city there is a mixed farming country. The farmers to the east, along the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, and the Goose lake line of the Canadian Northern railway would naturally send their grain to the elevators at Saskatoon and Moosejaw. It is in the extreme southern part of the province that the great proportion of grain for export is grown in Alberta, and in order to reach the Calgary elevator ninety-nine and a half per cent of it would have to undergo a back haul. In response to a question that I asked since the opening of the present session, the minister informed me that the Calgary elevator was erected to serve shipments by the Pacific coast and through the Panama canal. That elevator has been constructed, and is receiving a little—very little—grain. It is a fact, however, that no test has been made to prove that grain can be shipped in bulk by the Pacific route.

Mr. CURRIE: Is that not due to the fact that the Panama canal is not open?

Mr. BUCHANAN: What I am trying to point out is that no test has been made to establish whether or not this route is practicable for the shipment of grain from our Pacific ports; yet this elevator has been erected in order to accommodate shipments by that route. Further, the elevator has been placed at Calgary, where it is of no service for eastern shipments. If it had been placed at Lethbridge or Medicine Hat it would have met the need for Pacific shipments, because these points are tributary to the great grain areas of Alberta; and it would have also facilitated shipments eastward to lake ports. Now, there is a congestion of grain in Alberta at the present time. I inquired as to the capacity of this elevator, and was told that its capacity was 2,500,000 bushels; that from August 27 of last year, when it was opened, to the end of the year, the amount of grain received at that elevator was 185,455 bushels; that from January 1, 1915, to January 14, 1916, the amount received was 248,367 bushels. I have said that in the southern part of the province from fifteen to twenty million bushels of grain are still in the possession of the farmers, who have no facilities for disposing of it. In some sections of my constituency wheat is lying out in the open because the farmers could not raise the money to buy lumber to erect storage bins upon their farms. This wheat, lying in the open with a covering of straw, is in danger of being ruined if the weather conditions are severe in the coming spring. The elevator at Calgary, which cost the people of Canada a great deal of money, is practically of no service to the farmers of Alberta. If that elevator was erected solely for the purpose of meeting the needs of shipments westward via the Pacific, I do not think it should have been erected until the feasibility of that route had been established. If, on the other hand, it was erected to meet the present needs, it should have been placed in another part of the province, where it would meet the requirements of the farmers in the harvest and crop-selling season.

I have been speaking of the needs of western Canada, and particularly of my own province. I wish to emphasize the fact that we are not asking for anything of an exceptional nature, but simply for the solution of the problems which face us from year to year. If we want to have a happy and contented people in the western prairies; if we want to encourage immigration into that country and to accelerate its development, these problems must be solved. Those men in eastern Canada who are engaged in commercial or industrial activities will admit that the prosperity of the whole country depends very largely upon the development and prosperity of the western provinces. This year evidence was given of that fact; if we had not had the crop that we did have last year, there would not be the business prosperity which exists in many cities and towns of eastern Canada. It is true that the war has helped

many of these communities, but it is true also that many industrial and mercantile houses would have suffered severely had it not been for western Canada's great crop last year.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce gave us to-day a vision of Canada after the war. But, we can develop that vision during the war, and aid in carrying out his vision of Canada after the war. There must be a system of give and take in this country, and the problems of the western farmer must be solved in order to bring about contentment in the western country, and in order to satisfy us that we will have a united Canada now and forevermore. If those problems are solved during the course of this war, after the war, the western prairies will be populated by a people who will produce great wealth for this country, and who will aid in the development of the whole of Canada. Those people are doing their part to-day as Canadian citizens, and they are prepared to do their part until the conclusion of this war. At the same time they feel the burdens which are resting upon them, and it is our duty to remove those burdens, and to bring satisfaction and happiness to their prairie homes. Every man in the West to-day is a pioneer; practically every man in Saskatchewan and Alberta is a pioneer undergoing the hardships of pioneer life, working day and night to produce wealth for this country and very little profit for himself. That has been the case in the past. This is an exceptional year, and even under the circumstances of this exceptional year he cannot dispose of the wealth which he has produced, and he is discontented. He sees, lying to the south of those provinces, a country where he thinks he could find a better market than exists at the present time. These farmers, in their organizations, demand this market, and we fail to listen to them. They know that there is another great and powerful organization in this country whose demands are listened to; and how can we expect them to be satisfied when they know that that powerful organization is heeded, and that their organization is not heeded.

You find the farmers of the western prairies asking for the removal of the duty on wheat. They are prepared to face this world with their products in open competition, and they ask for the advantage of the U.S. market and of every other market that they can get. They are prepared to meet the rest of the world with their wheat, and yet their demand is not listened to. In the province of British Columbia the fruit growers asked for a duty on apples, and the Government proposes to grant their request. Can you expect the farmers of the prairie provinces to be satisfied under such circumstances? You may satisfy them in regard to the apples; they may say: all right, if it is going to help our fellow citizens in the province of British Columbia, well and good; but why not meet our wishes and help us. The fact that you are failing to do that is not encouraging unity in this country; rather is it encouraging dissension, and that is what we want to avoid. We want to develop in Canada a great nation, and we will develop it; but we must give every man in this country a square deal. There must be justice and liberty, about which we are talking so much in connection with this war, in our treatment of our own citizens. That is what we ask for, those of us who come from Western Canada. We are to-day doing our part in the western provinces in upholding liberty and justice across the seas, and we will continue to do it until this war ends victoriously. All that we ask of the Canadian people is that they will grant to those in the West who are enriching this country, the same justice and liberty in the marketing of their products.

On motion of Mr. John A. Currie, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Friday, February 18, 1916.

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

PRIVATE BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 36, respecting The Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company—Mr. Guilbault.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, Parts I., II., and III., for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915,—Mr. Patenaude.

THE WAR CONTRACTS COMMISSION.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: In the Mail and Empire's report of the nomination proceedings for the Local Legislature which took place yesterday in the county of Peel, Mr. Fallis, a gentleman whose name the House is familiar with in connection with

certain horse deals in that county, and who is a candidate for re-election, is reported as having said:

> That following the investigation he had met Mr. Thompson, K.C., who had conducted the investigation for the Government, and Mr. Thompson had assured him that the investigation had been a full and frank one, and that there was no possibility of legal action against Mr. Fallis. All that any person could say was that as a member he was injudicious in having anything to do with the matter.

I know Mr. Thompson personally, and have a very high regard for him; and, knowing him as I do, I cannot believe that he would give any such statement in advance of the commissioner's opinion. I think the House and the country have a right to know whether he is correctly reported, and I would therefore ask the minister who has to do with this matter to make inquiries, so as to be able to advise us whether or not Mr. Thompson made such a statement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman is referring to me, I do not know that I have any right to ask Mr. Thompson any such a question. Mr. Thompson is a private practising lawyer, and has just as much right to express his opinions as the hon. member for Pictou has. He is a free lawyer, just the same as my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister cannot disown Mr. Thompson; or, if he can, the Minister of Justice cannot. Mr. Thompson was the public official who was employed for the purpose of conducting the investigations before the Davidson Commission. He and I are not in the same position at all. I am here as a representative of the people, and have a right to ask this question. Mr. Thompson was the servant of the people and of the Government, and the Government have a right to inquire whether he prejudged the case.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Thompson has been doing the legal work in connection with the inquiry, and doing it gratuitously. While he is not "employed," strictly speaking, I should imagine he is at perfect liberty to express his views. It is not part of my business to go running around after newspaper reports; when that report comes to this House, we shall be able to deal with it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I should like to know what the Minister of Justice has to say as to the irresponsibility of Mr. Thompson in prejudging this matter. I suppose the Minister of Justice has something to do with this matter.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): As I have not had the advantage of hearing what the matter was about, I cannot very well say anything in regard to it. I may say, however, that Mr. Thompson was selected by the commissioner to aid him in carrying on his investigation. I may say that that investigation is carried on by the commissioner upon his responsibility to the public of Canada, and that the Minister of Justice would consider he was going very far out of his way if he tried in any manner to interfere with the work of the commissioner, who is charged to carry on an absolutely impartial investigation.

Mr. MACDONALD: He was appointed upon your recommendation.

Mr. DOHERTY: The commission was appointed upon my recommendation, and I have no reason to be otherwise than proud of that recommendation; furthermore, I am satisfied that the public of Canada, both now and after the report is made, will join with me in the opinion that no better man could have been chosen to make that investigation than Sir Charles Davidson.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not speaking about Sir Charles Davidson at all. The Minister of Justice cannot disclaim responsibility for the counsel who was appointed to represent the people in this investigation. If the high ideals which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce very properly placed before the Canadian people last night are to be denied by his colleagues within twenty-four hours, it is just as well for us to know. I want to tell the Minister of Justice that as a lawyer he cannot tell me or any other lawyer in this country that, as the advisor of the Crown who recommended the appointment of this commission, he has nothing whatever to do with Mr. Thompson, the counsel, who, according to the Mail and Empire's report, has prejudged this case, by saying what could or could not be done with Mr. Fallis.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have pointed out how Mr. Thompson came to be the counsel to the commission. I have no desire to say anything else than that I thoroughly agree in the opinion which the commissioner evidently entertained of Mr. Thompson when he retained him as counsel.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not blaming Mr. Thompson at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: Who is the hon. gentleman blaming?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend did not wait to hear what I was going to say. I say I know Mr. Thompson very well, and believe him to be a gentleman of rectitude. According to the Mail and Empire, the statement was made yesterday by Mr. Fallis, at the nomination proceedings in the county of Peel, that after the investigation, Mr. Thompson had assured him that the investigation had been full and frank; that there was no possibility of any legal action against Mr. Fallis, and that all that any person could say was that perhaps as a member he was injudicious in having anything to do with the matter. From what I know of Mr. Thompson I have every confidence in him, and I cannot believe that he prejudged the case. He would certainly be considered as having been lax in his duties if he did so. If possible, I want to find out if my hon. friend can ascertain if it is true that Mr. Thompson did prejudge the case as Mr. Fallis said he did.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. minister may make his answer; but I think I should say that this discussion is in my opinion absolutely out of order. I see in Bourinot that, when the Orders of the Day are called questions may be asked "relative to the state of public business, or other matters of public interest; but no discussion should be allowed when a minister has replied to a question, nor after a member has made his personal explanation." Perhaps the answer given by the minister was, in the hon. member's opinion, insufficient.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was quite evident that the Minister of Justice did not hear my remarks; in fact, he said so, and I rose again only for the purpose of putting the question to him as I desired it to be put. I await his answer.

Mr. DOHERTY: I may say that I have not seen in the newspaper the statement referred to. After I have read the statement, I shall be in a position to judge whether there is anything in it or not, and whether I should take action or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Here is a commission appointed by the Government and nobody apparently is responsible for it. A Shell Committee was appointed some months ago and nobody claims to be responsible for it. A new Shell Commission has been appointed and nobody is responsible for it. I think it is about time that the Government should resign.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no doubt that the suggestion made by my right hon. friend would suit him very well, although his recent action in the House shows that he has some confidence in the Government. So far as the Shell Committee and the Imperial Munitions Board are concerned, there is, so far as I am aware, some one responsible for them, unless my right hon. friend is disposed to consider the British Government as an absolute nonentity, and I imagine he would not go so far as that. The Minister of Justice has not said that the Government is not responsible for the commission presided over by Sir Charles Davidson.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Militia said so.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are certainly responsible for the appointment. Having appointed a man of high reputation, wide experience and unimpeachable character, an appointment commended by the press and by public opinion throughout the country, we felt that we had adequately discharged a public duty in selecting a man of that type for the inquiry which he was commissioned to make. His report is not yet before the House. When it comes before the House, hon. members may make any criticism they see fit of the conduct of the commission or of its finding; but in the meantime I do not think its proceedings ought to be commented upon or discussed in this House.

THE SHELL COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In regard to the Shell Committee, perhaps we shall have the papers promised the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Shell Committe are responsible for their action, and my right hon. friend may properly be referred to them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Apparently nobody on the Government side of the House is responsible.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The British Government is entirely responsible for the Imperial Munitions Board and for the orders placed by that Government through the Shell Committee and for their control of its proceedings.

FEDERAL VACANCIES IN QUEBEC.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to ask the Minister of Justice when the vacancies on the bench at Montreal and Three Rivers will be filled. My hon. friend from Three River (Mr. Bureau) may speak for his city, and I can speak for mine. The Board of Trade, and the Bar of Montreal are very anxious that the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Justice St. Pierre a month ago should be filled as soon as possible, and I think that the Minister of Justice should make the appointment at the earliest possible date.

Mr. DOHERTY: Neither the Board of Trade nor any other body is more anxious than I am to fill the vacancy, and I shall be very pleased to reach the nomination as soon as it is possible for me to do so. The matter has had my active attention since my return to this House, although there is no doubt there was delay attributable to the uncontrollable fact that I was unable for some time owing to illness to attend to my duties.

Mr. BUREAU: How soon may we expect an appointment at Three Rivers?

Mr. DOHERTY: The same answer will apply to Three Rivers as to Montreal. I am just as anxious to make the appointment there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The same scramble?

Mr. DOHERTY: In all instances we find ourselves with a very large number of competent gentlemen who might be appointed.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the minister to say that he will make the appointment as soon as he can? Is it for lack of applicants for the position that he is embarrassed? Surely there are plenty of barristers in Three Rivers, and I know of plenty of candidates. The minister knows how congested legal matters are in that city.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have stated that there are a very large number of thoroughly competent gentlemen who might be appointed, but it does not follow that the greater the number the easier the choice. If we had only one applicant who was competent and who might be appointed, why, of course, the embarrassment would be less.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: While we are on the question of appointments to the judiciary, I call the attention of the minister to the fact that there is in Prince Edward Island a vacancy which has been in existence for several months. I do not ask for an appointment; I take the opposite position from that of my hon. friends from Quebec. I do not think there is any congestion of legal business in Prince Edward Island. This vacancy, as perhaps the minister knows, is in the county court. There are three counties in the province and a judge for each county. The judge for Prince county died some months ago, and no appointment has yet been made, and I would suggest that the other two judges could do the work. In this time of stress and trial, when economy is urged, and I hope, practised to some extent, the amount that could be saved in this way until the war is over would be some consideration. I am aware that the Government is under some embarrassment——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think my hon. friend has a right to go on discussing the subject. He has the right to ask a question.

Mr. HUGHES: No right to give an opinion?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, I was giving good adviee to the Government, and I thought perhaps the Government wished to get advice.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We get so much of it that we are overwhelmed.

Mr. HUGHES: At all events, I think I have made my point clear.

WAR TAXATION—MINING COMPANIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I ask the Minister of Finance if his new tax will apply to mining companies, whose profits, of course, are terminable, in the same way as it will apply to ordinary incorporated companies?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It will apply to mining companies; but whether or not the details will be precisely the same as in respect to other companies, is a matter which I have under advisement.

BANK LOANS TO FARMERS.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 33, to amend the Bank Act. He said:

The principle of this legislation was dis-

cussed at some length on the occasion of the consideration in Committee of the Whole of the resolution preceding the Bill. For the information of the House, and as showing the point of view of myself, of the bankers, and of the farmers of the West, I propose to place on Hansard certain correspondence. First, I shall give a letter which I addressed to the banks, and then some extracts from the replies received from the banks. I shall also place upon Hansard a copy of the resolution which was telegraphed to me on behalf of the United Farmers of Alberta. The letter which I wrote is as follows:

Ottawa, December 24, 1915.

Dear Sir,—For some time past I have had under consideration the question of an amendment to the Bank Act authorizing the banks to take as security for advances to farmers liens upon cattle and certain other live stock. It would seem that such liens should be registered in order that the rights of other creditors might not be prejudiced. The question as you know is one which has been much canvassed at successive revisions of the Bank Act and there has been a conflict of view as to the expediency of such legislation. As it is greatly desirable at this juncture of our affairs that production should be facilitated in every way possible I should appreciate an early expression of your views upon the following questions:

1. Would such legislation facilitate and lead to increased advances by your bank to the stock-raising community and would it tend to increase production?

2. Will there be during the coming year sufficient bank credits available for all the increased production possible to the Canadian agricultural and stock-raising community?

3. If the answer to (2) is in the negative, can you suggest any feasible plan for increasing the available banking credits for the purpose in view?

As I am exceedingly interested in the matter referred to I shall be greatly obliged for a full and frank expression of your views.

Yours very truly,

W. T. White,
Minister of Finance.

I propose, if the House will permit me, to read extracts, first, from letters received from banks favourable to this legislation, and then extracts from letters of those believing that this measure will not accomplish the object I have in view. First, I give the letters favourable to the legislation:

Referring to your letter No. 1904-15 we certainly think the answer to the question asked by the Minister of Finance should be in the affirmative. The development of the live stock industry in the Western States has been greatly accelerated by bank loans rendered possible only by the fact that the banks there have power to take chattel mortgage security on the stock.

It seems likely that in making advances to farmers, banks will continue to be guided principally by consideration of the prospective borrower's character, his demonstrated ability as a farmer, and the financial position shown by his statement, but, as in the case of recent legislation authorizing loans against the pledge of threshed grain, there will be a percentage of cases where the pledge will turn the scale and therefore, in the opinion of this bank, the proposed legislation would be helpful and have a tendency to increase production.

Our Western supervisor is of the opinion that if the banks could legally take security from farmers on live stock it would greatly tend to increase production. He states that there are many farmers in Western Canada whose financial responsibility does not warrant unsecured advances, but whose honesty entitles them to assistance from the bank if we could get unassailable security. He informs me that this is the general feeling amongst the bankers in Winnipeg, but that they are unfavourable to the registration of aliens.

I have your letter inquiring as to the advisability of allowing banks to loan to farmers on their chattels. I have always been an advocate of this and know that in the Western States, it has worked out to the advantage of the small farmer in many cases.

If we were permitted to take security on the stock, we would certainly do more of this class of business.

The power to take security on live-stock would be distinctly useful. We certainly would lend more freely with this protection than without it. The chief difficulty which we encounter in dealing with farmers is in the matter of security. Endorsers are usually not available, and we are debarred from accepting the only collateral which a farmer has to give.

I think it would be an assistance to the farmers, particularly in the prairie section, if banks could get a lien on cattle and other live stock at the time an advance is made. My replies to your questions are as follows:

1. I think such legislation would facilitate and lead to increased advances by our bank to the stock-raising community and consequently, it would tend to increase production.

Replying to question No. 1, in your favour of the 24th ultimo, while I am inclined to the belief that, speaking generally, legislation authorizing the banks to take as security for advances to farmers or cattle raisers, liens on cattle and other live stock, might possibly facilitate lending to the stock-raising community, if it is found necessary, as you seem to think it would be, that any lien taken as security should be registered, I am of the opinion that any good which might be done by having this power would be offset to a very considerable extent by the trouble and expense of registering the said liens. You ask the question whether such legislation would lead to increased advances by this bank to the stock-raising community. I am not prepared to say that it would lead to increased advances. In so far as this bank is concerned, our custom has been to lend to a farmer where his position has been satisfactory, without exacting security, excepting in the autumn sometimes, when he was able to put up warehouse receipts

for grain, but our lendings have been very largely on the general financial position of the man and his moral character.

Replying to the points you raise:

1. I think it would be advisable to give farmers the right to borrow against cattle and sheep by a pledge to the banks without registration. The question of animals being covered by previous chattel mortgages will have to be provided for.

1. The suggested Legislation would doubtless lead to increased advances by this bank to the stock-raising community, and it should tend to increase production. It would probably not benefit the homesteader or the small farmer to the extent that might be expected. Advances to farmers of this class, whether with or without security, must always continue to be a moral risk. The questions of feed, housing, and the borrower's reliability would always have to be considered.

1. Our long established policy throughout Canada is to lend to the farming community who apply to us in all cases where they are entitled to credit. It does seem to me, however, that the proposed legislation would facilitate and lead to increased advances by the banks and should therefore tend to increased agricultural production.

1. Legislation such as is under consideration would in all probability lead to increased advances by this bank and would tend to increased production of live stock.

1. In our opinion, the suggested legislation provides a simple and direct method for security on live stock and should tend to facilitate bank advances.

It will thus be seen that about half the chartered banks take a position favourable to this measure. Now, I give a few extracts from letters received from banks whose managers believe that the legislation will not accomplish what we have in view.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not doubt the accuracy of the letters, but we would like to have the names. Particularly, I would ask the minister if he could give us the opinion of two prominent bankers—say, the president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce for one, because that bank has so many agencies in the West, and of Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, general manager of the Bank of Montreal, for another. Letters given without names have not the same effect as those that are signed. It is very important to have the names of the gentlemen who have written their opinions on this subject.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: On general principles I entirely agree with my hon. friend as to this point. I would much rather put on Hansard the complete letters. But I do not feel at liberty to do so. So far as the hon. gentleman himself is concerned, I shall take the opportunity of acquainting him with the views of the gentlemen to whom he has referred. I hope that will meet his wishes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is because some banks have so many branches in the West that I suggest that the names should be given.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am willing to put the extracts on Hansard, but if my hon. friend objects to my withholding the names I shall refrain from reading the extracts. I desire that this Bill shall be considered by the House absolutely on its merits, and my only object in giving these extracts is that the House may see that there are two points of view on the subject. As I stated when the resolution was under consideration, when we come to consider the matter in committee I want to have a very full discussion, so that we may reach a proper conclusion.

Mr. OLIVER: Are these letters from the managers, from the officials at the head offices, or from the officials in charge of offices in the western provinces?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The replies are from managers of head offices; in some cases the views of their western managers are given. I may say, generally speaking, that the western managers are in favour of this legislation. I shall read two or three extracts from letters expressing the negative view:

I am satisfied, and absolutely so, that should you decide to amend the Bank Act, authorizing the banks to take liens upon cattle and certain other live stock, it would not result in our assisting the stock-raising community any more generously than we are doing at present.

Here is another:

I cannot see that the proposed legislation would be likely to make any appreciable increase in our advances to the stock-raising community.

Another one:

Re amendment to the Bank Act authorizing banks to take as security for advances to farmers' liens upon cattle and certain other live stock, I do not think such legislation would facilitate or lead to any increase in advances by banks to stock-raisers.

Here is another opinion:

I do not think that legislation giving the bank a lien upon the cattle is desirable, or would tend to increase advances for stock-raising purposes.

Another bank says:

Such legislation as you mention would not lead to increased loans by this bank. We are

always ready to encourage and assist, by making liberal advances, those farmers desirous of increasing the production of live stock.

After receiving those letters, and after I had drafted the Bill which I have introduced to the House, I received a telegram, dated January 21, 1916, from the president and the secretary-treasurer of the United Farmers of Alberta. As this telegram, which has been published, is not confidential, I am quite sure that there can be no objection to placing it upon our records. It is as follows:

Calgary, Alta., Jan. 21, 1916.

Sir Thomas White,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Following resolution moved by Dunham, seconded by Trego, both vice-presidents, and passed unanimously:

Whereas, many farmers have large quantities of feed stuffs available but are not able to make profitable use of these because they cannot borrow money from the banks to buy horses, cows, cattle, sheep, and hogs, even if they are prepared to give security to the banks; and whereas, the Bank Act does not permit the banks to lend money to small farmers for such purposes and to take security over the live stock; resolved, that we, the United Farmers of Alberta, in convention assembled, request the Dominion Government at the present session of Parliament to amend the Bank Act so that small farmers may have the privilege of borrowing at long dates from the banks on the security of live stock. Note: This to apply to live stock held unencumbered or purchased after the amendment is passed because it is not suggested that securities already given over live stock should be interfered with.

H. Wood, President,
P. P. Woodbridge, Sec.-Treas.,
United Farmers of Alberta.

When this matter was under discussion the other day, the question was raised as to whether there had been any advantage to the western farmers from the legislation under which the banks were permitted to make advances upon the security of grain. As the statement was made that members were not aware of any such advances having been made, I have taken the trouble to get for the information of the House an article which was referred to by one hon. gentleman from the Grain Growers Guide of Wednesday, February 2, 1916. With the consent of the House, I should like to put this also upon Hansard:

Borrowing on Grain.

Several times in these colums we have asked for information from our readers to show whether or not the banks were loaning money to farmers on the security of the threshed grain on their farms. Up till two weeks ago we were unable to get a report from any farmer who had succeeded in making such loans. Since that time, however, we have received a considerable number of reports showing that the banks are loaning money to farmers on the security of their grain in accordance with the amendment to the Bank Act, section 88, made three years ago. We find that many of the banks doing business with the farmers in the West are loaning to the farmers on this security, and that some of the banks in particular are loaning quite extensively. Undoubtedly quite a number of the loans made on the security of the grain would have been made on the general standing of the farmer without such security, but our information is to the effect that a large number of farmers who would not have been able to borrow money from the banks under ordinary circumstances, have been able to do so by giving their threshed grain as security. This fact indicates that the amendment to the Bank Act was a benefit to the farmers of the West. It would seem, therefore, that any farmer who has a quantity of grain safely stored on his farm and insured, should be able to borrow a reasonable amount from his nearest bank. No doubt there is more money being borrowed on this security during the present year than ever before, because of the immense crop and the impossibility of putting it on the market as rapidly as has been done in years past. On account of the shortage of ships to take the wheat away from the eastern seaboard the wheat has been backed up clear to the Rocky mountains. Practically all storage capacity has been filled or will be filled by the amount of wheat now moving eastward. We receive letters regularly from farmers who tell us that they have several thousand bushels of wheat but have up to date not been able to market any of it because the elevators are full, the car-order book has several hundred names on it, and there are very few cars being received at their shipping points. In view of these facts the banks have a great opportunity this year for helping out the farmers by making advances on their grain on the farm until such time as it can be placed on the market.

In answer to question 3 in the letter which I addressed to the banks, the banks all assure me that there will be abundance of bank accommodation to meet the industrial and agricultural needs of the community during the coming year. A good deal of criticism has been directed against the banks for failing to lend where, in the opinion of hon. members, loans should have been made. It is to be borne in mind that the lending of money is a transaction that requires a good deal of judgment and care. The banks have a dual relationship; they have a relationship towards the depositing public, and they have a relationship towards the borrowing public. They are trustees of the funds of their shareholders, and of the funds entrusted to them by their depositors. The safe investment of money is, therefore, a prime consideration of the bankers. As they can only make money by lending their money at higher rates than those at which they borrow it, it would seem to be their interest to lend wherever good security can be obtained,

and upon personal credit if personal credit is such as appeals to them. My own view is that this legislation will be distinctly helpful in the way of obtaining advances to the western and other farmers upon the security of their livestock. I have no doubt, however, that the element of personal standing and credit will be of large, if not determining, weight with the banker in considering the question of whether or not advances should be made. I know that all members of the House have but one idea with regard to this matter, and that is to adopt legislation that will facilitate the extension of credit along safe and sound lines to our great agricultural community. I know that the banks are very desirous of in every way possible assisting to increase production, especially during the period of the war. Only a few weeks ago I wrote the banks a letter, which unfortunately I have not with me, in which I emphasized the importance of the banks, during the war, extending credits wherever they could safely do so in order to promote and encourage production. The great question in Canada to-day is that of increasing our production in order to meet the wastage of the war and to keep ourselves strong for the struggle which lies before us. I pointed out in this letter to the banks that the great danger in a time like this as that of inflation, the encouragement of speculation in either securities or commodities. I stated that I was aware that the banks were fully seized of the importance of that aspect of the matter. But I stated further that to make advances for the purpose of increasing production was wise policy, not only from the national standpoint, by its influence and effect in increasing production, but in making for the prosperity of the whole community, in which the banks, of course, are as much interested as any other class in the community. I am very glad to say that the banks have acted upon my request and are taking steps and will take steps to do their utmost to facilitate production, and especially agricultural production, during the coming year.

Mr. NESBITT: Did any of the banks except the one referred to say that they did not think it would be wise to register the liens?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is only one that deals with the matter. My view would be that the banks would probably prefer that the lien should not be registered. But that raises the very important question of notice to creditors and purchasers for valuable consideration without notice. I explained to the House when the resolution was under consideration that I have simply placed the banks in the same position as any individual or company that has power to loan upon chattel mortgage in a province, and such chattel mortgage shall then become subject to the laws of that province as to registration and legal consequences.

Mr. MACDONALD: I should like some explanation in reference to the differences in the laws of different provinces as to the requirements of affidavits and so on. Is it understood that in such particulars the security taken is to be subject to the laws of the province?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is what I have provided. What I had in mind was that we should accept the laws of the several provinces. But, of course, this matter will be fully discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee, which is a pretty capable committee, and if some better plan can be devised for registration which will still effectuate the object we have in view, I shall be only too glad to adopt it.

4 p.m.

Mr. McCRANEY: The minister read us letters from a number of banks who were favourable to the legislation. It would be of great value to the farmers to know what banks they might apply to with the security afforded under this Bill and be sure that they would get advances. If the minister will give us the names of those banks which offer the public money upon the security that this Bill is going to give, I think it would be of a great deal of use.

I notice that the minister read from the Grain Growers' Guide, and he spoke as though the comments of the Grain Growers' Guide were with reference to the legislation of last session. My understanding was that those comments did not refer to advances for seed grain, that is, that the security was to be on the growing crop. I understood that the article in the Grain Growers' Guide referred to advances made under the original Bank Act:

> The bank may lend money to a farmer upon the security of his threshed grain upon the farm.

The article did not apply at all to the Act of last session, nor is any comment made on the Act of this session. The other day I expressed some doubt, and possibly opposition, to the legislation which the min-

ister proposes. I have not changed my views. I do not think the banks will lend any more money under it. But in view of the fact that the United Farmers of Alberta have expressed a favourable opinion of it, I certainly would not stand in the way. The complaint in the western country is not that men who have security cannot borrow money. The great objection to our banking system there, is that men who should not need to give security cannot get money, that men who are well off go to banks and are refused; that large buildings and Grecian temples are built for the accommodation of banks in large centres, but that there is not enough money for the farmers in the outlying parts. The minister has had before him the question of permitting the amalgamation of certain banks. The public, I think, approve of the action he has taken on some of these applications. But he may have cases before him, perhaps has had, where the best thing that could be done would be to wipe out a weak bank. In saying that I do not wish to refer to any bank in particular. I had occasion to forward a letter to the minister not long ago complaining that at a certain point the bank was unable to make advances; and in that very case the fact is that the bank which is doing business at that point has not enough capital to do business in all the branches it has taken over. The weak bank, instead of being an accommodation to a community is quite the reverse. It is an obstacle to farmers getting money. A man who lives where there is one of these weak banks and cannot get money from it may come in to Saskatoon where, if there was no bank in his home town, he might get an advance. But the banker in Saskatoon says to him: Why do you not get money at your own home town? He has to answer that he cannot do it, and that at once becomes a black mark against any applicant from an outside point where the local bank will not make advances. I simply make the suggestion to the minister that the time may come when it will be necessary for him to see that we do not have weak banks that cannot do the work they are undertaking to do; and if he permits these banks to continue in business he may have to decrease the number of branches which they attempt to operate. I understood the minister to say the other day that he would consider the question of bringing the legislation of last year more in accordance with the provincial Statutes with regard to the registration of liens on growing crops. He is adopting that principle in the legislation of this year; he proposes that the surety shall accord to provincial law and practice in the matter of registration. I would ask him to bring the legislation of last year with regard to advances against growing crops in line with the same principle and provide for the same security and the same safeguards to the public in respect to these advances.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understood from the letters from the bank managers and from the minister's statement that one-half the banks did not favour this legislation, and that some of the banks, while they approved of it, said that even if this legislation was passed they did not think any more money would be advanced to the farmers than at present. I think in one of the extracts it was stated that the bank would not lend any more, but that they were favourable to the legislation.

In one of the letters it was looked upon rather favourably, but the writer stated that he did not think it would tend to increase the amount of money loaned to farmers, because the banks were already loaning to farmers without this legislation or security. If this legislation commends itself to the United Farmers of Alberta, they have probably looked into the matter very carefully, and I am not going to oppose it, but there is this point to be considered: If the banks under this legislation, are not going to advance any more money than they have been advancing to the farmers in the past, it would be worth the minister's while to consider whether they should be given this extra security. Take the case of the merchants in the towns who supply the farmers with credit during the summer. The fall comes, and supposing there is a poor crop, or a moderate crop, and the farmer is not able to pay everything, he wants money for one purpose or another, he goes to the bank, gives security on his cattle to get a small advance, this advance being covered by his stock, and the man who has given him credit all summer without any security is absolutely shut out. That is one phase of the question that ought to be very well considered in connection with this legislation.

I do not profess to know very much about this phase of the question, but my own idea is that under our present system of banking the farmer is never going to be able to get very much of an advance from the banks. The banks have been or-

ganized for the purpose of issuing short credits, for the purpose of loaning on the standing of the men who apply for loans and not on security. The farmer, as a rule, wants a longer credit, and it seems to me that a better way to get at this would be to have rural banks. If you have rural banks they would give longer credits than the chartered banks, and they would not be on the same footing as an ordinary bank for the reason that, I imagine, people would be a little more careful about puting call deposits into a bank whose known purpose was to lend out money on long dates. They would be more unlikely to put deposits into banks of that kind. But I think that something should be done by the Minister of Finance in the way of helping these banks by perhaps giving them some of the assistance which is now given to our present banking system.

It is true that my hon. friend proposes to tax the banks somewhat in his new taxation Bill, but after all that is only a trifle to the banks. In the first place, we give the banks, not an absolute, but a practical monopoly of all deposits in the Dominion of Canada. In addition, we give them the privilege of issuing an amount of paper money equal to their paid-up capital and we require them to make a deposit in gold with the Government to the extent of five per cent of the amount of that issue. I understand that the Government allow them three per cent on that deposit. So that the taxation imposed on the banks is only a trifle compared with what we give them. We give them with one hand a great, big bonus, a monopoly of the deposits of the country, the right to issue money free of cost, except the cost of printing the bills, and then we take back a small amount in taxation. The banks are in a different position from that of any other financial institution in the country. Other financial institutions do not get the advantages that the banks get and it occurs to me that something should be done along the line of withdrawing some of the advantages that we give to the banks under our present banking system, advantages that no other country on the face of the earth gives to its banks—bonuses and privileges such as banks in no other country get. It seems to me that something should be done in the way of withdrawing a portion of these priviliges, not to hurt the banks in any way, not to cripple them, and that we should establish a system of rural banks that would be of some real advantage to the farmer. I am sure that every man in this House who has ever been engaged in farming will understand that, if a farmer borrows money for the purpose of securing stock, he has to have that money for a considerable length of time in order to enable him to grow the stock, market it, get his money back with a profit and be in a position to pay off the debt. No three or six months' note will cover that.

Mr. NESBITT: It depends on what kind of live stock he is dealing with.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand that quite readily. In the case of hogs and sheep, even a moderate credit would cover it, but in most cases I think that farmers would want to go in for cattle as well as sheep and hogs. As far as sheep and hogs are concerned, my hon. friend from North Oxfor (Mr. Nesbitt) is quite right, but with respect to the bulk of the money that would be needed from the banks, there would require to be longer term credits. Long term credits cannot very well be got under our present system and they can be very much more easily got under a system of rural banks whose business it would be to grant longer credits and who would make arrangements for that purpose.

I do not want to be understood as opposing this proposal because it may be all right and it may be a help in some ways, but it does not seem to me that we are going far enough or that we are getting at the root of the trouble. There is a big agitation all through the west in favour of rural banks, or better still, farmers' credits, and a system of this kind should be worked out. While this may be a step in the right direction, it does not seem to me that it goes far enough to accomplish very much.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the stand that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has taken on the question of the amendment of the Bank Act. In the province of Alberta, from which an application has come through the United Farmers, there is a strong agitation against the course which has been pursued by the banks during the last three or four years. My own impression in regard to the legislation which was put through two years ago in connection with liens on grain is, that it has not been of very material advantage. In conversation with one or two bank managers, I have been informed that they prefer to advance money to the farmer on the security of his own note, endorsed if possible. The unfortunate part of it is that they almost entirely insist on obtain-

ing an endorsement in connection with any loans made to the farmer. But, in consequence of this amendment, and judging from the extracts which the Minister of Finance has read, I would be inclined to think that banks would be more likely to advance money on security of this nature. As the minister has said, this legislation is largely for the benefit of Western Canada, and as the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) has pointed out, it is practically essential that the people should know what banks favour legislation of this character. In Western Canada there are only about six banks which do an active business in their branches. These six banks, excluding possibly the Bank of Montreal, are doing an extensive business with the small commercial interests and farmers. If we had the assurance that the Bank of Commerce, the Imperial Bank, the Union Bank, the Merchants Bank, and the Royal Bank were in favour of this legislation and were prepared to loan money to farmers on security of this character, the farmer would be greatly reassured, for these banks practically control the business of the farmer and the small merchant in the West. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction, perhaps not so much among the farmers as among the mercantile interests and others, at the action taken by the banks during the past year. Once a loan becomes past due, the banks, under the present Bank Act, are allowed to take the security, and on account of the pressure which they can bring to bear on the debtor they exact the utmost security. I know, personally, of instances where men have had to give security up to thirty or forty thousand dollars for a loan of $1,000 or $1,500; they were morally forced to give this security; they knew that if they refused the banks would call in the loan. This is a very arbitrary method for the banks to adopt, and I should like to see the Bank Act amended so that the banks would not have this tremendous power in their hands. We are giving them great privileges, and I think the Act should be so amended that the banks would not have the power of life and death, commercially speaking, placed in their hands. I agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that the minister does not go far enough in his amendments.

Mr. MACDONALD: I notice that section 1 proposes to repeal the clause in the Act of last year which limited to August 1, 1915, the banks' powers in the matter of taking security for money advanced for seed grain. The effect of this amendment, I take it, will be to remove that restriction, and render it possible for a bank to take security on money which it may have advanced after that date.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This simply removes the limitation as to time, and will enable the banks to do, during this year and next, what last year's Act enabled them to do last year.

Mr. MACDONALD: Heretofore the policy in Canada has been along the lines of refusing to make amendments to the Bank Act, except under exceptional circumstances. We have had a lot of inroads upon that theory within the last few years; we have had the legislation of 1914, and of 1915, and now we have the legislation before us, creating new conditions under which banks can do business. Our friends from the West who have spoken on this Bill seem to think that it will mean that money will be lent more freely. I do not believe that it will have any such effect at all. My experience and practice of something over twenty years has been that in the East live stock is about the poorest security you can give for a loan, whether it is given by bill of sale or chattel mortgage. To my mind, therefore, the advantage will be more fancied than real. The Finance Minister has given us some correspondence which indicates a difference of opinion among banking people as to the usefulness of legislation of this character. As the minister is amending the Act, I think he might as well go a little further and provide that a bank may loan money on any personal property whatever; and not on live stock, merely, which is the most perishable kind of security, being animate life which may expire at any time, and which is subject to disease and pests which may at any time wipe the security out. This legislation practically says that the banks may loan money upon live stock in the West, but not in the East, and I do not think that that is wise. Though the banks would have power in any portion of the East to loan money on this security, just the same as is in the West, I think that any man in the East who, under this legislation, will be able to borrow from a bank on live stock security will need to have a very special case. If we are going to enter upon a new era in regard to banking conditions in this

country, and allow the banks to take a bill of sale or chattel mortgage upon live stock, I think we might as well avoid the discrimination that is sure to exist under this legislation by going further and allowing the banks to loan money upon personal property generally. Why should we allow a man who may be interested in the live stock interest to borrow money from a bank upon the security of live stock, and exclude another man from borrowing money whose security consisted of personal property? A wealthy man who has money in bank stocks or bonds can go to the banks and raise money, but the poor man who has personal property and cannot get an endorser cannot get money from the bank on the security of his personal security, although the security may be just as good. If we are to enter upon a new policy, my suggestion is that instead of using the limited phraseology:

> The bank may lend money to farmers and those engaged in stock-raising upon the security of their live stock.

We say, "The bank may lend money upon personal property." The wording of the Bill at present limits the conditions considerably. The word "farmers" is a word of special significance. For instance, a man not actually engaged in the tilling of the soil may be interested or engaged in the development of live stock; and if he is pressed by unfortunate conditions, which are liable to occur at any time, and seeks to borrow money from the banks, he will be unable to get it, for technically he would not be a farmer. Why does the minister not go the whole length and allow banks to lend money upon personal property? Let him cut out entirely the words "to farmers and those engaged in stock raising." If the minister is going to provide for future conditions, I urge him to empower the banks to loan money upon personal property generally; in that way he would avoid discrimination, he would avoid class legislation. This would not be compelling the banks to lend; under this legislation the banks are not compelled to lend a five cent piece more, they are allowed to take a certain kind of security. The question is to get the banks to lend money at all. The fact that you remove a technical objection in order to enable the banks to give a loan, is not going to make them more willing to lend money if the borrower is not satisfactory. A bank will be all the more ready to lend money when the borrower has personal property of any kind and is a man of integrity in the community, and there will not be the same difficulties if you tie the matter up, as is done in this Bill.

As a matter of strict law, it might be argued whether or not the phraseology of section 12 is not such that the power to lend money is given to the bank only when the loan is upon the security of livestock alone. The bank may say: well, we might lend that money to you, but we want to get an endorser. As this clause is enabling legislation, it might be urged that a loan on the security of livestock alone would render illegal the taking of an endorsement as well. I have heard in regard to promissory notes arguments which, although they did not seem to have as much in them as my argument, have been sustained by the courts. All these difficulties would be done away with if my hon. friend would make it clear that the endorsation could accompany the loan and not invalidate it. In all our eastern provinces, outside of the question of lending money on stock in warehouses, the proposed provisions in this Bill are not likely to be taken advantage of to a great extent. In the eastern provinces, the banks require an endorser in the first instance, but there is no reason why, on account of the financial restrictions owing to the war, the East will not be equally interested in this Bill and in the operation of its provisions. Therefore, I am urging upon the minister, while he is dealing with the amendment of the Bank Act at this juncture, to permit a loan to be made on personal property and good security by a bill of sale or chattel mortgage, the same as may be done by a private investor. There are some other matters which I intend to bring up when we go into committee on this Bill. In his speech the other day the Minister of Finance said:

> It is probable that in the straitened financial conditions which may prevail for some years forward the question of capital for the development of agriculture may be of paramount importance, and it is our intention to inquire carefully during the coming recess into this most important subject, with a view, if desirable in the public interest, to supplementing by federal aid existing facilities in this connection. Particularly will the question of establishment of a system whereby loans at reasonable rates repayable on the amortization principle engage the attention of the Government.

We therefore enter upon the fringe of what may come to be wide and important legislation in this matter. The avenue along which my hon. friend will enter in regard

to agricultural questions is one which will lead him into other lines where the development of other kinds of industries will make claims upon him with equal force. Take for instance the fish industry, where people have gone from the use of old-fashioned sail boats to motor boats which have now become essential to the pursuit of their business. The request by men engaged in that industry, that the aid given along one line should also be extended to them seem to me to involve a proposition which the minister would be bound to consider as being of equal importance. And so it will be argued in regard to other lines of business. I gather from what the minister said the other day, from the discussion that has taken place here, and from the provisions of this Bill, that we have now reached that stage in banking legislation where we are opening the door to the banks to take security in wider forms than ever before. The general conditions throughout the country has brought that about. The minister, therefore, might as well strip the whole legislation of the limitations which he is putting in this Bill; he might as well prevent what will be urged as class legislation, by simply providing that the banks may lend money on personal property and take security therefor by bills of sale, or chattel mortgages, as other investors may do.

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH (South Ontario): This question is one which affects me as an Ontario farmer who is deeply interested in the welfare of the western farmer. I take it that this Bill has been introduced because representations have been made to the Minister of Finance that there was a demand for these changes. The farmers of the West have been giving these matters very serious consideration, and which has been increased by the demand for mixed farming, and by the fact that between forty and fifty thousand cattle have been shipped out of the Northwest to the United States markets. That fact to a certain extent should be deplored, because many of these cattle were in an unfinished state, and many of them were females which were needed badly in our western provinces. Two parties are deeply interested in this question: the man who wants to sell his stock and the man who wants to buy. The man who wants to sell needs to raise money in some shape or form and one of the easiest forms in which he can raise it is by disposing of his cattle. He can easily find a neighbour who wants to buy, but unfortunately that neighbour, although he may have the feed, has not the money to pay for the cattle. The one has the feed but not the cattle; the other has the cattle but not the feed. Under this Bill the man who may be forced to sell for want of money should be able to raise the money easily. It is true that the banks have not been as popular with the farmers in years gone by as they might have been, but to my mind, a big change has come over the feelings of bankers during the last four or five years, and they are beginning to realize the fact that farmers are, to a very large extent, business men, and that if they are helped, it will in turn help the business prosperity of this country.

This matter, perhaps, has taken more pronounced form from the fact that in some states of the Union subsidiary companies have been formed which lend money to the farmers and become bondsmen, as it were, to the banks; or the banks lend the money and these companies become sureties for the payment. But, while I think that great good can be accomplished by these companies, I am a little afraid of their operation. They are generally backed by the packers of the large cities, and taking these men generally they are more deeply interested in speculative prices than anything else—to a certain extent they live upon speculative prices.

I take it to be scarcely possible that the western farmers would be opposed to the propositions of the Minister of Finance, for those propositions will be to their interest. It is true that many of them have been able to procure money upon their own notes in the past, but many others have not been able to do so. If the conditions can be made more liberal in the days to come than they have been in the past, so much the better for them. It has been said that the trouble was with short credits. I agree with that statement. I think that was one of the mistakes the banks made. The money was often loaned for three months, and at the end of that time, on account of trade conditions, they wanted the money back. I need scarcely say the farmer could not finish the cattle in three months, and he needed the money for the longer period. If I understand the temper and feeling of the bank managers to-day, they favour making credits longer than three months. If the animals have to be sold at the end of three months, the profits are so small that nothing accrues to the feeders. The time should be extended so that the cattle may go out in a finished state. If this is done, instead of these animals going to

the markets to the south of us, the chances are that many of them may drift to our eastern provinces. While it may be said that this would not do the consumer any good, I believe that the effect would be to so regulate prices in the eastern provinces that the consumer would be better off in the end, while the producer in the West would be none the worse. I cannot take any other view of this Bill than that it will help the western farmer, and in helping the western farmer it will be just as sure to do good to the farmer in the East.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): I regret that this Bill has been drafted on narrow lines. We have the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces who are equally entitled to consideration with the farmers of the West. From time to time, the fishermen are obliged to depend upon advances for the purpose of carrying on their operations, and I regret that this Bill does not contain a provision whereby they could more readily obtain the credits which will assist them in carrying on their industry successfully. This Act, so far as I apprehend its meaning, will not make it any easier for our people in Nova Scotia, nor for the people elsewhere in Canada, to obtain loans. In Nova Scotia, the bank managers insist on having one endorser, if not more, upon every note that is sought to be discounted. If the Finance Minister would put a clause in this Bill to compel the bank managers to advance money upon the security of personal property, I think some good would be accomplished. But, even if this Act is passed, and even if it should be made applicable to all classes of personal property, our farmers and fishermen would find it just as difficult to obtain credit in the bank as they have found it before.

I have an observation to make with regard to the drafting of the second section of the Act. That section is as follows:

> 2. Section eighty-eight of the Bank Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsections:
>
> 12. The bank may lend money to farmers and those engaged in stock raising upon the security of their live stock. "Live stock," for the purposes of this subsection and of subsections thirteen to sixteen, both inclusive, means horses and their progeny, bulls and cows and their progeny, swine and sheep.

I take it that this section means that if a man has a stallion and obtains a loan on the value of the animal the security extends equally to the animal's progeny. But the common law is that the progeny follows the dam. Therefore, if a man owned a mare upon the security of which money had been advanced, the bill of sale applies to the colt as well, whereas according to this section of the Act, if it has any meaning at all, that principle will be reversed. Under this proposed law a bill of sale given upon a male animal would apply to the progeny, while a bill of sale upon a female animal, owned perhaps, by a wholly different person, would equally apply to the progeny. Perhaps I do not understand the meaning of the section, but it seems to me that some correction ought to be made so that it may not lead to confusion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Is my hon. friend really serious? I assume he is. If he is, may I explain to him that the word "cattle' is standard, it is generic, and it is absolutely necessary to have the wording as it is in order to cover the male animal, the female and the calf.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the meaning of it? The system in many parts of the country is that a stallion is used to get colts in various parts of a district on dams in different ownership. The owner of the dam, apparently, will not participate in the loan. Does the Bill mean that the colt, when born, is mortgaged to the owner of the stallion, or to the owner of the dam?

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like an explanation on one point—as to what the rights of the banks are to be under this bill of sale. I am not familiar with the laws relating to chattel mortgages in provinces other than Nova Scotia. I have found that our laws of that kind generally closely resemble those of Ontario. No doubt, as has been suggested by an hon. friend near me, Ontario copies Nova Scotia. In Nova Scotia if a man gives as security for payment of a note, a bill of sale upon certain property, the person who holds the bill of sale may take possession of that property if default is made by the borrower. It is not a settled point in our province whether the man who takes a horse, for instance, under a bill of sale, is obliged to sell the animal, or whether he may keep it in satisfaction of his claim. The minister does not catch what I say; if he does not think it worth his while listening, I shall direct my observations to the Chair.

Mr. MORPHY: I merely wish to interject the remark that I was discussing for a moment with the minister exactly the point that was being raised. I heard every

word the hon. member said, and I have no doubt the minister did also.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister says he did, I am perfectly satisfied. For my own part I have found it difficult to listen to two persons at the same time, and to know what both are saying. I was saying that in Nova Scotia if a man borrows $50 and gives security on a horse worth $200, in case of default being made it is quite competent for the person, or the bank holding the bill of sale to take absolute possession of the horse. Unless the person defaulting gets a decree from the court directing the sale of the animal and accounting for the difference between the proceeds and the amount of the claim, there is no provision in our Act giving the owner of the horse any remedy. Subsection 16 of section 88 of the Bank Act reads:

A security agreement in form H may be enforced by civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction.

There are a great many kinds of action; what kind of action should be taken under this provision? Is the bank obliged to obtain a decree of the court vesting the property in the bank, or is it the duty of the court to ascertain the value of the property and to decide how much shall go to the bank and how much shall be returned to the borrower? When we create a new law, the machinery should be made as definite as possible, so that the court will be left as little as possible to settle. I imagine that if a bank came into court under this subsection, it would be the duty of the court to decide the value of the property, perhaps direct the sale of it, and determine the amount to be paid the respective parties. But this would be a very expensive way for the farmer to find out how much was coming to him. The Act merely says that the owner of the property can assign it to the bank. At common law there must be an absolute assignment to give title. No absolute assignment is provided for here; an assignment which is not absolute merely gives a lien. Perhaps the insertion of the word "absolute" would overcome that difficulty. I make these observations merely to call the minister's attention to the fact that, so far as I can gather, no machinery is provided by this Act for determining what shall happen if there is default on the part of the person who gives property as security. The minister will see that some of us do not understand the machinery that is provided for the ordinary operation of this Act.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry that my hon. friend should have thought that I was guilty of some discourtesy to him. I assure him that I was endeavouring to listen to what he said; he will realize that a minister is subject to more or less interruption from time to time, and I hope he will accept the explanation.

My hon. friend inquired as to the chattel mortgage legislation of Ontario. It is some years since I have been familiar with it, but I may say that in many respects it is similar to that of Nova Scotia. Under the English system, as my hon. friend knows, a mortgage vests the property in the mortgagee, and the property so vested—personal property in this case—may remain in the possession of the mortgagor until default. Upon default the mortgagee, under the terms of the mortgage, is entitled to pursue his remedies. There is usually a covenant in a chattel mortgage—I am speaking now of Ontario chattel mortgages—in which the mortgagor promises that he will pay the amount advanced. It is, therefore, open to the mortgagee to sue upon the covenant or to enforce his security through the courts, as he might in the case of a land mortgage if there were not some agreement or covenant to the contrary. There is also in the Ontario chattel mortgage a power of sale which enables the mortgagee, upon giving the notice stipulated, to sell in accordance with the terms of the mortgage. Any surplus that he may have upon realization of the chattels and after payment to himself of the amount advanced, with interest and all charges, would, of course, belong to the mortgagor.

My hon. friend has called attention to Form H of the schedule. He will observe that in section 2 there is the following provision:

The bank may lend money to farmers and those engaged in stock-raising on the security of their live stock.

Then there is a definition of live stock:

The security agreement may be made in the form of a bill of sale or chattel mortgage, or, in any province where no provision exists in the laws of the province for the filing or other registration of bills of sale or chattel mortgages, then in the form H in the schedule to this Act or in a form to like effect.

The intention of the legislation is that the bank may take a chattel mortgage in provinces where there is provision for the registration of chattel mortgages. Usually, under the terms of such legislation, there

is a requirement of an affidavit of bona fides and provision for registration within a certain number of days. I think five days in the province of Ontario. The security agreement is intended to be used in provinces where the chattel mortgage is either not recognized by legislation or where no provision exists for such registration. I may call my hon. friend's attention to the last section in form H, which I think he has overlooked:

> This security is given under the provisions of subsections twelve and thirteen of section eighty-eight of the Bank Act, and is subject to the provisions of the said Act.

The Bank Act itself provides for the method of realization of the security. What we had in mind in providing that the security agreement in form H might be enforced by the court, was that machinery might be provided for its realization as the court might direct in cases in which it might not be expedient to realize under the provisions of the Bank Act mentioned. That, in general terms, is what we had in view. Before the matter comes up in committee I should be very glad to give attention to the point brought up by my hon. friend, and shall be glad to have the benefit of his views in committee.

The hon. member for Pictou stated that we were making a departure, and that is true. The Bank Act, for many years, in fact ever since it was first enacted, has had in view that banks should make short date loans. The idea of quick assets has always been present to legislators in considering legislation affecting banks. The reason is, of course, obvious. Bankers borrow from the public, and they borrow a large portion of their funds repayable on terms by which they may be asked to repay upon demand. Other deposits which they receive are upon notice. It is therefore of great importance to the banks that their assets should be of a quickly realizable character. That is to say, that their bills should be payable at short dates so that they may have money coming in from time to time which will enable them to meet their liabilities. Then in order to get the maximum of advantage to the community from the use of the bank capital, it is advisable that loans should be made for short date periods rather than that this capital should be tied up for long periods, because a bank will frequently be able to serve twenty customers requiring, let us say, $50,000, each representing a total of a million dollars, with much less than a million dollars of bank capital, because all the customers will not require the money at the same time. While that has been the policy of the banks and of all legislators in the past, my hon. friend, I know, recognizes that conditions are continually changing; and sometimes I think we fail to do justice to important sections of the community by reason of our failure to realize that conditions are changing, that new conditions are arising which have to be met by legislation. That is what has occurred in the West. Conditions in the West are different from conditions in the East. In the East the banks loan to farmers and others usually upon notes for which they have obtained endorsers. In the West it is very difficult to obtain satisfactory endorsers; and the result is that where the borrower is a man of good character and likely to succeed, where the moral risk, as they say, is good, then the bank has to face the question: Shall we make this loan? The bank might hesitate to make the loan if the borrower had not security; but, as has been pointed out, if he had the live stock security to pledge and if his credit was good, that is to say if the moral risk was looked upon as good, I think the loan would often be made where otherwise it would not be made. I think that is a justification for this legislation. In the case of sheep and hogs, I think the short term loan would be satisfactory; but in the case of cattle where it takes a couple of years or more to rear the animals to maturity, I think this legislation will be very useful. In the United States it is said to have been of supreme value to the stock raising industry, and over there the industry has been developed upon a large scale, with great benefit to the farming community, by reason of the facilities which are afforded under the banking legislation of the northwestern states whereby the banks are permitted to lend upon chattel mortgage security. My hon. friend from Pictou has said: Why not go further and allow the banks to loan upon all personal property? Well, there is something to be said for that view, although I think I could mention many objections. At present the banks loan to wholesale dealers and merchants upon commodities of all kinds. That has been the law and that, in a sense, was class legislation. It was regarded as necessary in the common interest of the community. This is in a sense class legislation, if it can be called class legislation where we are only endeavouring to put the farmer in the same posi-

5 p.m.

tion that a certain class of the business community has been in before. In time it may well occur that other interests will feel the need of some amendment of the Bank Act and they may say they think there might be an amendment under which they might be permitted to pledge personal property of their production to the bank. Should such an occasion arise, I should deem it my duty to consider such an application, or any representation made on that behalf, upon their merits. Hon. gentlemen know that bonds and stocks are personal property, but they are not classified as chattels under the chattel mortgage legislation of several of the provinces. It is a common transaction for an individual, as well as brokers, to pledge and hypothecate bonds and stocks as security for advances from banks.

When this matter comes before the committee it is my hope and wish that the proposed legislation will be thoroughly canvassed, because it does involve a departure and if, in the opinion of the majority of the committee, it is deemed advisable that a time limit should be put upon this legislation, so that it may, in a sense, be experimental, that will be well worthy of consideration. I remember that when we were bringing in the legislation of last session as to seed grain advances by banks, and permitting them to take security for such advances, my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggested, either by way of question, or by direct statement, that as it was war time an experiment might well be made. I would be prepared to consider, if the committee thought it desirable, a time limit in order that we might have the benefit of the experiment.

I have read over carefully the discussions since 1890 in connection with the successive revisions of the Bank Act and it is astonishing how history repeats itself. The arguments put forward here to-day, and when the resolution was under consideration, are precisely the arguments, pro and con, that were put forward in the old days, and I think it will interest hon. members of the House when I say that Mr. Donald Smith, afterwards Lord Strathcona, who knew the West as well as any man in the early nineties, was very strongly in favour of legislation of this character. I desire to thank the House for the very interesting discussion we have had and for the information which I have derived from the debate.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

INSURANCE COMPANIES EXTENSION BILL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 34, to authorize certain extensions of time to insurance companies. He said:

Mr. Speaker, I explained, when the House was in committee upon the resolution which preceded this Bill, that the intention of the legislation was to extend the time in which insurance companies might apply for licenses under the provisions of the Insurance Act of 1910. There are outstanding a number of company charters which would terminate this year unless they have organized and put themselves in the position to comply with the requirements of the Insurance Act. On account of the conditions which have prevailed since the outbreak of the war, it has not been possible for these companies to organize, to get their stock subscribed so as to be in a position to obtain licenses under the Insurance Act. The purpose of the legislation is to enable them to do so without special application on their part to Parliament. The other day the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) asked me for the names of the companies whose charters were so outstanding, and which would expire, and I laid upon the table of the House a list of which I gave him a copy. I think there were some seven or eight of such companies. A precisely similar Act was passed by the House last session.

Mr. OLIVER: Are these companies just being organized, or companies which have been organized, and which have to conform with some provision within a required time?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They are companies which were incorporated by Parliament, but my hon. friend knows that before they get a license under the Insurance Act they must have a certain amount of their capital subscribed and paid up. On account of the outbreak of the war and on account of the conditions which have prevailed since the war it has not been possible for these companies to get their stock subscribed as would have been the case had times remained normal. If a charter was about to lapse the ordinary course would

be for the company to make a new application by private Bill for an extension of the term. This is rather costly, and for the convenience of these companies we have thought it advisable to bring in this Bill in the same terms as the Bill of last year, extending for one year the period in which they may comply with the provisions of the Insurance Act.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the policy of the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to this matter? Does he think it a wise policy to continue extending the charter of a company that has been unable to comply with the terms of the Act? I understand we are leaving the whole matter in the discretion of his department, and that any of these companies will be at liberty to apply to him, or his department, to get an extension. Are we to understand that these extensions are to be granted to any company without any investigation or any requirements on the part of the company?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The policy has been not to lightly permit the renewal of charters, but I have not known of a case in which the Banking and Commerce Committee or the House have refused a private Bill for the extension of a charter when it has been shown to the satisfaction of the committee and the House that reasonable efforts have been made by the promoters of the company to capitalize it and to comply with the provisions of the Insurance Act. There is usually strong objection to a second renewal and that would obtain in this case were it not for war conditions. If it were not for war conditions I should not have introduced this Bill because if a company has been given an extension, and if it has failed to comply with the requirements of the Insurance Act, I think it should be called upon to show cause why it should be given a further extension.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

SUPPLY.

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

Government of the Northwest Territories—salary of Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, $1,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: As this is probably the last item on which I can bring this subject up, I should like to ask the minister why Inspector Heffernan of the Northwest Mounted Police was not given his ordinary promotion, and why two junior officers were put over his head, practically compelling him to resign? I do not ask the minister to reply now, but he might have this information for me when his estimates come up again.

Mr. ROCHE: I would point out that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police are not in my department, but in the Prime Minister's. I will direct his attention to the hon. gentleman's question.

Government of the Yukon Territory—salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the territory, $128,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the population of the Yukon? How are conditions there generally? We should economize in these times; what is the justification for all this expenditure?

Mr. ROCHE: I will ask the hon. member for the Yukon to answer that.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I am very glad indeed to be able to give my hon. friend the information which he asks for. I might preface my remarks by saying that it is very much easier to economize in the older and more settled sections of Canada than in outlying territories such as the Yukon. The Yukon is a very large territory—about 200,000 miles in extent; it is sparsely settled, and we have found it difficult to adjust the cost per annum to the variations of our population. Miners go out from the settled centres to outlying districts and prospect for gold and silver, copper, coal, petroleum, etc., and the Government gives them every possible assistance in carrying on this work, which we conceive to be for the benefit not only of the Yukon but of the whole of Canada. We have also roads to build, trails to cut, steamship lines to subsidize. We have found it difficult to adjust our expenditure to a lower amount than we are asking for this year. I am sure that every dollar that was spent by the Government in the Yukon last year was spent well, and I believe that if the House passes this vote the country will be given full value for the money.

Mr. KYTE: Does this include the cost of administration of justice in the Yukon?

Mr. THOMPSON: I think there is a separate vote for the administration of justice. As the item explains, there is a grant to Local Council for maintenance and re-

pairs of roads. Our population, according to the census of 1911, was 9,000. I do not think it has increased since that time.

Mr. TURRIFF: How much has it decreased?

Mr. THOMPSON: The last official figures I have are the census figures for 1911, when the population was 9,000. We are producing between four and a half and five million dollars worth of gold every year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By the use of gold dredges?

Mr. THOMPSON: About 80 per cent of the gold is recovered by dredging. These gold dredges are huge machines, and it may be interesting to the House to learn that we have in the Yukon the largest gold dredges in the world.

Mr. TURRIFF: Tell us about them.

Mr. THOMPSON: They are driven by electricity created by the water-power of the Klondike river and conveyed over wires to the seat of operation. They float in their own ponds and work twenty-four hours a day. The gold is recovered by a system of washing the gravel and carrying it through a series of operations. The cost of operation is being gradually reduced year by year, and thereby the basis of our pay-streak is being widened annually. This refers particularly to the older settled portions of the Yukon and those districts within striking distance of Dawson City. The auriferous area of the Yukon is not confined to those particular districts; large areas of gold-bearing gravel still await the prospector and the hydraulic operator. The cost of transportation is very considerable, and the cost of operation in the past has been so great that only the richer portions of the gold-bearing gravel could be mined profitably. Year by year, however, as the industry is becoming standardized, so to speak, the operating costs are decreasing, and therefore the low-grade gravels are being worked from time to time. New districts are opening up, and the future of the Yukon, I believe, was never better than it is at the present time.

We are successfully mining silver ores in the Yukon—ores that go between two and three hundred dollars in silver per ton. We also have in the Yukon perhaps the largest antimony deposits in the world, certainly the largest on this continent or on this side of China.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the location of them?

Mr. THOMPSON: The antimony deposits are in the vicinity of the Wheaton district, which is between lake Bennett and Whitehorse, about twenty miles along the Whitehorse railway. They were examined during the past year by Dr. Cairnes, an eminent geologist in the employ of the Government, and reported upon by him. I am not sure that the report is yet published, but if any hon. member is interested in antimony, he will find very interesting information in that report.

Mr. OLIVER: Are the antimony deposits being worked?

Mr. THOMPSON: I believe some of them are being worked this year. The price of antimony is pretty high at the present time, owing to the fact that it is used to harden shrapnel bullets, and a great deal of it is being used now by all the Powers that are fighting. Like many other things, the economic chemistry of antimony was in a somewhat indefinite condition before the war. Since the war began, antimony, like many other substances, has been investigated, and it has been found that it can be used for hardening lead. Therefore it is expected that a compound of antimony and lead will be extensively used in place of corrugated iron, because this compound will give a better and more durable roof, and the initial cost will be only a very little more. Therefore a great future in this respect is opening for the antimony industry.

We have gold in the Yukon, and we are producing large quantities every year. We have also silver, and, by the way, I may say that the silver deposits were examined last year by Dr. Cairnes for the Government, and his report will be issued in due course. We have also a very large copper belt in the vicinity of Whitehorse, which is at the head of navigation on the Yukon river, two thousand miles from its mouth on the Behring sea, and 110 miles from the town of Skagway on the Lyn canal, the chief port of the Yukon, although it is in Alaska. The copper belt is some twelve miles in extent, and some very valuable copper deposits are now being operated there. As a result of the war, copper also has advanced very materially in price. There are two, or perhaps three, mines operating on that belt at the present time, and I expect that before the end of the year there will be several others. A report on that

copper belt has already been published by Mr. McConnell, Deputy Minister of Mines. It is in the archives of the Mines branch, and I would commend that report to any one interested in copper.

There are huge areas of land in the Yukon that are capable of being developed as grazing lands, and some of our citizens are paying attention to that particular line of industry so that altogether the future of the Yukon is most bright and hopeful, and the last page of its history has not been written by any means. I feel sure that the committee, in passing this vote, will be doing credit to itself, and the money will be well expended, and will return from the Yukon like bread thrown on the waters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can my hon. friend tell me about the creek called Too-Much-Gold? A friend of mine was interested in it, but he told me that he had received nothing from his investment. He was carried away by the name.

Mr. THOMPSON: The name is certainly an attractive one, but I am afraid that the hopes raised by the name were not justified. There is a creek in the Yukon known as Too-Much-Gold, and the tradition is that the Indians, who were living on that creek when the white prospectors went there, had named it Too-Much-Gold or some name similar to that, and the prospectors adopted the name. I do not think, however, that that creek has produced any gold to speak of.

Mr. MACDONALD: I find the very large item of $90,000 for the administration of justice. For looking after 9,000 people in the Yukon, it is costing this country $443,000. Although my hon. friend the member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) has given the most optimistic view that could be given of that portion of the Dominion, the amount is a very large one per capita, especially if we take into account the fact that the population has been stationary, if not decreasing, during the past five years. It is larger than the provincial subsidy for some of the provinces. Now, it is a fair subject for consideration whether or not, in view of the fact that this territory adjoins British Columbia, the administration of provincial affairs under the British North America Act could not be transferred to British Columbia. It is a great anomaly that we should keep such a panoply of organized state in order to deal with 9,000 people. A friend who has made the calculation tells me that it amounts to $49 per capita. Conditions are changed from those which existed when the Yukon was expected to have a very large population. Though we have a minimum of population, we have all the machinery of Government for a vastly greater number of people. It seems to me that in this year of economy our expenditure in that part of the Dominion is too great. The minister ought to devise some means to economize. The business of the East is being taxed enormously in order to carry on the war, and there ought to be some concessions by these 9,000 people of the Yukon. I would like to know what the argument is in support of this expenditure.

Mr. THOMPSON: I quite realize the force of the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald); but I am sure he will bear me out when I say that while it is easy to cast a scheme of government for a given population, it is not so easy to adjust that scheme to a decreasing population. There is a certain fixed charge, as in any other organization, below which it is impossible to go. For instance, you must have a court in that part of Canada; we are entitled to it.

Mr. MACDONALD: But the expenditure involved is very large.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that even the labouring man, who has no more skill than is required to handle a pick and shovel, gets four dollars a day and board.

Mr. OLIVER: All the year round?

Mr. THOMPSON: While he works. He works at mining, dredging, hydraulicking, in the summer, and if he works in the winter he gets the same wage.

Mr. OLIVER: How many months does the season cover?

Mr. THOMPSON: The season is being extended. One dredge is working this year all winter, I believe, but I fancy that six months would be the average, perhaps a fairly high average. The work begins in the latter part of March and ends in October, as a rule. One company has been able to operate its dredges until the beginning of the New Year, and I believe is even operating one all winter. One of the difficulties we have been confronted with is to adjust the cost of governing the territory to the decreasing population. But that is not a new problem in the governing of western countries. When the province of British Columbia was admitted into this

confederation—I quote from memory and subject to correction—she had not more than 25,000 white people, yet she was given a representation of six members in this House.

Mr. TURRIFF: We are not dealing with representation; we are not thinking of cutting down the representation of the Yukon.

Mr. THOMPSON: I thank my hon. friend for that. My point is that in considering these new countries, you must not think that the last stage has been reached. A stampede may occur, and an influx of population, at any time.

Mr. MACDONALD: What internal taxation have you there?

Mr. THOMPSON: That is another point, and I am glad my hon. friend reminded me of it. We have in the Yukon what you have not in any other province of Canada, a direct tax of 2½ per cent on our principal output, that of gold.

Mr. MACDONALD: Every province pays royalties.

Mr. THOMPSON: As a provincial tax, but no province returns a tax on its output to the federal treasury.

Mr. MACDONALD: But we more than give that back in the expenditure we make.

Mr. McCRANEY: What is the amount of revenue derived from that royalty?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am not arguing that our revenue is sufficient—

Mr. MACDONALD: Is there any local taxation?

Mr. THOMPSON: We have the municipal taxes of Whitehorse and Dawson. Then, of course, we have liquor licenses, the proceeds of which are used for road building. Besides, a tax is charged for recording a claim and for the annual renewal of a claim.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the hon. gentleman any idea what the returns to the Dominion treasury are for the recording and renewal of claims?

Mr. ROCHE: Last year the revenue was $210,000 for all sources.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the reason for the decrease in population?

Mr. THOMPSON: Mining populations are notorious for their migratory habits. Gold miners especially are attracted to new countries by prospects of discovery. We lost quite a large number of our population some years ago to Alaska, which is also a gold-mining country, and the conditions in which are very similar to those in Yukon. Some of our people went there, and are there to-day. It is quite within the realm of probability that they will come to the Yukon again if some of the new strikes which are now being exploited prove as good as we hope they will.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the revenue from the recording and renewal of claims?

Mr. THOMPSON: Royalty on gold in round figures, $116,000; placer grants, $9,000; placer renewals, $40,000; placer relocations, $3,000; quartz grants, $975; gold dredging leases, $5,000; hydraulic leases, $5,000; mining fees, $6,000; payments in lieu of work, $1,000; land sales, and quartz acreage, $2,900; rentals, $7,000; timber dues, $11,000; suspense account, $1,000; total, $210,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many schools and colleges are there in the Yukon?

Mr. THOMPSON: We in the Yukon are on the very outposts of Canada; we are a part of Canada, and we are keeping up our share in this Canadian civilization of ours. Our schools are excellent. We have in Dawson a school which is not called a normal school, or a high school, but which gives students work equivalent to that of the first year in the University of Toronto or McGill. We send pupils from Dawson to the University of Toronto and to McGill to take second year work. We are, therefore, doing our share in keeping up the standard of education which we believe to be in the best interests of all Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: You have no more people there than would be found in a fair-sized town in any of our eastern provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON: There are not more people in the whole of Nova Scotia than there are in the city of Toronto.

Mr. MACDONALD: But the Dominion Government does not pay them $44 a head to live in Nova Scotia.

Mr. THOMPSON: The province of Nova Scotia, from which I came, and of which I am proud, passed through the same series of events which the Yukon territory is passing through to-day. It did not come suddenly into existence, with a population of half a million, with great industries,

great commerce and great educational institutions; it had to grow, as the Yukon is growing. The same is true of the other provinces of Canada; the western provinces had their periods of good fortune and of bad fortune.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A few years ago my hon. friend brought a bag of wheat and submitted it to the House as an indication of the fertility of the soil in the Yukon. Will my hon. friend tell the committee whether wheat is still grown in the Yukon?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am glad to inform my hon. friend that we are growing some wheat in the Yukon.

Mr. MARCIL: Do you grow enough for your own needs?

Mr. THOMPSON: No, we grow practically no wheat, unless it be for experimental purposes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You grow vegetables, do you not?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes, excellent vegetables: potatoes, carrots, cabbage, beans, barley, and quite a large quantity of oats. Some of the farms are very creditable indeed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You ought to grow a Yukon minister.

Mr. THOMPSON: I hope in time that the Yukon may be important enough to have a minister; I thank my hon. friend for the suggestion. It may be interesting to the House to know that the wheat that I brought from the Yukon on that occasion proved to be of a very virile type. I sent a sample of it to the seed specialist at the experimental farm, who planted 100 grains. Of these 100 grains, 100 per cent germinated, which shows the possibilities of the seed we can grow in that country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When I was Postmaster General there was considerable quarrelling about the postal service in the Yukon. Has the quarrel with the railway company been settled, and is the service in good running order?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes, excellent. The embargo has been removed, and we can get all the mail all the time, which was one of the slogans that we used in the Yukon. I would draw the attention of the hon. member for Pictou to the fact that for years we had to pay double rates on money orders; we paid 60 cents where the other parts of Canada paid only 30. In this respect we are now on the same basis as the rest of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think you use the post office for the forwarding of gold-dust.

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you pay a high rate?

Mr. THOMPSON: No, the rate is the same as that on any other commodity. The gold is smelted and made into small bricks and sent out by mail.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you pay insurance?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am not sure about that.

Mr. MARCIL: Have you a rural mail service in the Yukon?

Mr. THOMPSON: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: I desire that the hon. member for Yukon should not misapprehend the position I take with regard to this matter. I am delighted to know that he is so confident about the future of the Yukon country; nothing would give me greater pleasure than to look forward to the development of that portion of Canada. The point that I desire to raise is whether or not we are paying this year for the administration of the affairs of the Yukon the same amount that we paid when the population was double what it is to-day. If it be true that we are paying for administering the affairs of 9,000 people what it cost when the population was 20,000 or 25,000, I should like to ask whether, in view of the pronouncements made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as to the necessity for strictest economy in these times, some amendment could not be made by which a saving could be effected. I say this in all friendliness to my hon. friend's constituency. Before this vote is passed I think we should know what the Yukon is costing us to-day, and what it cost us, say, in 1910. Is there any reason why there should be no retrenchment in the Yukon if there is retrenchment in every other part of Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: Perhaps the hon. minister will bring down a list of the officials who are employed in the Yukon.

Mr. ROCHE: I have a list of them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I feel like being generous to my hon. friend and to the territory he has the honour to represent; I do not think we should be too rigid in our criticism of

the expenditures out there. But at the same time I think there is a certain necessity for retrenchment. In looking at the Auditor General's Report of last year, I find that the total customs revenue is $164,000, and this has cost us about $30,000 to collect. There are a number of officers obtaining large salaries and large living expenses in the employment of the Customs Department. Although the amount collected is small and the expense so large, I see that one man has been working overtime, and is allowed $403 for overtime work. It is just possible that some of these salaries might be reduced, and that we do not need so many customs officers for the collection of so small an amount as $164,000. I know that the Minister of Customs believes in a large staff; we have learned that since he became minister. But it seems to me that it is up to him to look into that matter and see if he cannot trim the Yukon salary list a little.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the hon. member for the Yukon tell us where the northern terminus in the Alaskan territory of this new American railway will be? Will it have any appreciable effect on the condition of the people in the Yukon as regards transportation facilities? Have they started the construction of that road at both ends?

Mr. THOMPSON: They have not begun construction at both ends, but they have begun construction at the tide water end. That will be at a point called Seward, in Alaska, 600 miles west of Skagway, the port at which we land for the Yukon. The internal terminus of the road is said to be Fairbanks, which is in the heart of the gold-bearing district of Alaska. Fairbanks is about 700 miles from Dawson, and I do not expect that the road will very materially alter the transportation affairs of the Yukon territory.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at six o'clock p.m.

INDEX

SIXTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1916.

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 5.
Acknowledgment of, 1117.

Address to His Majesty the King, 636, 755.
See Parliament, extension of term of.

Adulteration of food. *See* Food.

Advertising, government,
Homestead regulations, 827.
Immigration, 2436.
Payments for, 2299, 3095.
Post Office Department, 1164, 2739.

Agriculture
Agricultural products, export of, 345.
Animals
Diseased, destruction of, 2957.
Health of, 1430, 2956, 2968.
Apples
Cost of production, 2312.
Duty on. *See* Taxation.
Bulletins, 1405.
Butter and cheese factories—taxation of, 1391, 1398.
Cold storage, 1427.
Dairying industry, 1391, 1398, 1420, 2966.
Department
Clerks, 2801.
Employees with diplomas, 2176.
Estimates, 661, 1386, 1410, 2956.
Official of—remarks on apple duty, 1426.
Staff and salaries, 661.
Development of, 1211, 1220.
Eggs, marketing of, 2961.
Exhibitions. *See that title.*
Experimental farms, 1386, 1409, 2871, 3160. 3407.
Flax. *See that title.*
Flax expert, 2348.
Fruit growing, 1407.
Grain. *See that title.*
Hay. *See* war supplies.
Hogs
American, 2923.
Cholera, 395, 1397, 2957.
Government inspection of, 1552, 1606.

Agriculture—*Con.*
Hogs—*Con.*
Slaughtering of at Amherst, 2174.
Smuggling of into Canada, 4099.
Horses
Exportation of prohibited, 1329.
Importations from United States, 2057.
Purchases by Department, 3881.
Stallion—gift of by the King, 1398.
See also war supplies.
Illustration stations, 1387, 1397, 1399.
See also experimental farms.
Insect pests, 1412.
Livestock, 716, 886, 1390, 1393, 1398.
Potatoes
Duty on, 1430.
Embargo on, 1412.
Export of, 1059.
Inspectors, 951, 1395, 1398, 1415, 1420.
Powdery scab, 1413.
Prices, retail, 873.
Shipment regulations, 1412.
Tobacco industry, 394.
Wheat. *See* grain.
Wool
Embargo on, 393.
Exportation of, 2058.

Aitkin, Sir Max, duties of, 534.
Payments to, 2692.

Airships.. *See* Aviation.

Alberta
Contributions to war, 915.
Farmers, relief for, 532.
Purchases of war supplies in, 3232.
Seed grain, 886.

Alguire, Mr. Duncan Orestes (Stormont)
Soldiers, appointment of to Civil Service, 649.

Aliens
Employment of, 850.
Farm labour, for, 2649.
Government employment of, 1142.
Naturalization of, 2922.
Registration of, 542.
Supervision over, 691.

Allied Economic Conference, 2475, 2802.

Allison, Colonel J. Wesley, 271, 290, 1343, 1345, 1355, 1358, 2012, 2245, 2276, 2291, 2476.
See also Shell contracts.

American Club, Toronto, wrecking of, 856.

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Mont'l., St. Antoine)
Budget, 1255.
The Patriotic Fund, 1255.

Amherst, N.S.
Canada Car and Foundry Company buildings, 1078.
Military barracks, 1435, 2300, 2600.
Postal revenue, 3561.
Troops at, 3269.
War supplies purchased at, 3266.

Ammunition. *See* War supplies.

Annandale buoys, 1808.

Annuities, Government, 1437, 2735.

Anse à Beaufils breakwater, 3623.

Anticosti, Gaspé and north shore mail service, 536.

Antigonish
Fishery officer, 552.
Post office, 552.
River guardians, 552.
Station flower garden, 2057, 3593, 3603.

Apples. *See* Agriculture.

Archibald, Captain M. G., services of, 539.

Arisaig lightkeeper, 1808.

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (E. Lambton)
Budget, 1015.
The duty on apples, 1016.
The duty on oil, 1018.
Production and consumption of gasolene, 1019.
Flax industry, 1287.
Gasolene, production and consumption of, 1019.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2421, 2444, 2472.
Railways, location of, 2746.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2746.
Taxation
Apples, 1016, 1789.
Oil, 1018.

Armstrong lake bridge, 2692.

Army
Allowances
Disability, 105, 108, 110, 158, 2873, 3334.
Separation, 109, 116, 550, 1021, 1098, 1256, 2176, 2924, 3098, 3232.
Subsistence, 550. *See also* Pensions.
Amherst, barracks, 1435, 2300, 2600.
Badges, 3509. *See also* Decorations.
Cadets. *See* Militia.

Army—*Con.*
Campbellton, accommodation at, 1162.
Camps
Farnham, 1164.
Valcartier, 2174.
Canadian forces, 24, 31, 40, 60.
Reorganization of, 2015.
Canadian troops in action, 889.
Carson, Brigadier-General, Staff of, 2693.
Casualty lists, 2841, 3029, 3280, 3293.
Chaplains, 2171, 3097.
Clothing. *See* war supplies.
Commissions, granting of, 3509.
Conscription, 19, 26, 59, 65, 103, 180, 592, 829, 1272.
Decorations, military, 1969, 3294.
Dental corps, 3237, 4129.
Enlistments
Civil Servants, of, 655, 817-826, 1044.
Coloured men, of, 235, 557, 2114.
Districts, by, 1350.
Foreign labourers, of, 2145.
French-Canadians, of, 179, 1081, 3281.
Generally, 104, 107, 360, 367.
Interior Department, from, 833, 2084, 2092.
Jews, of, 1550.
Minors, of, 3049.
Paquette, Edward, of, 2241, 2648.
Post Office employees, of, 1761.
Provinces, by, 3025.
Royal Military College, from, 362.
See also Recruiting.
Equipment, military, 112.
Farnham, military camp, 1164.
First contingent, transportation of, 2693.
French-Canadiana Battalion, 1373.
Medical
Corps, 3236.
Examination, 4069, 4125.
Officers
Black, Dr. J. B., 1368.
Charlottetown, 1905.
Forbes, Dr. A. McKenzie, 3528.
Freeman, Dr. N. P., 3097.
Ottawa, 1759.
Pay of, 1349.
Selection of, 3289.
Medicine Hat Overseas Battalion, 1435.
Moosejaw military, 1651.
Officers
Canadian, in England, 949, 1377, 1551.
Commissions, granting of, 3509.
Muirhead, Major, charges against, 306, 398.
Political activities of, 3541.
Spidal, J. A., 3541. *See also* Spiddel.
Training of, 289, 3533.
Unattached, in England, 1377.

Army—*Con.*
Orangemen in Army Service, 359.
Overseas forces
Equipment of, 3504, 3513.
Forwarding of, 3513.
Framing and disposition of, 2348.
Parliament, members of, in military service, 949, 1328, 1550, 2168.
Pensions. *See that title.*
Prisoners from penitentiaries in, 2117.
Promotions, system of, 1351.
Provisions. *See* war supplies.
Rations, expenditure for, 440.
Recruiting
Alleged opposition to, 1607.
Bellechase county, in, 1325.
Coloured men, of, 235, 557, 2114.
Edmonton, in, 113, 3586.
Enrollment by districts, 1350.
French-Canadians, of, 3643.
Medical examinations, 440.
Methods of, 292.
Montreal, in, 4069, 4125.
Nova Scotia, in, 145, 1367, 3255.
Officers
Appointment of, 1350, 1373.
Fillimore, Major, 2477.
Kennedy, R. H., 4075.
Mullock, T. A., 2300.
Ottawa, 3586.
Spiddel, Rev. J. A., 3097, 3541.
Quebec, in, 479, 491, 498, 3281.
Unfit men, of, 3251.
Western provinces, in, 3550.
Rifle practice, 3517.
Soldiers
Ballots for, 673.
Barbour, Private, death of, 3417.
Chute, Lieutenant A. H., 2476.
Civil Service—appointment of to, 642, 1276.
Curry, Private D., death of, 2987, 3049.
Deceased, estates of, 4075.
Decorations, record of, 1969.
Dependents of, allowances to. *See* Allowances.
Disabled, provision for, 105, 108, 110, 158, 2873, 3334.
Discharge of, 3230.
Employment of
In England, 995, 1371.
On farms, 3589, 4129.
Equipment of, 3502-3528.
Private subscriptions for, 590.
Grenier, Private Adolphe, 3559.
Hayes, Joseph, charges against, 306, 400.
Homes for, 1657, 1662.
Illiterate, 1904.
Insane, 1659, 1664.

Army—*Con.*
Intoxicating liquor, use of by, 756, 803.
Kits. *See* war supplies.
Mail matter for, 532, 2051, 2053.
Medical examination of, 4069, 4125.
Pay of, 552, 1162.
Punishment of, 3051, 3099, 3230, 3257, 3525, 3537.
Railway fares, for
Return, 2646.
Single, 3594.
Special, 2549.
Relatives of, payments to, 3560.
Return tickets for, 2646.
Returned, provision for, 233, 237, 1638.
Riots, participation in, 756, 803, 855, 2548.
Special railway rates, for, 2549.
Stedman, Robert E., 3232.
Stewart, Corporal, death of, 2443.
Technical training for, 1618, 1626.
Voting of, 3511.
Working in England, 995, 1371.
Troops
Local, supplies to, 552, 851, 968, 1042, 1043, 1077, 1349, 2172.
Mobilization of, 288, 302.
Transportation of, 35, 58, 2693.
Woodmen's Regiment, 1117.
13th C.M.R.—commanding officer, 1329.
40th Battalion, 1043.
68th Battalion, 2695.
101st Battalion, 3548.
102nd Battalion, 1041.
104th Battlaion—medical officer, 1161.
106th Regiment—supplies, 851, 1042, 1077, 1349, 2172.
109th Battalion—separation allowances, 2348.
151st Battalion, recruiting of, 1372.
159th Battalion, 1435.
163rd Battalion, 4152.
191st Battalion, 1329.
206th Battalion, 2167.
See also War *and* Militia.

Astronomical observatory, western, 2430, 2871.

Astronomical surveys. *See* surveys.

Auditor General, salary of, 657.

Aviation, 2895, 2898, 2900.

Baddeck, wharf, 548.

Badger, W., employment of, 1439.

Baleine, steamship, 3676.

Bank Act Amendment Bills
Interest on deposits, 1r., 2599.
Loans to farmers, Res., 674. 1r., 681. 2r., 924. Ref. to Com., 937. Com., 1611. 3r., 1714. Sen. Amdts., 3147.

Banks and banking
Dominion notes, advances of, 592.
Nationalization of, 1834.
Paper currency, issue of, 1834.
Savings deposits, rate of interest on, 543.
Taxes payable by banks, 2176, 2478.

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Pelagic Sealing Commission, 3025.
Shipbuilding, 4057.

Bateman, Captain John, employment of, 545.

Battle of St. Julien—commemoration of anniversary, 3026.

Bay Fortune breakwater, 3635.

Bay St. Lawrence telegraph office, 1551.

Bear River, N.S.—public building site, 1164.

Beehan, J. J., employment of, 3408.

Beland, Dr. H. S., detention of in Germany, 806, 1274.
Payment of sessional indemnity to, 3873.

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Bilingual question, the, 3824.
Budget, 1034.
Canada and the war, 1034.
Our national security, 1035.
Intercolonial railway—sleepers, 549.
Rivière du Loup
Dredging, 2477.
Wharf, 2543.

Bennett, D. D., 1759.

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bilingual question, the, 3812.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—loan to, proposed, 3945.
Grain
Congestion in the West, 3883.
Transportation of, 3077.
Interior Department expenditure, 2091.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2210.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2071.
Seed Grain indebtedness, 510.
Shell contracts, 1565.
Technical education, 2206.

Bennett, Mr. Wm. H. (East Simcoe)
Mail contracts, 2615.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2449.
Political patronage, 1363.
Shipbuilding, 3127.
War supplies—Securing of, orders for, 971.
Woman suffrage, 1195.

Berlin, Ont.
Aliens, registration of, 542.
Disturbances at, 855.

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Enlistment of Post office employees, 1761.
Genest, Mr. S. M., employment of, 885.
Mail contracts, 2613.
Railways—passenger service, 3422.
Taxation of apples, 1786.

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Aliens, naturalization of, 2922.
Capital punishment, 39, 558, 1956, 1968.

Big Island mail service, 549.

Bilingual question, the, 482-490, 1206, 1810, 1833, 3618, 3676, 3734.

Blades, Captain Charles, employment of, 545.

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada, 2907.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1891.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2906.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1888.

Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Mines Department
Estimates, 2326.
Reports, 2336.
Peat, 2329.

Blue River M. & L. Company, 1076.

Boivin, Mr. Geo. H. (Shefford)
Bilingual question, 1206, 3808.
British Columbia Companies Act, 3561.
Farnham Experimental farm, 3407.
Fenian Raid Bounty, 3231.
Hogs, smuggling of into Canada, 4099.
Judges
Montreal, 2301.
Quebec, 2692.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2356.
Quebec referee on butter and cheese, 3942.
Victoria Memorial Museum, specimens for, 2343, 2345.

Bonaventure
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.
Mail service, 1438, 2172.

Boots, army. *See* War Supplies.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 22.
Decease of members, 22.
Government expenditures, 23.
Commandeering of wheat, 23.
The war situation, 23.
Canadian forces, 24, 31.
Conscription, 26.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
War commissions, appointment of, 26.
Visit to Great Britain, 27.
Production of munitions and supplies, 28.
Transportation, 29.
Purchase of horses, 30.
Spirit of the Allies, 30.
Address to His Majesty the King, 636, 755.
Aliens, supervision of, 690.
Army
Badges, 3509.
Canadian forces, 24, 31.
Casualty lists, 3280, 3293.
Clothing, 3527.
Commissions, granting of, 3510.
Conscription, 26.
Dental corps, 3237, 4129.
Medical corps, 3236.
Military decorations, 3294.
Officers
Political activities of, 3541.
Training of, 3533.
Overseas forces, equipment of, 3504, 3515.
Recruiting, 3289, 3587, 4125.
Soldiers
Civil Service—appointment to, 650.
Deceased, estates of, 4095.
Dependents of, allowances to, 4105.
Discharge of, 3230.
Employment of on farms, 4129.
Equipment of, 3502, 3528.
Homes, for, 1662.
Pensions. *See* Pensions.
Punishment of, 3231, 3525, 3537.
Return tickets for, 2646.
Riots, participation in, 756.
Voting of, 3511.
Battle of St. Julien—commemoration of anniversary, 3026.
Beland, Dr., detention of in Germany, 806.
Bilingual question, 3619, 3690.
Brantford, city of, 2664.
Cable and wireless rates, 672.
Cadet service, 3502.
Calgary, alleged disturbances at, 756.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3945.
Canadian Red Cross Society, 1325, 1492, 2014.
Canals, patrolling of, 3591.
Censored mail matter, 3029, 3050.
Chairman of Committee, appointment of, 531.
Civil Service
Appointment of soldiers to, 650.
Enlistments from, 822, 824.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Civil Service Commission, 665.
Constitutional Documents, publication of, 976.
Currie, General, 2351.
Davidson Commission, 2399, 4006.
Daylight saving, 4006.
Economic and Development Commission, 3641.
External affairs, Department of, 1207.
Fair wages boards, 1277.
Government expenditures, 974, 976.
Governor General—Correction of press statement, 2443.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3577, 3662.
Gratuities to public servants, 3535.
High Commissioner, Canadian, 664, 667, 956.
Home Guard, 3504.
Hospitals, military, 3236.
House of Commons
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 1329.
Business of the House, 1208.
Clerk assistant, appointment of, 884.
Hansard, alleged omission from, 2648.
Mace, the, 762.
Morning sittings, 2111, 2924.
Two o'clock sittings, 3294.
Immigration—widows and children, 1330.
Imperial Munitions Board, 594, 804, 923, 1509.
Intercolonial railway—return tickets for soldiers, 2646.
International Joint Commission, 980.
Law, the late Mr. B. B., M.P., death of, 590.
Meredith-Duff. Commission—printing of evidence, 4130.
Militia and Defence Department estimates, 3502, 3537, 3586.
Minister of Munitions, 532.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 686, 956.
National Transcontinental Railway, Government operation of, 2399.
Naval Service, 1689, 1763, 2545.
Nickel, exportation of, 2166.
Ottawa buildings, height of, 2166.
Parliament
Extension of term of, 622, 4077.
See also Address to His Majesty the King.
Independence of—subscriptions to Dominion loan, 755.
Railways, jurisdiction respecting, 947.
Parliament Buildings
Destruction of, 578, 582.
Messages of sympathy, 855.
Report of Chief Commissioner of Police, 669.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Parliament Buildings—*Con.*
Reconstruction of, 591, 663, 2013, 2014.
Committee of members on, 3050.
Pensions to soldiers, 1659, 1989, 4131, 4150.
Political patronage, 3288, 3544.
Post Office Department expenditure, 1887.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1441. 2351.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2530.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4048.
Railways
Location of, 2750.
Oil for fuel on, 977.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2750.
Remounts for Canadian forces, 950.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3502.
Shell Committee. *See* Shell contracts.
Shipbuilding, 4052.
Solicitor General, 667.
Tupper, late Right Hon. Sir Charles, Bart, 39, 582.
Vessels, Canadian, requisitioning of, 1970.
Vickers-Maxim Ltd., strike at, 1764.
War
Appropriations, 3233, 3287, 3533.
Purchasing Commission, 1279.
War Supplies
Ammunition, 28, 106.
British Government, for, 957-973.
French Government, for, 973.
Horses, 30, 542, 652, 653, 758, 950, 1041.
Issues of to Canadian troops, 968.
Machine guns, contributions for, 3291, 3522.
Orders for, securing of, 957-973.
Ross rifles, 3505-3522, 4106, 4107.
Russian Government, for, 973.
Shell contracts—proposed committee of, investigation into, 1505, 2442, 2920, 2985, 3477.
Small arms ammunition, 2302, 3890.
Water powers
Control of, 556.
Ownership of, 760.
Wheat, commandeering of, 23.
Winnipeg, disturbances at, 2548.
Woman suffrage, 1203.

Boots, purchase of. *See* War supplies.

Boucher, Dr., complaints against, 1550.

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)
Agriculture, 1395.
Budget, 1079.
Reply to Mr. Lanctot, 1079.
Immigration, 1080.
Germans in the public service, 1081.

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
French-Canadian and enlistment, 1081.
Government expenditure, 1082.
Censors and decipherers, 2476.
Civil Service
Appointments to, 650, 666.
Examinations, 2478.
French-Canadians in, 1176.
Soldiers, appointment of, to, 650.
Enlistment of Jews, 1550.
French-Canadians in Civil Service, 1176
Gulf fisheries guardian, 548.
Haanel, Dr., employment of, 851.
Intercolonial railway
Dining car service, 2420.
Express service, 2420.
Operation of, 2595.
Passenger service, 3421.
Interior Department, expenditure, 2095.
Life-saving stations, 2916.
Military Hospital Commission, 2347.
Mining products, export of, 1161.
Ottawa Citizen—statements of, 807.
Penitentiaries, 2121.
Pilotage, 751.
Political patronage, 1377.
Post office employees, 1906.
Potato inspectors, 951.
Quebec steamship service, 2852, 2855.
Rimouski and Matane, enlistments from, 2301.
Rimouski harbour improvements, 3175.
Soldiers, appointment of to Civil Service, 650.
Wheat, free, 1060.

Boundary surveys. *See* surveys.

Bourassa, Henri, alleged disloyal utterances of, 356, 363, 379.

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Gely, Aurele, employment of, 1759.
Lévis
Drill hall, 2173.
Military property, lease of, 2922.
Quarantine station, 2011, 3352.

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Dempsey, Ernest, stone purchased from, 3098.
Macdonald, Archibald, 2694.
Maple sugar industry, 2159.
Monpetit, Eleazer, 2694.
Nickle export, 2799.
Rigaud-Pointe Fortune mail route, 541, 595.
Soulanges Canal, 1041, 1437, 1760.

Boys, Mr. W. A. (S. Simcoe)
Shell contracts, 2249.

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Political patronage, 1365.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2928.
Selkirk barracks, 1385.
Sweeney, Mr.—statement of Mr. Turriff, 1156.

Brandt, Peter, employment of, 832.

Breen's pond breakwater, 1438.

Bristol, Mr. Edward (Toronto Centre)
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2470.

British Columbia
Goods shipped to via Panama Canal, 4092.
Indian Commission, 852.
Labourers, importation of, 1329.
Lighthouse service, 3352.
102nd Battalion, mobilization of, 1041.
Public works—dredging, 1077.
Resources and production of, 3842.
Sealers, claims of, 595.

British Columbia Companies Act, 3561.

British North America Act, proposed amendment. *See* Parliament, extension of term of.

British Remount Commission, 2799.

Broad Cove Marsh wharf, 3557.

Broder, Mr. Andrew (Dundas)
Shell contracts, 2519.

Bromptonville mail service, 3562.

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat)
Alberta farmers, relief for, 532.
Aliens, interned, as farm labourers, 2649.
Army
13th C.M.R.—commanding officer, 1329.
191st Battalion, 1329.
British Columbia copper refineries and zinc smelter, 2799.
Budget, 915.
Alberta and the war, 915.
Taxation, 916.
Duty on apples, 916.
Political patronage, 917.
Marketing of wheat, 917.
Western farm problems, 919.
Grain elevators, 920.
Carslake hotel property, 3562.
Casualty lists, 3029.
Experimental farms, 1407.
Farm labour, 1906, 2649.
Flax industry, 1293.
Fruitgrowing, 1407.
Grain
Elevators, 532, 920, 1609.
Marketing of, 917.
Shipments on Transcontinental railway, 1276.

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat) —*Con.*
Grain—*Con.*
Transportation, 1308.
Wheat, commandeering of, 3222, 3226.
Grazing leases, 847.
Iimmigration—Austrian and German, 547.
Indian Lands Commission, 2057, 2867.
Irrigation, 842.
Lethbridge,
Immigration agent, 2695.
Internment camp supplies, 2011.
Post office, 2800.
Loans to farmers, 550, 679.
Medicine Hat
Customs building, 1440.
Eagle Butte mail service, 534.
Overseas regiment, 1435.
Post office, 534.
Pre-emptions, payments on, 534.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 638, 2357.
Railways, guarantees to, 887.
Roseberg post office, 2474.
Seed grain,
Distribution, 2862.
Purchase of, 886.
Taber irrigation district, 2807.
Taxation of apples, 1775.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2903, 2906.
Transcontinental railway—grain shipments on, 1276.
War supplies
Alberta purchases, 3232.
Hay, 2298.
Oats, 2298.
Purchasing agents, 3528.
Wool, exportation of, 2058.

Budget debate, 807, 889, 989, 1015, 1079, 1118, 1137, 1209, 1228. *See* Taxation.

Buffalo in parks, 845.

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Marchand, Zepherin, fuel purchased from, 3098.
Mines Department expenditure, 2341.
National Transcontinental Railway, Government operation of, 2593.
Ontario Hydro-Radial scheme and French Members, 1432.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1491.

Burleigh expedition, 853.

Burleigh falls, lease of, 2583. *See* Water-powers.

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 372.
The Opposition and the war, 372-376.
Nationalists, and political parties, 377.
Statement of Mr. Armand Lavergne, 377.
Civil Service, appointment of ex-soldiers to, 649.
Labour bureaus, national, 610.
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 377.
Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Railway Company, 2458.
Peterborough public building, 2810.
Political patronage in military affairs, 1363, 3253, 3542.
Post Office
Mail contracts, 2725.
Rural mail service, 2621.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2480.
Railways
Departmental estimates, 3063.
Nationalization of, 3364.
Recruiting, alleged opposition to, 1607.
Soldiers
Appointments to Civil Service, 649.
Illiterate, 1904.
Taxation of land, 2000.
Technical education, 1628, 2200.
Toronto Star—statements of, 555.
Trade policies, 1618.
Trent canal, 2580.

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 313.
Canadians and the war, 313.
The Davidson Commission, 315.
Purchase of submarines, 316-319.
Hay contracts, 320-335.
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4154.
Submarines, purchase of, 316-319.

Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3638.

Business Profits War Tax Bill, 1r., 2298. 2r., 2601. Com., 2636, 2649. 3r., 2802.

Cables. *See* Telegraphs.

Calgary, alleged disturbances at, 756, 803.

Campbellton
Alleged disturbances at, 756, 803, 855, 945.
Gaspé steamship service, 536, 3100.
Proposed bridge, 3628.
Public building, 1162.
Railway superintendent, 535.
Soldiers' accommodation at, 1162.

Canada Car and Foundry Company, payments to, 1078.

Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 1603. 2r., 1706. Com., 1706, 1971. 3r., 1971.

Canada Peat Society, 2329.

Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills.
Certificated motor boats, 1r., 2346. 2r., 2802. Com., 2885. 3r., 2956.
Coasting, 1r., 589. 2r., 1300-1305. Com., 1305. Ref. to Com., 2496. Com., 4128. 3r., 4128.
Pilotage, 1r., 2542. 2r., 2804. Com., 2804, 2885. 3r., 2956.

Canada Temperance Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 2878. 2r., 3298. Com., 3298. 3r., 3303.

Canadian Associated Press, 3638.

Canadian Manufacturers Association and war supplies, 159.

Canadian Northern Railway Company
Audit of revenues and expenditures, 3989.
Director of, 2648.
Loan to, proposed, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3826, 3933, 3943.
Rates on oil, 3410.
Snow blockade on, 2647.
Subsidies and guarantees to, 1042.

Canadian Pacific Railway
Freight congestion on, 2742.
Subsidies and guarantees to, 1042.

Canadiana Red Cross Society Amendment Bill. 1r., 1325. 2r., 1493. Com., 2014. 3r., 2015.

Canadian Transport Service, 2888.

Canals, 1712, 3609.
Patrolling of, 3519. *For individual canals, see their titles.*

Cap a la Roche channel, 761.

Cape Breton, dredging, 2172.

Cape Negro island lighthouse, 544.

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill. 1r., 391. 2r., 1957. Div., 1968.

Carkner, W. Lloyd, employment of, 1169.

Carleton Beach protection works, 536.

Carleton Drug Company, purchases from, 2542.

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 363.
Nationalists and the war—Bourassa and Lavergne, 363.
Loyalty of French-Canadians, 365.
The Shell Committee, 366.
Enlistments, 367.

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
Naval policy, 368.
Political patronage, 368.
Technical education, 370.
Divorce, 777.
Enlistments, 367.
Glace Bay mail service, 533.
Louisburg, censors and decoders at, 1808.
Naval Service, 1693.
Political patronage, 368.
Shell Committee, The, 366.
Shipbuilding, encouragement of, 712, 4065.
South Cape Breton, enlistments in, 2547.
Sydney Pilotage Commission, 986.

Carslake hotel property, 3562.

Carson, General John, position of, 851.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 236.
The financial situation, 236.
Provision for returning soldiers, 237.
Naval affairs, 238.
War contracts, 238-275.
Davidson Commission, 266-274.
Political patronage and the war, 276.
Allison, Colonel J. Wesley, 1355, 1358.
See also Shell contracts.
Army
Enlistment of minors, 3049.
Officers, Canadian, in England.
102nd Battalion, 1041.
Soldiers
Pay of, 1162.
Returning, provision for, 237.
British Columbia—102nd Battalion, 1041.
Censoring of mail matter, 2880.
Cold storage, 1427.
Desks, purchases of, 1279.
Experimental farms, 1387, 1410.
Fish and fisheries—salmon, 2394.
Flax expert, 2348.
Fraudulent questions, 1492.
Hay contracts. *See* war supplies.
Indians, 2674.
Motor car—Pierce Arrow—purchase of, 1327.
Munitions inspectors, 2006.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1158.
Patent rights—extension of, 1158.
Personal explanation—shell deliveries, 2240.
Political patronage, 276, 1353, 1361.
Potatoes
Powdry scab, 1416.
Shipment regulations, 1412.
St. John and Quebec railway, 1433, 3015.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)—*Con.*
St. John harbour improvements, 730-738.
St. John Valley Railway, 757, 1908, 1945.
Scammell, J. K., position of, 1157.
Stewart, J. H.—automobile seizure, 1438.
Surveys, 1323.
Taxation
Oil, 1804.
Profits, 1892, 1897, 1994, 1998.
Technical education, 370.
Victoria, B.C.—coal for dredges, 546.
War
Investigations, 265-276.
Submarines, 266.
Purchasing Commission, 1279, 1907.
War supplies
Bandages, 1354.
Bayonets, 1761.
Binoculars, 1353.
Clothing, 1356.
Hay, 255-265, 1422, 2543.
Horses, 267-270.
Lumber, 1354.
Motor trucks, 1358.
Munition contracts, 235.
Pistols, 270-274, 1358.
Ross rifle, 1359.
Shell contracts, 238-255, 683, 803, 1523, 1552, 1609, 3404, 3464, 3498.
Small arms ammunition, 2168, 2881, 3908.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 1278.
New Zealand purchases, 1278, 1438.

Casgrain, Hon. T. Chase (Postmaster General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 40.
Canada's war forces, 40.
Patriotic meetings in Quebec, 41.
French-Canadians in active service, 42.
Attitude of Le Devoir, 43.
Germanic aims, 44.
Heroism of France, 45.
Overseas Dominions and the war, 46.
Annuities, Government, 2735.
Bilingual question, 3620, 3709.
Canadian military forces, 40.
French-Canadians in military service, 42.
Montreal postal service, 2031, 2037.
Pilot, wreck of the, 106.
Post office
Censoring of mail matter, 2880.
Department estimates, 663, 2016, 2716, 3934.
Employees, 2029.
Letters for soldiers, 2051, 2053.
Mail service on the Transcontinental, 2051.

Casgrain, Hon. T. Chase (Postmaster General)—*Con.*
Post Office—*Con.*
Parcel post, 2736.
Railway mail service, 2023, 2051.
Revenue, 532.
Rural mail service, 2017, 2032, 2040, 2052.
Quebec
Patriotic meetings in, 41.
Postal service, 2035.
Railways, acquisition of, 4001.
Soldiers' letters, postage on, 532.
Casualty lists. *See* Army
Cattle. *See* Agriculture.
Censoring of mail matter. *See* Post office.
Censors and decoders, 640, 851, 1808, 2476.
Census—population of Canada, 1277.
Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker.
Chandler wharf, 3161.
Chaplains. *See* Army.
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Public works employees at, 2799.
Chatham, N.B.
Local freight at, 1705.
Train service, 3394.
China, Canada's trade with, 344. *See* Trade and commerce.
Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Cape Breton—dredging, 2172.
Eastern harbour—dredging expenditure, 760, 853.
Fish and fisheries
Bait, 2387.
Dogfish, 2405.
Trawlers, beam, 760.
Halifax terminals, 885.
Indians, 2671.
Intercolonial railway—passenger service, 3428.
Inverness
Mail service, 2718.
Post offices, 1550.
Public works expenditures, 853.
Margaree harbour
Removal of wreckage, 717.
Wharf, 739.
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2854.
Port Hood wharf, 760.
Sick Mariners Fund, 752.
Temiskaming dam, 2546.
Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)
Antigonish
Fishery officer, 552.
Post offices, 552.
River guardians, 552.
Station garden, 2057, 3593, 3603.
Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)—*Con.*
Arisaig lightkeeper, 1808.
Breen's pond breakwater, 1438.
Broad Cove Marsh wharf, 3557.
Cape St. George lightkeepers, 727.
Coal mining, government control of, 719.
Cribbin's Point wharf, 1438.
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., employment of, 885.
Fish and fisheries
Dogfish, 2408.
Fishermen, medical treatment for, 2414.
Transportation, 2415.
Lobsters, 2370, 2391.
Indians, enlisted, 3407.
Intercolonial railway
Fish on, 2479, 2415.
Locomotives, 3067.
Management, 3092.
Passenger service, 3421.
Nova Scotia public works, 3149.
Pope, Sir Joseph, 2924.
Public works, expenditure on, 3319.
Spidal, J. A., 3541.
Tibbits, Archibald, employment of, 1439.
Tracadie harbour improvements, 1438, 3149.
Civil Service
Appointments to, 948, 1148, 1149, 4089.
Auditor General, salary of, 657.
Commission, 664, 665.
Deputy Ministers, salaries of, 659, 983.
Dorchester county appointments, 2921.
Employees in Government Departments, 3674.
Enlistments from, 655, 817-826, 1044, 1761.
Examinations, 2478.
French-Canadians in, 1176, 2006.
Generally, 658.
Lower grade employees, pay of, 4079.
Messengers, 2743, 2765.
Ministers, salaries of, 667.
Public Works Department clerks, 3096.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4079.
Soldiers, appointment of to, 642, 1276.
Wives of enlisted Civil Servants, allowances to, 3232.
Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Bilingual question, the, 3796.
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4152.
Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 32.
Tribute to Governor General, 32.
Western production and prices, 33.
Free wheat, 33.
Question of a general election, 34.
Delay in getting troops to the front, 35.

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
Government's war expenditures, 36.
Sir Wilfrid Laurier's patriotism, 37.
Free wheat, 33.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Loans—Dominion, $75,000,000, 1839.
Political partyism in war time, 3275.
Taxation of apples, 1765, 2308.
Troops, transportation of, 35.
War
Appropriations, 3275.
Expenditure, 36.
Woman suffrage, 1197.

Clements, Mr. Herbert (Comox-Atlin)
Dredging, Victoria—graft charges, 2398.

Coal. *See* Mines.

Coasting trade. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills and Steamship service.

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Hudson Bay Navigation—Anderson report, 636.
Transcona railway shops, lease of, 636.

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 57.
Canada and the war, 57.
Transportation of troops, 58.
Achievments of British fleet, 58.
British forces, 58.
Conscription, 59, 65.
Canadians at the front, 60.
Great Britain's sacrifices for the war, 60.
Resources of Great Britain, 61.
Australians and the war, 61.
India and the war, 62.
Ireland and the war, 62.
Present war conditions, 63.
Supreme efforts necessary, 66.
Brantford, city of, 947, 1625.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3850.
Conscription, 59, 65.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3850.
Taxation of profits, 2002.
War
British fleet, 58.
British forces, 58.
Canadians at the front, 60.
Transportation of troops, 58.

Cold storage. *See* Agriculture.

Cole falls water-power, 842.

Cole Harbour wharf, 758, 3150.

Coloured men, enlistment of. *See* Army.

Commissions. *See individual titles*

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Conscription. *See* Army

Conservation Commission, 977.

Constitutional documents, 976.

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 403.
The Government and the war, 403.
Shell contracts, 405, 409.
The Minister of Militia, 407.
Recruiting and pensions, 408.
Selection of officers, 410.
Hay contracts, 410.
Extension of term of parliament, 413.
Amherst
Military barracks, 2300, 2600.
War supplies, purchases of at, 3266.
Burleigh expedition, 853.
Experimental farms, 1402.
Ferguson, Dr., 1042.
Fillimore, Major, 2477.
Fish and fisheries
Gasolene, 2393.
Inspectors, 2392.
Lobsters, 2371.
Patrol service, 2413.
Hay compressing contracts, 537.
Hogs, slaughtering of at Amherst, 2174.
Immigration, 2106.
Indians, 2679.
Intercolonial railway
Employees, 3097, 3401.
Equipment, 3606.
Freight, handling of, 2742.
Operation, 3398.
Sackville spur line, 3611.
Train service, 3397.
Truro-Moncton section, 3352.
Militia, Minister of—trips to England, in 1914 and 1915, 2425.
Moncton—Main Street subway, 3024.
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, 3025.
Officers, military, selection of, 410.
Parliament, extension of term of, 413.
Penitentiaries, 2122, 2149.
Pensions, 408.
Political patronage, 1364, 1366, 3266.
Potatoes, inspection of, 1419.
Prince Edward Island car ferry service, 3393.
Recruiting, 408.
Rural mail service, 2730.

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N.B.)—*Con.*
Sackville
Public building, 2816.
Wharf accommodation, 3160.
St. John Valley Railway, 1941.
Seffington, George, 1437.
Sharpe, Colonel Samuel, M.P., 2924.
Stewart, Corporal D., death of, 2443.
Taxation of profits, 1853.
War appropriations, 3265.
War supplies
Hay, 410, 2968.
Shell contracts, 405.

Cost of Living Commission, 852, 1216.

Courts. *See* Justice

Cribbin's Point wharf, 1438.

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Abolition of Capital Punishment. 1r., 39. 2r., 1957. Div., 1968.
Bigamy, 1r., 1040.

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W. (Minister of Labour)
Fair wages clause in munitions contracts, 3555.
Globe newspaper, statements of, 1811.
Labour
Bureaus, national, 604.
Department estimates, 3555.
Soldiers returned, provision for, 1638.
Technical education, 535, 1636, 2187.
White phosphorus matches, 989, 1493, 1615.

Cruise, Mr. Robt. (Dauphin)
Elliott, Dr. H. H., employment of, 553.
Free wheat, 1052.
Grain congestion in the West, 3882.
Manitoba school lands, 3675.
Timber protection, 839.

Currie, General, at St. Julien, 2351.

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Budget, 989.
The financial situation, 990.
Taxation proposals, 990.
Germany's commercial policy, 991.
The war and Imperial unity, 992.
Mobilization and training of Canadian forces, 993.
Soldiers—employment of in England, 995.
Experiences in the trenches, 995.
Food and clothing of the soldiers, 997.
Promotions in the army, 998.
The Battle of St. Julien, 999.
National service in France, 1002.
Organization of our industries, 1004.
Public printing—proposed reduction in cost, 3875.

Currie, Lieutenant Colonel John A. (North Simcoe)—*Con.*
Rifles, 3518.
Rifle practice, 3517.
Soldiers
Employment of in England, 995.
Punishment of, 3525.
Training of, 3517.

Customs
Agricultural implements, duty on, 4068.
Bonding privileges, 4097.
Department
Estimates, 661.
Staff and salaries, 661, 3644.
Free entry of goods, 3644.
Minister of—visit to New York, 2012.
Smuggling, 642, 4099.

Customs Tariff Act Amendment Bill. Res. 1764. 1r., 1842. 2r., 2303. Com., 2303. 3r., 2361.

Daigle, Zepherin, employment of, 2922.

Dairying. *See* Agriculture.

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Apples, duty on, 1092.
Budget, 1088.
Party tactics, 1088.
Party policies contrasted, 1089.
The farmers and fishermen, 1091.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 1091.
The tariff on apples, 1092.
Reduction of government expenditure, 1092.
Taxation features of the Budget, 1090.
Dogfish, 2408.
Indians, 2670.
Intercolonial railway—branch lines, 2775.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2223.
Taxation of apples, 1092.

Davidson Commission
Appointment of counsel, 4006.
Printing of evidence of, 4130.
Report of, 3188. *See also* Shell contracts.

Daylight saving, 4006.

Debates. *See* House of Commons, Hansard.

Delisle, Mr. Michel (Portneuf)
Commercial agents, 1653.
Inland Revenue Department, appointments to, 2175.
Neuville lighthouse, 593.
Port Marcotte, 2171.
Valcartier camp, 2174.
Vallyfield breakwater, 2694.
Weights and measures, inspectors of, 2475.

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 529.
French-Canadian Conservative representation in the Cabinet, 529.
Hay contracts, 530.
Loyalty of French-Canadian people, 530.
Ham, Mrs. Berlington, 949.
Hay contracts, 530.
Lasoski, Max, 949.

Dempsey, Ernest, stone purchased from, 3098.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. E. N. Rhodes), rulings and statements of
Adjournment motion, 3405.
Amendments irrelevant, 1712, 1714.
Bills not to be introduced by resolution, 3617.
Committee of Supply, powers of, 3944.
Irrelevancy, 975, 1645, 1834, 3548.
Motion for Committee to rise not in order, 2453.
Unparliamentary expressions, 4035.

Derby junction railway improvements, 3393.

Descarries, Mr. Joseph A. (Jacques Cartier)
Montreal island, bridge connection with, 3629.
Petroleum, 2648.
Quebec highways, 3169.
Whistling of vessels, 3612.

Devenish, Mr., employment of, 638.

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 337.
Purchase of submarines, 337.
Canada's financial and trade conditions, 339-346.
The Shell Committee, 346-350.
Agricultural products, export of, 345.
Berlin, Ont.—registration of aliens, 542.
Bilingual question, the, 3684.
Civil Service, enlistments from, 823.
Fish, Canadian, in England, 2741.
Pay and Record Office, Canadian, 3024.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2359.
Public works—buildings, 341.
Shell Committee, The, 346-350.
Submarines, purchase of, 337.
Taxation, 339.
Trade and Commerce—China, United States, 344.
Transport, director of, 3096.
War supplies, director of, 3096.
Woman suffrage, 1203.

Digby Gap submarine bell, 1276.

Dingwall, N.S., postmaster, 1160.

D'Israeli government wharf, 3562.

Divorce cases, procedure in, 595, 762-792.

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Aliens, naturalization of, 2922.
Bilingual question, the, 1833, 3802.
Canadian Law Library in London, 987.
Canada Temperance Act Amdt., 2878, 3298.
Capital punishment, 1956, 1967.
Divorce, 781.
Exchequer Court Act, 3404.
Gratuities to public servants, 3536.
Judges' salaries, 2319, 2323.
Judicial vacancies, Quebec, 924.
Justice
Department
Estimates, 983, 2115.
Staff and salaries, 983.
Indeterminate sentences, 2845.
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 2115, 2133.
Prison reform, 2841-2846.
Prisoners from in military service, 2117.
St. Vincent de Paul, 2118.
Ticket of leave system, 2117.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1901, 2478, 2494, 2550-2569, 2696-2716, 2758-2765, 2882, 2946-2956, 4127.
Provincial legislation, reports on, 988.
Ross, W. T., release of, 2302.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2065, 2318, 2940.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2071-2078.
Shell contracts, 3487.
Small arms ammunition, 3914.
Solicitor General, office of, 985.
Thompson, Mr., 922.
Vickers-Maxim Ltd., strike at, 1764.
White phosphorous matches, 1616.
Winding-up Act, 1548, 1616.

Dominion Lands and Parks.
Administration of, 2079.
Estimates, 817-850.
Forest protection, 838, 850, 2088, 3412.
Homestead inspectors, 828, 832.
Pre-emptions, payments on, 534.
Purchase of property, 2864.
Surveys. *See that title.*
Timber areas, 836.

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)
Amherst barracks, 1433.
Banks, taxes payable by, 2176.
Canada Car and Foundry Company, 1078.
Forest protection, 2087.
French-Canadian Battalion, 1373.
Killam, Alta., mail service, 1438.
Lands, western, survey of, 834.
Loans to farmers, 930.

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)—*Con.*
151st Battalion—recruiting of, 1372.
Recruiting, 3592.
Officers, 1372.
Political patronage in, 1372.
Taxation of, apples, 1781.
Wetaskiwin settlers, grievances of, 2088.

Drab, Max, employment of, 1439.

Dredging. *See* Public Works.

Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 1161, 1610.

Dunvegan railway, 2081.

Dyes, shortage of, 3553.

Eastern Harbour dredging, 853.

East Gore mail service, 3353.

Economic and Development Commission, 1640, 2999, 3641.

Edmonton
Disturbances at, 8837.
Recruiting in, 3586.
Technical school, 649.

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 2081, 3445.

Edwards, Mr. John W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 351.
War contracts, 352.
Enlistments by provinces, 360.
Churches and the war, 355.
Canada and Imperialism, 360.
The British Navy, 356.
Disloyal utterances in Quebec—Bourassa and Lavergne, 356.
Orangemen in army service, 359.
Army
Chaplains, 2171.
Enlistments, 360, 362, 3025.
Orangemen in, 359.
Bilingual question, the, 3747.
Hay contracts, 353.
Horses for war purposes, 353.
Immigration Department expenditure, 2109.
Kingston harbour improvements, 3182.
Lavergne, Lieut.-Col. Armand, 541.
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 2118, 2123, 2146.
Portsmouth, 541.
Prison reform, 2845.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2223. 2494.
Rifles, 3507, 3522.
Royal Military College, 362, 2172, 2831.
Rural mail service, 2043.
Trade and commerce, 3018.
Transportation, ocean, 703.

Electoral lists, printing of, 3099.

Electricity, export of, 671.

Elevators, grain. *See* grain.

Elliot, Dr. H. H., employment of, 553.

Employment. *See* Labour.

Estimates. *See titles of departments and subjects.*
Supplementary, 2646, 2798.

Esquimalt dockyards, 2889.

Ethier, Mr. Joseph A. C. (Two Mountains)
Automobiles for Militia Department, 2544.
Budget, 1269.
Taxation of profits, 1269.
Compulsory military service, 1272.
Farm help, 1272.
Political patronage in war time, 1273.
Germans in the public service, 1274.
Mr. Edwards and the French-Canadians, 1275.
Canada, population of, 1277.
Civil Service messengers, 2743, 2765.
Conscription, 1272.
Paquette, Edward, enlistment of, 2241, 2648.
Secretary of State Department, translators in, 3231.

Evans, A. A.,
Employment of, 1439.
Payments to, 1653.

Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3404. 2r., Com., 3502. 3r., 3502.

Exhibitions, 1429, 1432, 3026.

Experimental farms. *See* agriculture.

External Affairs, Department of, 1207.

Fallis, Mr., profits of, 1259.

Farmers
Compensation for destroyed cattle, 2957.
Credits for, 1025, 1842, 2401.
Labourers, 1272, 1906.
Loans to, 463, 674, 681, 924-936, 1611, 3146. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bill.
Relief to, 432, 760, 2860, 3938. *See* Seed grain.
Rural credits. *See* credits.

Farmers Bank, depositors of, 544.

Farnham, Quebec
Experimental farm, 3407.
Military camp, 1164.

Federal Plan Commission, 1603, 3135, 3640.

Fenian Raid bounty, 593, 3231.

Ferguson, Mr. T. R., employment of, 885.

Fertilizers—Dogfish, 2404.

Field kitchens. *See* War Supplies.

Fielding, P. M., employment of, 2175.

Finance
Bonds, government, negotiability of, 660.
Coin, American, 654.
Debt of Canada—interest, 654.
Department
Estimates, 653.
Staff and salaries, 661.
Dominion notes, issue of, 1218.
Expenditure of Canada, 807, 893, 1212, 1223, 1244-48, 2622, 3137, 4116.
Loans
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3826, 3933, 3943.
Dominion
Domestic war loan, 807, 811, 815, 891, 904, 1100.
$75,000,000, 1812, 1834, 1843, 1972, 2006, 2546. *See* also Public Service Loan Bill.
Farmers, to. *See* Farmers.
Recent government—$100,000,000, 659.
War, 1023, 2546, 3233. *See* also War Appropriations Bill.
Munitions credit to Imperial Government, 1810.
Paper currency, issue of, 1834.
Revenue of Canada, 807, 893, 948, 1212, 1244. *See* also Budget and Taxation.

Fish and Fisheries
Advisory Board, 2010, 2361, 2368, 2389.
Bait, 2386.
Boats, liscensing of, 2409.
Bounties, 2546.
Canadian fish in England, 2741.
Canadian troops, for, 1652.
Canning factories, 2368.
Codfish, price of in Portugal, 3560.
Department estimates, 2404, 2901.
Dogfish, reduction works, 2404.
Exhibit at Toronto, 2376.
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2379.
Fishermen—medical treatment for, 2412.
Fishing industry, 2363.
Guardians, 2394.
Gasolene, 2393.
Hatcheries, 2373.
Herring, 551, 2475, 3439.
Intercolonial railway, on, 2415.
Inspection, 3438.
Inspectors, 1078, 2392.
Lobsters
Close season for, 950, 2368, 2375, 2382, 2385, 2439, 4077.
Export of, 2547.
Extension of open season, 4077.
Size limit, 2369.
Marketing. *See* Transportation.

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Officers, 2379.
Overseer, appointment of, 535.
Patrol service, 2412, 2373.
Pickled fish, 1761.
Inspectors of, 2175.
Protection service, 2901.
Quebec, in province of, 638.
Robertson, Mr. A. C., 2379.
Salmon, 2394.
Shell Fisheries Commission, 2368.
Shipments to Great Britain, 2411.
Smelt-fishing regulations, 673.
Toronto exhibit, 2415.
Transportation and marketing of, 558, 582, 636, 2374, 2365.
Trawlers
Beam, bounty to, 760.
Steam, 640, 641.
Trout fry, 2421.

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 2411.

Fisheries Marine Biological Board of Canada, 3439.

Fisher, Mr. Ward, employment of, 1078.

Flax industry, The, 1279.

Food—maple sugar, adulteration of, 2159.

Forest protection. *See* Dominion Lands.

Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2495. 2r., 2663. Com., 2663. 3r., 2663.

Forget, Sir Rodolphe Kt. (Charlevoix and Montmorency)
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4020.

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbiniere)
Quebec public works 3176.

Foster, Mr. A. De W., 949, 2175, 4075.

Foster, Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Bilingual question, 3620, 3790.
Budget, 903.
The Balance of Trade, 903.
Domestic war loan, 904.
War expenditures, 905.
Capital expenditures, 906.
Political patronage, 907.
Government taxation proposals, 907.
Taxation of incomes, 908.
The war and economic problems, 908.
Future immigration, 910.
Outcome of the war, 910.
Lessons from the war, 913.
Canada Temperance Act, 3298.
Civil servants, enlistment of, 655.
Davidson Commission, 3189.
Domestic war loan, 904.

Foster, Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)—*Con.*
Grain
Administration of Act, 3189.
Commissioners, 1603.
Congestion, 1706, 1971.
Oats and oatmeal, embargo on, 653, 854.
Storage and shipment, 532.
Transportation of, 2080, 3069.
Wheat, commandeering of, 544, 610, 3192, 3224.
Immigration, 910.
Political patronage, 907.
Railway Department estimates, 3056.
Shipbuilding, 639, 3106-3134.
Small arms ammunition, 3943.
Speaker, election of, 1.
Steamship service, 2531-2542, 2847, 3134, 3554.
Taxation
Incomes, 908.
Profits, 907.
Tonnage, shortage of, 3100-3134.
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 3023, 3551.
Department estimates, 664, 3022, 3120, 3551.
Statement on, 2989, 3100.
Trade Commission, 4076.
Transportation, ocean, 638, 2858, 3100-3134.
West Indies—syrup shipments from, 1970.

Fox river breakwater, 1761.

France, fighting in, 1118.

Fraserville—river store repairs, 535.

Fredericton experimental farm. *See* Experimental farms.

Free Wheat. *See* Grain.

Freight rates. *See* Transportation and Railways.

French-Canadians
Alberta and Saskatchewan Battalion, 1373.
Civil Service, in, 1176, 2006.
Enlistment of, 179, 1081, 3281.
Military service, in, 42, 51, 177.

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Cable and wireless rates, 672.

Galops canals, 6310.

Gasolene. *See* oils.

Gaspé
Anticosti and north shore mail service, 536.
Bonaventure lighthouses, 536.
Campbellton steamship service, 536, 3100.
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.
Maritime road, repairs to, 746.

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Lareau, J. E., 950.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1486.

Gauvreau, Mr. Chas. A. (Temiscouata)
Blue River M. & L. Company, 1076.
Devenish, Mr., employment of, 638.
Dionne, vs. the King, 2743, 2924.
Fraserville—river store repairs, 535.
Intercolonial railway
Saving of life and property on, 3458.
Train despatchers, 2691.
Lighthouse keepers retiring fund, 754.
Louisville
Post office, 546, 1077.
Postmaster, 2114.
Pilot, wreck of the, 106, 154.
Post Office Department—advertising, 1164, 2739.
Rimouski customs officer, 546.
Shell boxes, duty on, 2351, 2691.
Temiscouata mail service, 2477.
Victoriaville, P. Q.—Post Office Department advertising, 1164.

Geley, Aurele, employment of, 1759.

Georgian Bay Canal, 3182.

German-Canadians
Military service, in, 683.
Public Service, in, 1142, 1274.

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2467.
Shell boxes, 543.

Girard, Mr. Jos. (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
Agriculture, 1388.
Bilingual question, the, 3822.
Experimental farms, 1389.
Mail contracts, 2721.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4042.

Glace bay
Harbour improvements, 3154.
Mail service, 533.

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 277.
The war, 278.
War contracts, 279.
Liberal members and the war, 283.
Canada's problems and prospects, 285.
Animals, inspection of, 2960.
Flax industry, 1279.
Rural credits, 1842.
Shell contracts, 279.
Soldiers, insane, 1665.
Technical education, 1631, 2200.

Gobeil, Antoine, payments to, 1551.

Government railways
Acquisition of new lines, 1590.
Branch lines, purchase and operation of, 2789.
Divisions, 549.
Ferguson, Dr., employment of, 1042.
Halifax terminals, 1597.
Intercolonial
Accident at Val Brilliant, 2058.
Branch lines, 2767, 3432.
Campbellton superintendent, 535.
Cars, 757, 1705, 2347, 3091.
Chatham, N.B.
Local freight at, 1705.
Train service, 3394.
Coal
Alleged expropriation of, 1762.
Supply, 538, 2115, 2795, 3462.
Cold storage service, 2415.
Devenish, Mr., employment of, 638.
Dining car service, 2379, 2420, 3093.
Elevator, 3597.
Employees, 1040.
French-speaking, 2789.
From other railways, 3097.
Rates of pay, 2881, 3401.
Equipment, 2793, 3459, 3606.
Estimates, 2767-2798.
Fish on dining cars, 2415, 3093.
Freight
Congestion, 2742.
Rates
Coal, 548.
Forest products, 1652.
Lumber, 1435.
French-speaking employees, 2789.
Halifax terminals, 2573.
Locomotives, 3067.
Lumber, rates on, 1435.
Management, 3092.
North Sydney terminals, 3425.
Operation, 1590, 2595, 2792, 3398.
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 2781.
Passenger service, 3393, 3419.
Pay, rates of, 2881.
Pensions. *See that title.*
Pictou harbour bridge, 2785.
Pugwash spur line, 3024.
Return tickets for soldiers, 2646.
Rolling stock, 2799.
Sackville spur line, 3611.
Saving of life and property on, 3458.
Sleepers for, 549.
Train despatchers, 2691.
Truro-Moncton section, 3352.
Locomotives, lease of, 2546.
Rates on coal, 548.

Government railways—*Con.*
Small claims. *See* Government Railways Small Claims Act Amendment Bill.
Steamers, charter of, 1076.

Government Railways Small Claims Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1900, 2919. 2r., 3303. Com., 3303. Rep., 3308. Amdt., 3308. Div., 3311. 3r., 3312. Sen. Amdts., 3884, 4039.

Governor General
Speech, opening of Parliament, 4.
Correction of press statement, 2443.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 491.
Extension of term of Parliament, 492.
Canada Foundries and Forgings, 493.
War contracts, 494.
Recruiting, 498.
Collection and disbursement of Patriotic and other funds, 500.
Naval defence, 502.
Unity of the Empire, 504.
Allied Economic Conference, 2802.
Armstrong lake bridge, 2692.
Army
Barbour, Private, death of, 3417.
Recruiting, 498.
159th Battalion, 1435, 2349.
Separation allowances, 2176, 2349.
Bilingual question, the, 3785.
Brantford, corporation of, 1649, 1726.
Bridges, construction of, 3164.
Budget, 1099.
Public expenditure, 1100, 1102.
Dominion loans, 1100.
The balance of trade, 1101.
Purchase of war supplies, 1102.
Proposed taxation measures, 1103.
United States and the war, 1108.
Results of the war, 1109.
Canadian Associated Press, 3638.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3574, 3649, 3827, 3962.
Capital punishment, 1966.
Censoring of mail matter, 2054.
Civil Service
Appointments to, 642, 4091.
Auditor General, salary of, 567.
Commission, 664.
Deputy Ministers, salaries of, 983.
Enlistments from, 656, 822.
Ministers, salaries of, 667.
Soldiers, appointments to, 642.
Dairying industry—rennet, 2966.
Dredge Port Nelson, 2690.
Dredging, 3186.
Federal Plan Commission, 3135.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)—*Con.*
Forest protection, 2088.
Government railways—lease of locomotives, 2546.
Grain
Elevators, 3597.
Transportation of, 1309.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3574, 3649, 3827.
High Commissioner, Canadian—office of, 970.
Highways, 3164, 3168.
Horse raising, 2970.
House of Commons
Saturday sittings, 3409.
Two o'clock sittings, 3295.
Hudson Bay Navigation—Anderson report, 636.
Hudson Bay railway, 543, 3376.
Immigration
Expenditure, 2100.
Inspection, boundary, 656.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 2767.
Elevator, 3597.
Halifax terminals, 2573.
Lindsay, J. T., 2349.
Loans, Dominion, 1100, 2006, 2546.
Lumber, rates on, 548.
Marine
Harbour improvements, 741.
Prescott depot, 724.
Wreck of the Mayflower, 727.
McNab, C. C., claim of, 4074.
Medical instruction, 978.
Mines Department expenditure, 2326.
Montreal postal service, 2037.
Morrisburg, free entry of goods at, 3644.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3374.
Munitions Works Commission, 2841.
National Transcontinental Railway
Government operation, 2569, 3038.
Quebec terminals, 2569, 2584.
Rates on lumber, 548.
North Bay armoury, 2691.
Oil, freight rates on, 3411.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1648.
Paris agency, 982.
Patriotic funds, 500.
Prison reform, 2842.
Port Nelson
Dock accommodation, 2692.
Harbour improvements, 2838.
Live stock for, 2692.
Post Office Department, administration of, 2035.
Postage stamps, sale and use of, 2051.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)—*Con.*
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2356, 2699, 2946.
Public works expenditure, 2826.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3146, 3431.
Quebec bridge, 3435.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3616, 3995, 4010.
Railway Commissioners, 3411.
Railways
Department estimates, 3054.
Fires caused by, 3412.
Location of, 2744.
Oil for fuel on, 977.
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3982.
Subsidies to, 3445.
Royal Military College, 2831, 3881.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4091.
Taxation
Land, 2000.
Oil, 1803, 2303.
Profits, 1103, 1854, 1978, 1991, 200, 2640.
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 3338.
Post office, 2836.
Railway terminals, 3414.
Trade and Commerce, 3021.
Transcona railway shops, lease of, 636.
Transportation, ocean—harbour facilities, 741.
Trent canal, 2575.
Naval policy, 502.
Parliament, extension of term of, 492.
War
Appropriations, 3284.
Munitions, manufacture of, 493.
Shell contracts, 494.
Supplies, orders for, 970.
United States contracts, 495.
Water-powers, ownership of, 556, 760.
Welland canal, 3455.
Yukon, the, 1309, 1318.

Grain
Administration of Act, 3189.
Amendment Bill. 1r., 1603. 2r., 1706. Com., 1706, 1971. 3r., 1971.
Calgary elevator charges, 1609.
Canada Grain Act Amendment. *See that title.*
Commissioners, 1603, 3191.
Congestion in the West, 3882. *See* also Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill.
Corn, freight rates on, 2963.
Elevators, 920, 3084, 3190, 3594, 3597, 3604.
Alberta—petitions from, 2693.
Calgary, 532, 3223.
Quebec, 3058.
St. John, 3060, 3593.

Grain—*Con.*
Freight rates on, 2795, 3058-3089, 3601-3604.
National Transcontinental railway freight rates, 2795.
Oats and oatmeal, embargo on, 803, 854, 653.
Shipments on National Transcontinental railway, 1276.
Storage and shipment, 532.
Transportation of, 1207, 1306, 2857, 3069-3089, 3601, 3456, 3981.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 20, 23, 156, 168, 445-452, 458-461, 544, 1278, 1434, 1609, 3192.
Free, 33, 793, 802, 856-884, 1046-1096.
Marketing of, 917.
New Zealand purchases, 1278, 1438.
Storage of, 428, 445-452.
Winnipeg and Minneapolis prices, 857.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.
Audit of revenues and expenditures, 3989.
Lease of by the Government, 1594.
Loan to, proposed, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3826, 3933, 3943.
Subsidies and guarantees, 1042.
Transcona terminals, 1595.

Gratuities to public servants, 3535.

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Mining industry, 1873.
Pacific Northern and Omineea Railway Company, 1013.
Taxation
Apples, 1773, 2307.
Mining companies, 1373.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1889.
Zinc, bounties on, 3033.

Guest, Mr. S. M., employment of, 885.

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2356, 2481, 2563, 2952.
Taxation of profits, 1896.

Guysborough
Branch railway, 850.
Mail service, 2800.

Haanel, Dr., employment of, 851.

Half Moon fog alarm, 593.

Halifax
Coal shipments from, 1759.
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Exports and imports through, 3734.
Military hospital, 2114.
Ocean terminals, 885.
Postmaster, 2033.
Post office, 1651.
Railway terminals, 1597.

Ham, Mrs. Berlington, employment of, 949.

Hanover public building, 1439.

Hansard. *See* House of Commons.

Harbours. *See* Public works.

Hartt, Mr. Thomas A. (Charlotte, N.B.)
Naval Service Department—travelling expenses, 2300.

Hayes, Joseph, charges against 306, 400.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 184.
Mobilization of Canadian troops, 184.
Ocean shipping conditions, 185-192.
Lumber export trade, 490.
The Shell Committee, 193.
Shell contracts, 194-200.
Purchase of submarines, 200-211.
Soldiers' pensions, 211-215.
Extension of term of Parliament, 215.
Shell inspection and political patronage, 217.
Agriculture
Animals, health of, 1430, 2957.
Cold storage, 1427.
Department estimates, 661, 2956-2971.
Eggs, marketing of, 2961.
Experimental farms, 1402.
Hay, 2963.
Hogs, government inspection of, 1606.
Potato inspectors, 1398, 1415.
Apple duty—government official on, 1426.
Aviation, 2898.
Canadian Law Library in London, 987.
Coal mining, government control of, 719.
Crosby, A. B.—hire of steamer, 727.
Dairying industry, 1420.
Deputy ministers, salaries of, 983.
Exhibitions, 1429.
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2389.
Boats, licensing of, 2409.
Department estimates, 2404, 2901.
Dogfish, 2404.
Gasolene, 2393.
Hatcheries, 2373.
Herring, 551, 3439.
Inspection, 3438.
Intercolonial railway, on, 2416.
Lobsters, 2376, 2389, 2441, 4077.
Officers, 2381.
Patrol service, 2373.
Protection service, 2901.
Shipments to Great Britain, 2412.
Transportation, 2374, 2416.
Flax industry, 1295.
Harbour Commission, organization of, 740, 742.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)—*Con.*
Hay contracts, 1424.
Health, public, suggested department of, 1172.
Heidman, Gustav, 681.
Horses for war purposes, 2969.
Hospitals, marine, 3437.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2908.
Live stock inspection, 716.
Lumber, export trade, 190.
Marine
Coasting privileges, 700.
Coast service, 723-728.
Department estimates, 2361, 3436.
Government steamers, 693, 727, 751.
Harbour improvements, 729, 741.
Hospitals, 752, 3437.
Hudson Bay—Anderson report, 726.
Ice breaking, 723, 743.
Life-saving, 726, 2916.
Lighthouse keepers retiring fund, 754.
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 728.
Salaries and allowances, 725.
Supplies, 728.
Masters and Mates, examination of, 694.
Motor boats, 2346, 2802.
Navigation
Aids to, 728.
Obstructions to, 715.
Pilotage, 2542, 2804.
Pensions, 747, 750.
Schools, 695.
Ocean Transportation, 185, 740, 1681.
Prescott depot, 724.
St. John harbour improvements, 729.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 719.
Shipbuilding, 701, 2896.
Shipping conditions, 701. *See also* Transportation.
Sick Mariners Fund, 753.
Wrecks
Investigations into, 695.
Mayflower, 727.
Wrecking plants, 716.
Naval service, 1671.
Department estimates, 662, 2885, 2908, 3442.
Recruits for, 2947.
New Brunswick—lumber exports, 190.
Noreen, steamer, hire of, 727.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1157, 1159.
Parliament, extension of, term of, 111, 215.
Patent rights, extension of, 1158.
Pensions
Pilots, 747-750.
Soldiers, 211-215, 4131.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)—*Con.*
Pictou—handling of freight and coal at, 953.
Political patronage, 217.
Prince Edward Island ferry service, 954, 1704.
Radiotelegraph service, 2908.
St. John post office, 2039.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3365.
Sealers, British Columbia, claims of, 595.
Shell Committee, The, 193.
Shell contracts, 194, 805.
Shipbuilding. *See* Marine.
Stefansson expedition, 2914.
Submarines, 200, 2897.
Surveys, hydrographic, 2901.
Transportation, ocean, 185, 1681.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 1604, 2078.
Vessels, commandeering of, 1608.
West Indies—syrup shipments from, 1762, 1809.
Wireless telegraph stations, 2909, 2913.

Health, Public, proposed department of, 1065.

Heidman, Gustav, 681.

Hepburn, Mr. B. R., (Prince Edward, Ont.)
Shell contracts, 155.

High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 664, 667, 956.

Highways, 3164, 3168.

Hjort, Dr., employment of, 1552.

Hog cholera. *See* agriculture.

Homesteads.
Entries by volunteers, 3529.
Inspectors, 828, 832.
Purchases, collections on, 3463. *See* also Dominion Lands.

Horses. *See* Agriculture and War supplies.

Hospitals
Marine, 752, 2918, 3437.
Military, 2114, 3236.

House of Commons
Business of the House
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 1329.
Easter adjournment, 2925.
Government orders, 2303.
Morning sittings, 2111, 2925.
Notices on order paper, precedence of, 1908.
Saturday sittings, 3409.
Two o'clock sittings, 3294.
Wednesday sittings, 1208.
Chairman of Committees
Appointment of, 531.
Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker.

House of Commons—*Con.*
Committees
Debates, 3143.
Internal Economy, 38.
Library of Parliament, 151.
Printing of Parliament, 151, 3875.
Public Accounts, 2973.
Restaurant of Parliament, 161.
Select Standing, 5, 148.
Decease of members, 22.
Deputy Speaker, appointment of, 531.
Electoral lists, printing of, 3099.
Fraudulent questions, 1492.
Hansard—alleged omissions from, 2647, 2840, 3188.
Mace, the, 762.
Members
Decease of, 22.
Military activities of, *See* Army.
New, 1.
Officials, appointment of
Assistant clerk Orders and Records, 4079.
Aubrey, Napoleon, 2300.
Chief of Committee Reporters, 4131.
Clerk, assistant, 884.
Clerk Votes and Proceedings, 755.
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 77.
Editor of Debates, 4131.
Horton, Mr. Albert, transfer of to Senate Staff, 4127.
Library Accountant, 4152.
Reading room, 1706.
Reporting Branch, changes in, 2398, 4127, 4131.
Sessional clerks, 2799.
Speaker, election of, 1.
Vacancies
Bellechase, 3618.
Lincoln, 3404, 3410.
Restigouche, 3404, 3410.
Yarmouth, 3942.
See Parliament.

Hudson Bay navigation, 636, 726, 2908.

Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 138, 543, 636, 1598, 3375.
Government operations of, 3989.
Terminals, 636, 3375.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)
Annandale buoys, 1808.
Army
Canadian forces, reorganization of, 2015.
First contingent, transportation of, 2693.
Mullock, Major T. A., 2300.
Officers
Medical, 1905.
Unattached, in England, 1377.
Parliament, members of in, 949, 1328, 1550.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)—*Con.*
Army—*Con.*
Troops, local, supplies for, 552.
Budget, 1118.
Public expenditures compared, 1119.
Patriotic spirit of the people, 1125.
Purchase of war supplies, 1122.
Censoring of mail matter, 2880.
Coal mining, government control of, 718.
Charlottetown—Public works employees at, 2799.
Coasting privileges, 699.
Experimental farms, 1409, 1411.
Exports to United States, 2057.
Fielding, P. M., 2175.
Fish and fisheries
Herring fishery investigation, 551.
Inspectors, 2010, 2175.
Intercolonial railway, on, 3093.
Foreman, Dr. N. O., 2174.
Government railways—small claims, 1900, 3303-05.
Horses
Exportation of prohibited, 1329.
French Government, for, 950.
See War Supplies.
House of Commons
Members of in military service, 1328.
Reading room, 1706.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2911.
Imports from United States, 2057.
Intercolonial railway
Car shortage, 3091.
Dining cars—fish on, 3093.
Labour bureaus, national, 620.
Little Sands
Breakwater, 2175.
Wharf, 3154.
Navigation schools, 696.
Necklaces—duty on, 641, 758, 1329.
Parliament, Members of in military service, 949, 1150.
Political patronage, 3261.
Potatoes
Duty on, 1430.
Export of, 1059.
Inspection of, 1418.
Powdery scab, 1418.
Shipping regulations, 1414.
Powder milk. *See* War Supplies.
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry service, 954, 1704, 3391.
Dredging, 853.
Hillsborough bridge, guard on, 1433.
Horses, purchases of in, 672.
Judicial vacancies, 924.
Public works, 3152.
Steamship service, 536, 2850.
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3187.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island—*Con.*
War supplies purchased in, 3406.
Winter communication with, 1433.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1949, 2235, 2558, 2697, 2758, 2955.
Riverside Lumber Company, 2058.
Ships, purchase of for war purposes, 673.
Souris rifle range, 2600.
Summerside
Post office building, 2010.
Rifle range, 2010.
Taxation
Pearls and diamonds, 641, 758, 1329.
Profits, 1852.
War
Appropriations, 3261.
Supplies
Hay, 2963.
Horses, 542, 652, 653, 672, 759, 1041, 1124, 1380, 1383.
Political patronage in purchase of, 3261.
Powder milk, 850, 1043, 1053, 2175, 3262.
Prince Edward Island purchases, 3406.
Rifles, 1328, 3506.
Shells, 1123.
Shovels, 156, 1123.
Wheat, free, 1058.

Hughes, Major-General Sir Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 287.
Mobilization of Canadian troops, 288, 302.
Militia officers in Canada, 288, 299.
Machine guns, 289.
Training of officers, 289.
Purchase of pistols, 290.
Col. J. Wesley Allison, 290.
Location of Canadian troops, 291.
Recruiting, 292.
The Ross rifle, 292.
Shell contractors, 293.
Militia Appointments, 294.
The Shell Committee, 295, 303.
Shell manufacture, 295-302.
The press and the war, 303.
Aitken, Sir Max, duties of, 534.
Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 1343, 1345, 1355. *See also* Shell Contracts.
Allowances, separation and subsistence, 551.
Bands, regimental, 1044.
Berlin, Ont., disturbances at, 855.
Campbellton, disturbances at, 855.
Canadian troops in action, 889.
Civil Servants, enlistment of, 1045.
Currie, General, at St. Julien, 2351.

Hughes, Hon. Major-General Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)—*Con.*
Currie, Lieut.-Colonel John, M.P., 1045.
Edmonton, alleged disturbances at, 888.
Field kitchens, 547.
France, fighting in, 1118.
Fuses, 1345, 2979. *See* Shell contracts.
German-Canadians in military service, 684.
Horses, purchase of, 542, 685, 1378.
Inspectors of munitions, 544.
Lavergne, Lieut.-Col. Armand, 541.
Lessard, Major-General, position of, 547. 670.
Machine guns, 289, 532.
Medical examiners, 1349.
Medical officers—Black, Dr. J. B., 1369.
Militia
Appointments, 293.
Estimates, 1341.
Officers in Canada, 288.
Mobilization of troops, 288, 302.
Motor trucks, 1345, 1358, 2978.
Officers
Training of, 289.
Unattached, in England, 1377.
Pistols, purchase of, 290, 1343, 1346, 2977.
Political patronage in war contracts, 1351, 1361.
Recruiting
Coloured men, of, 557.
Officers, 1350.
System, 292.
Ross rifle, 292, 1347, 1359.
Shell Committee, The, 295, 303.
Shell contracts, 295-302, 2974, 2979.
Shovel shields, 1347.
Small arms ammunition—sale of, 3902.
Soldiers
Employment of in England, 1372.
Enrolment of by districts, 1350.
Equipment, private subscriptions for, 590.
Payment of, 553.
Riots, alleged participation in, 803, 855.
Southern rifle deal, 2981.
Thompson, Mr., 922.
Troops, local, supplies for, 552.
War contracts, 1342, 1351, 1361.
Wellington Barracks School, 558.
Woodmen's Regiment, 117.

Huntingdon preventive stations, 641.

Ice-breaking. *See* Marine.

Immigration
Advertising, 2436.
Agencies, 1440, 2096, 2435.
Austrian and German, 547.
Boston agent, 593.
Chinese, 2441.

Immigration—*Con.*
Co-operation of British Government in, 1164.
Department expenditure, 1245, 2606, 2628.
Dominion and provincial government co-operation in, 1277, 1904.
Future, 910.
Inspection, boundary, 656.
Jewish, 1080, 1083.
Newfoundland, from—regulations affecting, 2441.
Stations, western, 2869.
Statistics, 540, 1436, 2093.
Widows and children, 1330.

Illustration stations. *See* Agriculture.

Imperial Munitions Board, 594, 923, 1509.

Indians
British Columbia, 2681, 2866.
British Columbia Indian Commission, 852.
Department clerks, 2800.
Education of, 2690.
Enlisted, status of, 3407.
Kitsilano reserve, 1652, 2681.
New Brunswick, 2674.
Nova Scotia, 2666.
Okanagan reserve, 3144, 3676.
Ontario, 2665.
Prince Edward Island, 2681.
Quebec, 2665.
St. Peter's reserve, 593, 2316.
See also St. Peter's Indian Reserve Bill.

Indian Land Commission, 2867, 2057.

Ingonish harbour, ice breaking in, 2421.

Inland Revenue Department
Appointments, 2175.
Clerks, 2544.
Estimates, 661, 2157.
Officials of in municipal elections, 1759.

Insurance Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1548.

Insurance Companies Extension Bill. Res., 685. 1r., 686. 2r., 937. Ref. to Com., 938. Com., 1610. 3r., 1714.
See also Life Insurance.

Intercolonial railway. *See* Government railways.

Interior Department
Enlistments from, 833, 2084, 2092.
Estimates, 655, 817-850, 938, 1309, 2079, 2428, 2665, 2860.
Expenditure, 895, 2079, 2086, 2090, 2095, 2431, 2435, 2607.
Minister of in Chicago, 756, 829.
Orders in Council approved, 3347.
Promotions, 836.
Salaries, 655, 817, 2079.
Surveys. *See that title.*

International bridge—guarding of, 1041.

International Joint Commission, 979.

International Nickel Company, 1867.

Inverness
Mail service, 2718.
Post office, 1550.
Public works expenditures, 853.

Irrigation
Staff and salaries, 843.
Works, 842.
See Taber Irrigation District Bill.

James, Mr. C. C.—question of appointment, 2477.

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Canadian Northern Railway—subsidies and guarantees, 1042.
Digby Gap submarine bell, 1276.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 558.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—subsidies and guarantees, 1042.
Lighthouse Board, 1078.

Joliette
Government offices, 3562.
Post office, 3561.

Jewish people, The, 1242.

Jews
Enlistment of, 1550.

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2071. 1r., 2078. 2r., 2319. Com., 2319. 3r., 2326.

Justice
Canadian Law Library in London, 987.
Department
Clerks, 2801.
Estimates, 983-989, 2115, 2157.
Staff and salaries, 983.
Indeterminate sentences, 2844.
Judges
Montreal, 2301.
Nova Scotia, 685.
Quebec, 2692.
Salaries, 2071, 2319.
Judicial vacancies, 924.
Provincial legislation, reports on, 988.
Solicitor General, office of, 985, 1076.
See also Penitentiaries.

Kastella, A., employment of, 1549.

Kay, Mr. William T. (Missisquoi)
British Remount Commission, 2799.
Censored mail matter, 3029.
Farnham Military Camp, 1164.
Hay, 2694.
Horses, 542, 671, 1326, 2057.

Keay, R. H., fraudulent operations of, 836.

Kemp, Hon. A. E. (East Toronto)
Canadian fish in England, 2741.
Canadian forces, reorganization of, 2016.
Casualty lists, 2841.

Kemp, Hon. A. E. (East Toronto)—*Con.*
Enlistment of Edward Paquett, 2242.
Shell contracts—Sheet Metal Products Company, 1646.
War supplies
Clothing, 3592.
Kits, 1810, 2167.
Small arms ammunition, 2881.
Winnipeg, disturbances at, 2548.
206th Battalion, 2167.

Killam, Alberta, mail service, 1438.

Kingston
Harbour improvements, 3182.
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries.

Kitsilano Indian reserve. *See* Indians.

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 423.
Political partyism, 424.
Extension of term of Parliament, 425.
Spirit of Canadian soldiers, 426.
Storage and transportation of wheat, 428.
United States and the war, 427.
Commandeering of wheat, 429.
Seed grain indebtedness, 432.
Problem of production, 435.
Agriculture—illustration plots, 1397, 1400.
Bilingual question, the, 3618.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3933.
Fair wage clause in munition contracts, 1969.
Government railways—small claims, 3309.
Grain
Congestion, 1708.
Freight rates on, 3058, 3065.
Gratuities to public servants, 3536.
Machine guns, 2542.
Moosejaw customs office, 2171.
Parliament, extension of term of, 425.
Public works expenditure, 3315.
Saskatchewan judges' salaries, 2075.
Saskatchewan river water supply, 3189.
Seed grain indebtedness, 432, 505, 517, 1607.
Soldiers, punishment of, 3051, 3099, 3537.
Taxation
Apples, 1770.
Land, 3934, 3941.
Wheat, commandeering of, 156, 428.

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 138.
Nova Scotia's contributions to war, 138.
Necessity for economy, 138.
Government expenditure, 139.
Hudson Bay railway, 138.

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
The Shell Committee, 140.
Appointment of shell inspectors, 143.
Political patronage in army service, 145.
Allison, Colonel J. Wesley, 2276. *See also* shell contracts.
Black, Dr. J. B., 1368.
Civil Service, enlistments, from, 823.
Crosby, A. B.—hire of steamer, 727.
Curry, Private D., death of, 2987, 3049.
Day, Colonel F. P., 2920, 3028.
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2379, 2389.
Fishery inspector Fisher, 1078.
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2010.
Lobsters, 2379.
Officers, 2379, 2389.
Glace Bay harbour improvements, 3152.
Gobeil, Antoine, 1551.
House of Commons—Saturday sittings, 3409.
Hudson Bay railway, 138.
Indians, 2667.
Intercolonial railway—passenger service, 3426.
Loans to farmers, 934.
Morrisburg, Ont., militia office, 1078.
Noreen, steamer, hire of, 727.
Nova Scotia—its contributions to war, 138.
Political patronage in army service, 145, 1366.
Railway mail service, 2025.
Recruiting, 1367.
Robertson, Mr. A. C., 2379.
Rural mail service, 2020.
Schooner Two Brothers, 533.
Shelburne
Customs duties, 1762.
Imports, 1276.
Shell Committee, The, 140.
Spiddel, Rev. J. A., 3097.
Technical education, 2206.
War
Expenditure, 138.
Recruiting of officers, 145.
Shells, inspectors of, 143.
War supplies
Fuses, 2274.
Machine guns, 2275.
Pistols, 2276.
Rifles, 2286.
Shell contracts, 2259, 2264, 3296.
Wheat, commandeering of, 544.
Woman suffrage, 1189.

L'Assomption
Mail service, 3881.
Wharf, 2174.

Labour
Aliens, interned, farm labourers, as, 2469.
Department
Estimates, 3555.
Expenditure, 1226.
Employment bureaus, national, 597.
Fair wage boards, 1277.
Fair wage clause in munition contracts, 1969, 3555, 3662.
Labourers
Farmers, for, 1906, 2469.
Foreign, enlistment of, 3145.
Importation of into British Columbia, 1329.
Munitions factories, in, 2549.
Unemployment, 535, 595.
Vickers-Maxim, Ltd., strike at, 1079, 1763.

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Boucher, Dr., 1550.
Daigle, Zepherin, 2922.
Montreal Immigration agent, 1440.
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2347.

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Penitentiaries, 2156.

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Taxation of profits, 1852.

Lamarche, Mr. Paul E. (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 467.
Canada in the war, 468.
Attitude of Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne, 468.
Principles of the Nationalists, 471.
The naval policy, 471.
Le Devoir newspaper, 474.
Aspirations of French-Canadian people, 475.
Extension of term of Parliament, 475.
Bilingual question, the, 3758.
Ogilvie, Major G., R.C.A., 1162.
Renfrew wool contracts, 1436.

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Budget, 1035.
War expenditure, 1035, 1036, 1038.
Canada's contributions to war, 1035.
French-Canadians and the war, 1036.
Mr. Patenaude's speech, 1037.
Expenditure and taxation, 1038.
Purchases of hay, 1039.
Chaplains, Roman Catholic, 3097.
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, 949.
Hay, purchase of, 1039, 2964.
Laprairie protection wall, 3164.
Lopassey, Major de, employment of, 1163.
Quebec highways, 3164.
Recruiting, 3530.
Solicitor General's office fittings, 1076.

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)—*Con.*
Taxation of profits, 1038.
War appropriations, 3530.

Lands. *See* Dominion.

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 377.
The war, 378.
Bourassa and Lavergne, 379.
Utterances of Cabinet Ministers, 381.
War contracts, 384.
Agriculture, 1394.
Agriculture Department—employees with diplomas, 2176.
Bilingual question, 1810, 3618, 3676, 3678.
Nationalism—Bourassa and Lavergne, 379.
Ottawa Separate School Commission, 2456.
Riviere Ouelle wharf, 1164.
War contracts, 384.

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Savings deposits, rate of interest on, 543.

Laprairie protection works, 3164.
Lareau, J. E., employment of, 950.
Lasoski, Max, government employment of, 949.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (East Quebec)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 16.
Progress of the war, 16.
Attitude of Canadian people, 17.
The nationalist party, 17.
Canada's interest in the war, 18.
Conscription, 19.
Rigid economy necessary, 20.
Commandeering of wheat, 20.
Battle of St. Julien—commemoration of, 3028.
Bilingual question, 2974, 3619, 3697.
Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3639.
Censoring of mail matter, 2691.
Chairman of Committee
Appointment of, 532.
Ruling of, 2453.
Conscription, 19.
Davidson Commission, 4006.
Dyes, shortage of, 3553.
Economic and Development Commission, 3642.
Federal Plan Commission, 3641.
Fuses, 1502.
Governor General—correction of press statement, 2496.
Gratuities to public servants, 3535.
High Commissioner, Canadian, 962.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (East Quebec) —*Con.*
House of Commons
Business of the House, 1208.
Hansard, alleged omission from, 2647, 2840.
Morning sittings, 2112, 2925.
Two o'clock sittings, 3294.
Immigration
Co-operation of British Government in 1164.
Dominion and provincial co-operation in, 1277, 1904.
Imperial Munitions Board, 804.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 2399.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 688.
National Battlefields Commission, 3148.
Nickel, exportation of, 2166.
Parliament, extension of term of, 629, 3943.
Parliament Buildings
Destruction of, 581.
Reconstruction of, 591, 2013, 3050.
Pilotage, 2805.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4004, 4036, 4040.
Quebec sewerage system, 3557.
Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3943.
St. Amour, A. C., 3408.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2070.
Saskatchewan judges' salaries, 2073.
Sealers of British Columbia, claims of, 595.
Shell Committee, The, 923.
Shell contracts, proposed investigation, 1495, 2351, 2519, 2984.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4084.
Small arms ammunition, 3898, 3943.
Soldiers' equipment, private subscriptions for, 590.
Soulanges Canal employees—charges of partisanship, 3231.
Speaker, election of, 2.
Taxation of profits, 1847.
Trade and commerce, 3006.
Tupper, the late Right Hon. Sir Charles, Bart, 584.
Valcartier expropriations, 1300.
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, 2078.
West Indies—syrup shipments from, 1762, 1970.
Wheat, commandeering of, 20, 1434, 1609, 3197.
Winnipeg, disturbances at, 2548.
Winnipeg Telegram—statements in, 2973.

Lavallée, Mr. J. O. (Bellechasse)
Talbot, Lieut.-Col. Onesiphore, 1325.

Lavergne, Lieut.-Col. Armand, statements of, 356, 363, 377, 379, 541.

Law, Mr. Bowman B. (Yarmouth)
Bateman, Captain John, employment of, 545.
Blades, Captain Charles, employment of, 545.
Cape Negro Island lighthouse, 544.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 571.
Half Moon fog alarm, 593.
Immigration officer at Boston, 593.
Intercolonial railway—coal supply, 539.
Nova Scotia, western, fishery inspector, 546.
Ross, Captain William, employment of, 545.
Shelburne
Bell buoy, application for, 543.
Fishery guardian, 545.
Mail service, 594.
Port physician, 543.
Steamer Starling, 544.
Yarmouth
Dredging, 550.
Public works, 550.

Law, The late B. B., M.P., Death of, 590.

Legion of Frontiersmen, 3507.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 47.
The Liberal Party and the war, 47.
Opposition's right to criticise, 48.
Our soldiers at the front, 48.
Common defence of the Empire, 49.
Britain's true glory, 49.
War against militarism, 50.
Unity of French and English in Canada, 50.
Traditional policy of Roman Catholic Church, 57.
Recruiting in Quebec, 51.
Government expenditures, 52.
Economy and retrenchment, 53.
Problems after the war, 54.
Technical education, 55.
Canada in Imperial affairs, 55.
Advertising, government, 2299.
Aliens, supervision of, 691.
Anse à Beaufils breakwater, 3623.
Bands, regimental, 1044.
Beland, Dr., payment of sessional indemnity to, 3873.
Bilingual question, the, 3715.
Budget, 1143.
Canada's part in the war, 1144.
United States and the war, 1145.
Achievements of the British Navy, 1145.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
British aristocracy and French democracy in the war, 1146.
Partyism in war time, 1147.
Public expenditures compared, 1147.
Civil service appointments, 1148, 1149.
Departmental appointments and expenditures, 1148.
Tariff policies—reciprocity, 1157.
The government's taxation proposals, 1153.
Britain and France and the war, 1154.
Cadet service, 3503.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3586, 3655.
Carkner, W. Lloyd, employment of, 1163.
Censoring of mail matter, 2840.
Censors in Rimouski, 851.
Chandler wharf, 3162.
Civil Service
Appointments, 1148, 1149.
Enlistments, 819.
Soldiers in, 1276.
Cost of Living Commission, 852.
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Divorce, 771.
Dredging, 3186.
Electoral lists, printing of, 3099.
Farmers Bank, depositors of, 544.
Federal Plan Commission, 3136.
Forest protection, 850.
Fox river breakwater, 1761.
French-Canadians, enlistment of, 3281.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3586, 3655.
House of Commons
Officials, 2475.
Vacancies, 3618.
Indians, 2665.
Intercolonial railway
Car shortage, 1705, 2347.
Freight service, 2543.
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 2781.
Inland Revenue Department officers, 2158.
Judges' salaries, 2319.
Labour bureaus, national, 597.
La Patrie, payments to, 2299.
L'Evenement, payments to, 2298.
Loans—Dominion, $75,000,000, 1817.
Magdalen islands steamship service, 3352.
Mines, former Minister of—travelling expenses, 2336.
Montreal Island, bridge connection with, 3163, 3628.
Monument of His late Majesty King Edward VII, 3324.
163rd Battalion, 4152.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)—*Con.*
Ottawa
Buildings, height of, 2165.
Departmental buildings, 2875.
Parliament Buildings, destruction of—alleged warning, 674.
Peat experiments, 2327.
Penitentiaries, 2144.
Pensions to soldiers, 4140.
Post office
Censoring of mail matter, 2840.
Employees, 1651, 2010.
Parcel post, 2737.
Revenues, 1651.
Salaries, 1651.
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4154.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2491.
Pulp industry—shortage of vessels, 638.
Quebec
Judicial vacancies, 924.
Post office, 547, 672.
Recruiting in, 51, 3281.
Sewerage system, 3557.
Steamship service, 2852.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2475, 2530, 3431.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4024, 4046, 4122.
Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3297.
Recruiting in Quebec, 51, 3281.
Roman Catholic church—traditional policy of, 57.
Royal Society of Canada, 2875.
St. Bernard-St. Maxime mail service, 3560.
Soldiers
Civil Service, in, 1276.
Disabled, provision for, 2873.
Steamship service, 3554.
Taxation of profits, 1336.
Technical education, 55, 535, 2177, 2209.
Trade Commission, 4076.
War
Appropriations, 3281.
Supplies
Kits, 1809.
Ross rifle, 4108.

Lesperance, Mr. David O. (Montmagny)
Bilingual question, the, 3811.
Pilotage, 2805.

Lessard, Major-General, position of, 547, 670.

Lethbridge
Immigration agent, 2695.
Internment camp supplies, 2011.
Post office, 2800.

Lévis
Drill hall, 2173.
Military property, lease of, 2922.
Quarantine station, 2011, 3352.

Life Insurance Companies Investment Bill. 1r., 885. 2r., 1611. Ref. to Com., 1615. Com., 2399. 3r., 2802.

Life saving. *See* Marine.

Little Sands
Breakwater, 2175.
Wharf, 3154.

Live stock. *See* Agriculture.

Loans. *See* Finance.

Loggie, Mr. Wm. S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 1126.
Parliament Buildings fire, 1126.
Political patronage, 1127.
Taxation of profits, 1127.
The Minister of Trade and Commerce and political partyism, 1129.
Canada Temperance Act, 3300.
Chatham, N.B.
Local freight at, 1705.
Train service, 3394.
Commissions, granting of, 3519.
Derby Junction railway improvements, 3393.
Dyes, shortage of, 3553.
Fish and fisheries
Canning factories, 2368.
Codfish, price of in Portugal, 3560.
Transportation and marketing of, 576.
Lobsters, 2368, 2383, 2391, 2547, 3441.
Government railways, purchase and operation of, 2789.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4121.
St. John Daily Telegraph—statement of, 213.
Shipbuilding, 3130.
Taxation
Apples, 1780.
Profits, 1127, 1338, 1849, 1859, 1891-1898, 1972, 1980, 1983, 1988, 2001.

Lopassey, Major De, employment of, 1163.

Lotbiniere and Megantic railway. *See* Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill.

Louisburg
Censors and decoders at, 1808.
Post office, 546, 1077.
Postmaster, 2114.

Lumber
Export trade, 190.
Freight rates, 1435.
Shipments, 1681, 1682.

Lunenburg county mail service, 3942.

Lyons, John, employment of, 3881.

Macdonald, Archibald, payments to, 2694.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 218.
Canada and the war, 218.
Political patronage in war expenditures, 220.
Shell contracts, 221-225.
Cabinet ministers and the war, 226.
Naval policy, 228-232.
Transportation, 232.
Provision for returning soldiers, 233.
Problems after the war, 233.
Aliens, supervision of, 689.
Army
40th Battalion—supplies, 1043.
106th Regiment—supplies, 851, 1042, 1077, 1349, 2172.
Officers in England, 1077, 1551, 2172.
Recruiting, 2987, 3255.
Soldiers
Disabled, provision for, 233, 2874.
Homes, 1657.
Pensions, 1654, 1666, 4137.
Punishment of, 3257, 3525.
Special railway rates for, 2549.
Technical training for, 1620, 1626.
Voting of, 3512.
Bear River public building site, 1164.
Beland, Dr., detention of in Germany, 806.
Big island mail service, 549.
Bilingual question, the, 3819.
British Columbia, subsidizing of ships in, 1551.
Budget, 1243.
Record of the Government, 1243.
Increases in the Civil Service, 1243.
Revenue and expenditure, 1244-1248.
Immigration, 1245.
Public debt, 1246.
The taxation proposals, 1248.
Political patronage, 1254.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3346, 3568, 3580.
Carson, Brigadier-General, staff of, 2693.
Davidson Commission, 2399. *See* Shell contracts.
Daylight saving, 4006.
East Gore mail service, 3353.
Eureka, railway accommodation at, 1043.
Fielding, P. M., 1551.
Freeman, Dr. N. P., 3097.
Government railways
Divisions, 549.
Freight rates on coal, 548.
Small claims, 3311. *See* Intercolonial railway.
Government steamers, 548, 950, 1076.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3346, 3568, 3580.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*
High Commissioner's office, organization in, 957-965.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Immigration
Expenditure, 2100.
Statistics, 1436.
Indians, 1652, 2668.
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1161.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 2773, 2785.
Car purchases, 757.
Coal supply, 538, 2795.
Employees, 1040.
Equipment, 3460.
Operation, 2792.
Pictou harbour bridge, 2784.
Pugwash spur line, 3024.
Rates
Coal, 548.
Forest products, 1435, 1652.
Kastella, A., 1549.
Law, the late Mr. B. B., M.P., death of, 590.
Loans
Dominion, $75,000,000, 1824, 1830.
Farmers, to, 931.
War, 3253.
Lobsters, 950, 2387, 2439, 4017.
Mines Department, expenditure, 2328, 2331, 2344.
Mining industry, 1862, 1874, 1878.
Munitions. *See* War.
Naval Brigade, 1671.
Naval service, 228-232, 1667, 1697, 2987.
New Glasgow, shell inspectors at, 674.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2454.
Nova Scotia
Coal situation, 1609.
Judges, appointment of, 685.
Steamship service, 2853.
Patent rights, extension of, 1160.
Political patronage, 220.
Pensions. *See* Army.
Pictou (county)
Mail service, 549, 955.
Recruiting officers, 1165.
Telephone service, 549.
Pictou (town)
Freight and coal, handling of, 952, 955.
Local troops, supplies to, 857, 1042, 1077, 1349, 2172.
Pictou Island life-saving station, 549.
Political patronage, 1254, 1326, 1875, 3256.
Port Howe, mail service, 1076.
Post Office
Department expenditure, 1875, 1885.
Rural mail service, 2045, 2049, 2052, 2616.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2359, 2478, 2554, 2760.
Public works, expenditure on, 2827.
Railway mail service, 2047.
River John customs officer, 549.
Rural mail service. *See* Post Office.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2073.
Shell Committee, the, 221-225.
Sherbrooke postmaster, 2033.
Shipbuilding, encouragement of, 703, 2115, 4052.
Steamship service, 2538.
Stellarton
Public building site, 1164.
Shell inspectors at, 673.
Taxation of profits, 1248, 1865, 1874, 1985, 1999, 2004, 2616, 2640, 2658.
Technical education, 1620, 1626.
Thompson, Mr. K. C., 921.
Transportation, 232.
Vale railway, 3024.
Vickers, Limited—sale of ammunition to, 2695.
Victoria Memorial Museum, specimens for, 2331, 2344.
War
Appropriations, 3253.
Cabinet Ministers and, 226.
Munitions
Factories—labour in, 2549.
Imperial Government, credit for, 1810.
Inspectors of, 544, 673.
Pay and record office, Canadian, 3023.
Supplies
Clothing, 4078.
Fuses, 2514.
Groceries—British Columbia, 3097, 3733.
Machine guns, 3258.
Orders for—securing of, 957, 965.
Ordnance, construction of, 2799.
Pistols, 2510.
Rifles, 3510.
Shells, 673, 2509, 3491.
Small arms ammunition, 1551, 2302, 2543, 2546, 2695, 3297, 3923.
War Purchasing Commission, 2695, 2801.
Wentworth mail service, 3353.
West Gore-Clarksville mail service, 2695.
Wilson, Fred S., 3353.
Woman suffrage, 1201.

Macdonald, Rev. D. R., claim of, 3675.

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto South)
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2663.
Bilingual question, the, 3780.
Prison reform, 2842.

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto South)—*Con.*
Pensions to soldiers, 4149.
Toronto harbour improvements, 3344.

Machine guns. *See* War Supplies.

MacInnes, C. S., position of, 2923.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Black, R. Robson, 3144.
Budget, 889.
Balance of trade, 890.
Domestic war loan, 891.
Revenue and expenditure, 892.
Customs taxation, 892.
Financial policy, 893.
Economy in public expenditure, 894.
Political patronage, 895.
Expenditures by departments, 895.
Government taxation proposals, 899.
Tariff on apples and oils, 899.
Taxation of profits, 899.
Taxation of incomes, 902.
Domestic war loan, 891.
Dominion notes advanced to banks, 592.
Dominion Telegraph steamer Tyrian, 1437.
Exports to United Kingdom, 592.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 572.
Halifax
Coal shipments from, 1759.
Postmaster, 2033.
Wellington Barracks School, 558.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Immigration, 540.
Indians, 2669.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 1612.
Interior Department expenditure, 2607.
Kennedy, R. H., employment of, 4075.
Labour bureaus, national, 618.
Lunenburg county mail service, 3942.
Mahone bay-Martin's brook mail service, 545.
Martin's river mail service, 3881.
Militia Department—political patronage in, 3248.
Navigation schools, 698.
Nova Scotia—coal shortage, 1608.
Political patronage, 895, 3248.
Population of Canada, 636.
Post Office
Department expenditure, 2609.
Mail contracts, 2610, 2720.
Public Works Department expenditure, 2605.
Shipbuilding, 701, 703.
Shipping, lack of, 700, 1608.
Soldiers' ballots, 673.
Steamer Starling, 540.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)—*Con.*
Steamship service, 2537, 2538.
Taxation
Apples, 899.
Income, 902.
Oil, 899, 1799.
Profits, 899, 1849, 1971, 2601, 2651.
Special revenue from, 948.
Voters' lists, 1915, printing of, 593.
War
Appropriations, 3247.
Expenditures by departments, 1161.
Supplies—Windsor purchases, 3407.

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York, O.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 461.
The wheat question, 461.
South York and the war, 461.
Effect of the war, 462.
Loans to farmers, 463.
Development of natural resources, 465.
The nickel industry, 465.
Canada's part in the war, 466.
Airships, building of, 2895, 2900.
Banks, nationalization of, 1834.
Budget, 1262.
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies—proposed loan to, 3826, 3871.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 2401.
Loans
Dominion, $75,000,000, 1814, 1834.
Farmers to, 464.
Railways to, 3826, 3871.
Nickel industry, 465, 1262.
Ores, refining of, 1265.
Railways
Location of, 2746.
Public ownership of, 3826, 3871.
Railway Commission, powers to, 2746, 3629.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2077.
Shipbuilding, 2895, 3116.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2907.
Transportation, 3114.
Wheat, free, 1067.

MacNutt, Mr. Thos. (Saltcoats)
Cable service, 759.
Duty on farm implements, 4068.
Steamship service, 3352.
Trench warfare, 2696.
Wheat, free, 856.

Mahone bay-Martin's brook mail service, 544.

Maloney, Thomas, injuries to, 3390.

Manitoba School lands, 3675.

Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society, 3144.

Maple sugar, 2159.

Marchand, Zepherin, fuel purchased from, 3098.

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 476.
Canada and the war, 476.
Loyalty of French-Canadian people, 478.
Recruiting in Quebec, 479, 491.
The Nationalist movement, 479.
The Bilingual question, 482-490.
Allies, Conference of at Paris, 2475.
Bilingual question, the, 482-490, 3297, 3734.
Bonaventure
Enlistments from, 4078.
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.
Mail service, 1438, 2172.
Civil Service Commision, 665.
Campbellton
Alleged disturbances at, 945.
Gaspé steamship service, 536.
Proposed bridge at, 3628.
Railway superintendent, 535.
Carleton beach protection works, 536.
Divorce, 778.
Dredging, 3627.
Fisheries overseer, 535.
Gaspé
Enlistments from, 4078.
Inspector of weights and measures, 671.
Wrecking station, 718.
Gaspé-Anticosti mail service, 536.
Gaspé and Bonaventure lighthouses, 536.
Government railways—small claims, 3307.
Grenier, Private Adolphe, 3559.
House of Commons—Clerk Assistant, appointment of, 884.
Immigration, 2102.
Imperial Munitions Board, 594.
Inland Revenue Department—officials of in municipal elections, 1759.
Intercolonial railway
Accident at Val Brillant, 2058.
Coal, 2115.
Interior Department, promotions in, 836.
Intoxicating liquor in prohibition territory, 2169.
Judges' salaries, 2324.
Letters for soldiers, 2051, 2053.
Life-saving, 726.
Lobsters, 2386.
Maria beach protection works, 536.
Maritime road, repairs to, 746.
Montreal Island, bridge connection with, 3629.
Montreal railway terminals, 3415, 3423.

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)—*Con.*
Murchies channel piers, 1654.
National Transcontinental Railway, government operation of, 3429.
New Carlisle wharf, 535.
New Richmond
Mail service, 2174.
Post office, 1118, 1653.
Overseas forces, 2348.
Paspebiac wharf, 536.
Postmasters and municipal elections, 1653.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1451, 2169, 2220, 2231, 2351, 2475.
Quebec
Fisheries, 638.
Recruiting, 479, 491.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3429.
Recruiting, 479, 490, 3590, 3643, 5354.
Rural mail service, 2018, 2021, 2040.
Rimouski
Harbour improvements, 3174.
Inspector of weights and measures, 671.
Saguenay river improvements, 3674.
St. Alphonse de Caplan mail service, 1654.
Soldiers' decorations, record of, 1969.
Steamers, whistling of, 3375.
Steamship service, 3100.
Temiscouata county public works, 4077.

Maria beach protection works, 536.

Marine
Baleine, lease of, 3676.
Coasting privileges. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bill.
Crosby, A. B.—hire of steamer, 727.
Department
Clerks, 2801.
Estimates, 662, 692, 716, 739, 2361, 2530, 2542, 3436.
Law clerk, 2176.
Staff and salaries, 662.
Harbour commissions, 740, 742.
Harbour facilities, 740.
Hochelaga, Steamer, 950.
Hospitals. *See that title.*
Hydrographic surveys, 2901.
Ice-breaker contract, 1440.
Icebreaking, 723, 744.
Life-saving, 726, 2916.
Lighthouse and coast service
Maintenance and repairs, 728, 739.
Retiring fund, 754.
Salaries, 725.
Supplies, 728.
Lighthouse Board, 1078.
Maritime road, repairs to, 746.
Mayflower, wreck of the, 727.
Minister of—visit to New York, 2012.
Minto, sale of the, 723.

Marine—*Con.*
Montmagny, repairs to, 751.
Navigation
Aids, 728.
Anderson report, 636.
Coasting regulations, 699.
Masters and Mates, examination of, 694.
Motor boats, certificated officers. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills.
Obstructions, removal of, 715, 745.
Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills.
Pilots' pensions. *See* Pensions.
St. Lawrence, 719, 1906, 3437.
Schools, 695.
Noreen, rental of, 727.
Pilot, wreck of, 106, 154.
Sick Mariners Fund, 752.
Shipbuilding, encouragement of, 639, 701, 1616, 1643, 2115, 2892, 3001, 3106, 3336, 3608, 4052.
Shipping
Shortage of, 638, 706.
Total Canadian, 2175.
See also Transportation.
Steamers
Foreign trade licenses for, 2694.
Government, 693, 723, 727, 751, 950, 1076, 1437, 3437.
Whistling of, 3375, 3612. *See also* vessels.
Steamship service. *See that title.*
Transportation. *See that title.*
Tidal stations, 2913.
Vessels
Canadian, net tonnage of, 1163.
Commandeering of, 116, 1608.
Requisitioning of, 1969.
Wrecks, investigations into, 695.
Wrecking plants, subsidies for, 716.

Martin, Mr. Mederic (Montreal, St. Mary's)
Unemployment, the poor and, 595.

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)
Advertising, 827.
Badger, W., employment of, 1439.
Bennett, D. D., 1759.
Brandt, Peter, employment of, 832.
Criminal Code Amendment—bigamy; foreign divorces, 1040.
Drab, Max, employment of, 1439.
Evans, N. A., employment of, 1439, 1653.
Homestead inspectors, 828.
Indians, 2688.
Keay, R. H., fraudulent operations of, 836.
Labour bureaus, national, 612.
Militia Department, political patronage in, 1374, 3252.
Moosejaw examining warehouse, 1550.

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)—*Con.*
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 691, 1439.
Political patronage, 1374, 3252.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2226.
Recruiting, 3251.
Regina
Army Service Corps—accommodation for, 1652.
Assistant Receiver General, 553.
Inland Revenue premises, 1439.
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 1439.
Riding Mountain timber reserve, 640.
Ross, W. T., release of, 2301.
Saskatchewan public buildings, 3329.
Saskatchewan river, direction of, 841.
Seed Grain indebtedness, 512.
Stedman, Robert E., 3232.
68th Battalion—payment of wages, 2695.
Swift Current post office site, 1041.
Taxation of apples, 2308.
War appropriations, 3251.
Wheat, commandeering of, 3219.

Martin's river mail service, 3881.

McCoig, Mr. Archibald B. (West Kent, O.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 389.
Kent county and the war, 390.
Hay contracts, 392.
Embargo on wool, 393.
The tobacco industry, 394.
Hog cholera, 395.
Horses for the war, 396.
Taxation of farmers, 398.
Agriculture, 1401.
Corn, freight rates on, 2963.
Hay contracts, 392.
Hogs, government inspection of, 1552.
Hog cholera, 395, 1397, 2957.
Horses, purchases of, 396, 671.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2357.
Tobacco industry, the, 394.
Wool, embargo on, 393.

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Budget, 1259.
Peel provincial election and Mr. Fallis, 1259.
The Minister of Public Works and the West, 1260.
Farmers and taxation, 1261.
Conscription, 592, 829.
Horses—Mr. Fallis, 674, 1259.
Immigration, 2442.
Interior, Minister of, in Chicago, 829.
Loans to farmers, 678, 928.
Prince George, B.C., railway station, 637.

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)—*Con.*
Railways
Location of, 2755.
Stations, naming of, 2738.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2755.
Reforestation, 2089.
Rural credits, 2401.
Saskatchewan—military district No. 12, 1903, 1971.
Seed grain, indebtedness, 761.
Taxation of apples, 1787, 1791, 2315.
Woman suffrage, 1195.

McCrea, Mr. Fancis N. (Sherbrooke)
Cap à la Roche channel, 761.
Rural mail service, 2042.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1906.
Sherbrooke
Drill hall, 3098.
Postmaster, 1906, 2032.
Steamship service, 2534.
Tan bark, embargo on, 3022.
Taxation of profits, 1852, 1858, 1981, 1986, 2005, 2639.

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Shelburne and Queens)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 398.
Charges against army officers, 398.
Politics in Nova Scotia, 402.
Correction of statement in Ottawa Citizen, 2548.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 567.
Intercolonial railway—rates of pay, 2881.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 303.
Public expenditures, 304, 312.
Political patronage and the war, 306-312.
The Minister of Militia, 307.
Purchase of war supplies, 309.
Conservative administration, 311.
Baddeck wharf, 548.
Baleine, steamship, 3676.
Bay St. Lawrence telegraph office, 1551.
Budget, 1109.
The war, 1109.
Financial conditions, 1110.
Revenue and expenditure, 1111.
Taxation proposals, 1111, 1114.
Cost of living, 1112.
The country's finances, 1113.
The Minister of Trade and Commerce and political partyism, 1115.
Constitutional documents, 977.
Dingwall, postmaster, 1160.
Divorce, 789.
Fish and fisheries
Development of industry, 2383.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)—*Con.*
Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishermen, medical treatment for,
Transportation and marketing of, 574.
Ingonish harbour—ice-breaking, 2421.
Immigration expenditure, 2606.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 3432.
North Sydney terminals, 3425.
Passenger service, 3424.
Jamesville breakwater, 3615.
Loans to farmers, 934.
Magdalen islands cable, 759.
Mahoney, Thomas, 3390.
Meat Cove breakwater, 758.
Militia Department, 307.
Mines Department expenditure, 2333.
Newfoundland—regulations affecting immigration from, 2441.
Political patronage, 306-312, 1370, 3543.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4044, 4050.
Railway situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3988.
Rural mail service, 2054.
Shipbuilding, 4063.
Small arms ammunition, 3884.
Soldiers, employment of in England, 1371.
Technical education, 1635.
Telegraph lines, government, 3328, 3634.
Victoria county, N.S.—Government telegraphs, 548, 758.
Wellington harbour improvements, 2169.
Westover county telegraph office, 2600.

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queens, P.E.I.)
Divorce, 779.
Government railways—small claims, 3304.
Horses, 1383.
Lobsters, 2382.
Political patronage, 3276.
Prince Edward Island public works, 3155.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1953, 2560.
Shipbuilding, 713.
Soldiers, voting of, 3510.

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2357.
War supplies—transport trucks, 3676.

McNab, C. C., claim of, 4074.

Meat Cove breakwater, 758.

Medical instruction, government, 978.

Medicine Hat
Customs building, 1440.
Mail service, 534.
Overseas regiment, 1435.
Post office, 534.

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 115.
Allowances to soldiers, 116.
Ocean transportation, 116-118.
Commandeering of vessels, 116.
The Shell Committee, 118, 126, 128.
Shell contracts, 120-128.
Expenditure of war funds, 125.
The Davidson commission, 129, 137.
Purchase of submarines, 132.
Budget, 1222.
Canada's trade and prosperity, 1222.
Our financial condition, 1222, 1241.
British and Canadian expenditures compared, 1223.
The late Government and taxation, 1225.
Duty on oils, 1227.
Duty on apples, 1227.
The farmers and taxation, 1229, 1242.
Exportation of nickel, 1233.
Economy in the public service, 1240.
The Jewish people, 1242.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3659.
Davidson Commission, the, 129-137.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3373.
Nickel, exportation of, 1233.
Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, 1014.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3996, 4012, 4032, 4039.
Railways, location of, 2752.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2752.
Retractation of expression, 107.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2061, 2069, 2317, 2934.
Shell Committee, 118, 126, 128.
Shell contracts, 1737, 3494.
Soldiers, allowances to, 116.
Submarines, purchases of, 132.
See Davidson Commission.
Taxation
Apples, 1227.
Generally, 1255-1299.
Oils, 1277.
Transportation, ocean, 116-118.
Vessels, commandeering of, 116.
War expenditures, 125.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 3207.
Free, 1068.

Mercantile marine. *See* Transportation.

Meredith-Duff Commission—printing of evidence, 4130. *See also* War Supplies, Small Arms Ammunition.

Michaud, Mr. E. Pius (Victoria, N.B.)
Bridges, interprovincial, 3633.
Budget, 1097.
Problems arising from the war, 1098.
Provision for returned soldiers, 1098.
Future immigration, 1098.
National economy, 1099.
Campbellton
Accommodation for soldiers at, 1162.
Public building, 1162.
International bridge, guarding of, 1041.
Minister of Militia, travelling expenses of, 2171.
Mitchell, Moses, 3408.
Penitentiaries, 2123.
Richards, I. M., services of, 1653.
Sabourin, Lieut.-Col., 949.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3371.
St. John Valley Railway, 1940.
St. Leonard, soldiers at, 640.
Soldiers, allowances to, 1098.

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Civil Service—appointment of soldiers to, 642.
Immigration, 2105.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1226.
Parliament Buildings, reconstruction of, 2013.
Political patronage, 1377.
Shipbuilding, 708.
Transportation, freight rates, 708.

Milford Haven Bridge postmaster, 2173.

Militia and Defence
Appointments, 293.
Bands, regimental, 1044.
Cadet
Services, 3502.
Inspectors, 3144.
Censors and decoders. *See* Censors.
Chief Transport Officer, 1903, 1969.
Conscription. *See* Army.
Department
Automobiles for, 2544.
Clerks, 2839.
Estimates, 1341, 3502, 3537, 3586.
Expenditures, 897.
Organization, 3233.
Political patronage in, 3248, 3252.
Dominion Arsenal, 3537, 3586.
Edmonton militiamen in active service, 114.
Fair wage clause in munitions contracts, *See* War.
Home Guard, rifles for, 3504.
Hospital Commission, 2347.
Military district No. 12, Saskatchewan, 1903, 1971.
Militia officers in Canada, 288.

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Military training, 3501.
Minister of
Travelling expenses of, 2171.
Trips to England, recent, 1117, 1915, 2012, 2646; in 1915, 2545.
Royal Military College, 362, 2172, 2831, 3528, 3881.
Wellington Barracks School, 558.
See also Army *and* War.

Military forces. *See* Army .

Mines and Minerals.
Coal
Mining, government control of, 718.
Nova Scotia shortage of, 1608.
Shipments from Halifax, 1759.
Department
Clerks, 2921.
Estimates, 2326.
Publications, 3883.
Reports, 2335.
Staff and salaries, 2337.
Geological survey, 2341.
Nickel, exportation of, 465, 1012, 1233, 1262, 1140, 1143, 2166, 2239, 2799.
Ores, refining of, 1265, 3021.
Peat
Canadian Peat Society, 2329.
Experiments, 2327.
Tar sands experiments, 2340.
Zinc
Bounties on, *See* Zinc Bounties Bill.
Duty on, 2839.

Mitchell, Moses, position of, 3408.

Moncton—Main Street subway, 3024.

Montpetit, Elzear, payment to, 2694.

Montreal
Barracks, 2821.
Customs
Building, 2175, 2476.
Officers and revenue, 2169.
Harbour, 740.
Immigration agent, 1440.
Inland Revenue building, 2822.
Postal station G, 2821.
Postal station A, 2821.
Postal station M, 2820.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036, 2820.
Revenues, 1651.
Salaries, 1651.
Service, 2031.
Railway terminals, 3415, 3423.
Recruiting in, 4069, 4125.
Soldiers, medical examination of, 4069, 4125.

Montreal Island, bridge connection with, 3163, 3628.

Monument of His late Majesty King Edward VII, 3324.

Moosejaw
Customs officers, 2171.
Examining warehouse, 1550.
Military, 1651.

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Bilingual question, the, 3769.
Cadet service, 3504.
Horses, 2968.
Immigration expenditure, 2108.
Intercolonial railway—operation, 3403.
Justice—indeterminate sentences, 2844.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2459.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2762.
Public works, expenditure on, 2829.
Railways
Location of, 2754.
Passenger service, 3418, 3422.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2754.
Ross rifle, 4112.
Seventh Day Adventists Conferences, 2167.
Soldiers, employment of on farms, 3589.

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Agriculture Department—horses purchased by, 3881.
Montreal island, bridge connection with, 3631.
Telephone Companies, 3327.

Morrisburg, Ont.—Militia office, 1078.

Morrison, Mr. Alex. (Macdonald)
Free wheat, 1057.

Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 686, 956, 1439.

Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company Bill. 1r., 3230. 2r., 3372. Com., 3373. 3r., 3375.

Muirhead, Major, charges against, 306, 398.

Munitions. *See* War Supplies.

Murchies channel piers, 1654.

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 156.
Visit of Prime Minister to England, 157.
Canada's status in the Empire, 157.
Provision for disabled soldiers, 158.
Canadian Manufacturers' Association and war supplies, 159.
War contracts, 161-167.
Taxation of war profits, 168.
Commandeering of wheat, 168.
The Shell Committee, 171.
Aitken, Sir Max, duties of, 534, 2692.

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)—*Con.*
Canadian Manufacturers' Association and war supplies, 159.
Electricity, export of, 671.
Horses for war purposes, 1385.
Immigration of widows and children, 1330.
Munitions, supply of from Canada, 106.
Ottawa Customs building, 1549.
Parliament Buildings, reconstruction of, 806.
Shell Committee, the, 171.
Soldiers
Payment of, 552.
Provision for, 158.
Submarines, equipment of, 534.
Taxation of profits, 168.
Wallace Shipyards, Limited—payments to, 1077.
War contracts, 161-167.
Wheat, commandeering of, 168.

National Battlefields Commission, 3141, 3148, 3637.

Nationalist party, 471.

National Transcontinental railway
Coal for, 3463.
Equipment, 2799.
Freight rates, 1276, 2795, 3036-3089.
Government operation of, 2569, 2584, 2399, 3036,-3089, 3429, 3605, 3980, 3985.
Grain shipments on, 1276.
Locomotives, 1596.
Operating expenses, 1596.
Police commissioner, 2696.
Quebec terminals, 2569, 2584.

Naval Service
Department
Estimates, 662, 2885, 2908, 3442.
Expenditure, 2889.
Staff and salaries, 662.
Travelling expenses, 2300.
Esquimalt dockyards, 2889.
Explanation by Prime Minister, 1763.
Naval brigade, 1671.
Niobe and Rainbow, 229, 238, 1684, 1701, 1667, 2890.
Patrol service, 1680.
Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3943.
Recruits for, 2987.
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, 228.
Schooner Two Brothers, 533.
Stadacona, 548.
Steamer Starling, 540, 544.
Submarines
Equipment of, 534.
Purchase of, 75, 132, 200-211, 266, 316, 337, 387, 2890, 2897.

Naval Service—*Con.*
Submarines—*Con.*
Transport service, 1681.
Vessels in service, 1667.

Navigation. *See* Marine.

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Animals, diseased, destruction of, 2957.
Brantford, city of, 2664.
Budget, 1006.
Government expenditures, 1007, 1012.
Taxation proposals, 1008.
Immigration policy, 1011.
Political patronage, 1012.
Control of nickel industry, 1012.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan, 3662, 3979.
Civil Service—enlistments from, 825.
Flax industry, 1286.
Government expenditure, 4116.
Hay purchases, 2967.
Hudson Bay railway, 3376.
Mines Department publications, 3883.
Nickel industry, control of, 1012.
Peat, 2328.
Pensions to soldiers, 1663.
Political patronage, 1012.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2360.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4019, 4116.
Railways
Location of, 2745.
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3979.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2746.
Soldiers
Pensions, 1663.
Technical training for, 1618.
Steamship service, 2532.
Taxation
Apples, 1008.
Oil, 1009.
Profits, 1009, 1793, 1990, 2631, 2641, 2651.
Technical education, 2208.
Water carts, 537.
Woman suffrage, 1201.
Zinc, bounties on, 3034.

Neuville lighthouse, 593.

New Brunswick
Lumber export trade, 190.
Public works, 3159.

New Carlisle wharf, 535.

Newfoundland
Immigration, regulations affecting, 2441.
Steamship service. *See that title.*

New Glasgow
40th Battalion, supplies for, 1043.
Postal revenue, 3561.

New Richmond post office, 1653.

Nickel. *See* Mines and Minerals.

Nickle, Mr. William F. (Kingston)
Bilingual question, the, 3723.
Pensions to soldiers, 4140.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4125.
Railways, location of, 2755.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2755.
Shipbuilding, 714.
Taxation of profits, 1860.

Niobe and Rainbow. *See* Naval Service.

Noreen, steamer, 727.

North Bay armoury, 2691.

Northrup, Mr. William B. (East Hastings)
Divorce, 595, 762, 791.

Nova Scotia
Coal shortage, 1608.
Fenian Raid Bounties, 593.
Fishery inspector, 546.
Horses, purchase of in, 685.
Public works. *See that title.*
Recruiting in, 1367, 3255.
Soldiers voting in, 3510.
Steamship service. *See that title.*

Oats and oatmeal. *See* Grain.

O'Brien, Mr. A. H., superannuation of, 2131.

Oil
Duty on. *See* Taxation.
Freight rates on, 3410.
Gasolene, production and price of, 885, 1019, 2393.
Petroleum, embargo on, 2648.
Railways, for fuel on, 977, 1550.

Okanagan Indian reserve. *See* Indians.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 99.
Ocean transportation, 100.
Extension of term of Parliament, 102.
War expenditures, 102.
Conscription, 103.
Enlistment, 104.
Provision for disabled soldiers, 105, 108, 110.
Provision for soldiers and their dependents, 109.
Patriotic Fund, 109.
Military equipment, 111, 112.
Our system of recruiting, 113.
Military forces in Canada, 114.
Alberta, enlistments in, 108.
Army
Casualty lists, 3280.
Conscription, 103.
Enlistments, 104, 108, 3279, 4076.
Military training, 3503, 3507.
101st Battalion, 3548.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
Overseas forces, equipment of, 3513.
Recruiting, 113, 3550, 3587.
Soldiers
Allowances to, 550, 4102.
Civil Service, appointments of to, 648.
Dependents of, allowances to, 4102.
Disabled, provision for, 105, 108, 110, 3334.
Equipment of, 112, 3502-3528.
Insane, 1659.
Medical examination of, 4073.
Pensions to, 1658, 4148.
Punishment of, 3539.
Technical training for, 1619.
Astronomical observatories, 2430, 2434.
Bilingual question, the, 3773.
Budget, 1209.
The Government and national conditions, 1209.
Agricultural development, 1211, 1220.
Revenue and expenditure, 1212.
Increasing taxation, 1213.
The cost of living, 1216.
Duty on apples, 1217.
Issue of Dominion notes, 1218.
Business corporations, government control of, 719.
Cadet service, 3503.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan, 3658, 3863, 3976.
Civil Service—appointments of soldiers to, 648.
Cold storage, 1428.
Cost of living, 1216.
Edmonton
Disturbances at, 887.
Militia, 114.
Technical School, 648.
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 2081, 3448.
Experimental farms—bee-keeping on, 1410.
Grain
Congestion, 1706.
Elevators, St. John, 3594.
Freight rates on, 3074.
Oats and oatmeal, embargo on, 653, 803.
Transportation of, 3074, 3085, 3456, 3981.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 3201.
Free, 874-880.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan, 3658, 3863.
Homestead entries by volunteers, 3529.
Hudson Bay railway, 3379, 3989.
Immigration
Expenditure, 2110, 2440.
Policy, 831.
Stations, western, 2869.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
Indian Commission—British Columbia, 852.
Indians
Okanagan reserve, 3144, 3676.
Saint Peter's reserve, 593, 2060, 2067, 2316.
Intercolonial railway equipment, 3601.
Interior
Department expenditure, 2079, 2090.
Minister of—speech in Chicago, 831.
Orders in Council approved, 3347.
Lac St. Anne improvements, 3313.
Lands, western, survey of, 835.
Legion of Frontiersmen, 3507.
Loans to farmers, 681.
Mining industry, 1880.
National Transcontinental railway
Freight rates, 3074.
Government operation of, 3980.
Northern Alberta, enlistments in, 4076.
Oats and oatmeal. *See* Grain.
Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, 1013.
Parliament, extension of term of, 102.
Patriotic Fund, 109.
Penitentiaries, 2154.
Prisoners from in military service, 2117.
Pensions. *See* Army.
Political patronage in military affairs, 3547.
Potatoes, duty on, 1431.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2947.
Public works, expenditure on, 3313.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4002, 4016.
Railways
Oil for fuel on, 977, 1550.
Western, 2081.
Railway mail service, 2045, 2050.
Rogers, Colonel Maynard, services of, 848.
Rural mail service, 2044.
Seed grain indebtedness, 509.
Seventh Day Adventists Conferences, 2167.
Spirit river—proposed forest reserve, 3529, 3883.
Surveys, 1324, 2342, 2429.
Tar sands, 2340.
Taxation
Apples, 1217, 1792, 2306, 2310, 2315.
Profits, 1880.
Telegraph lines, government, 3326, 3634.
Transportation
Ocean, 3131.
Railway, 3980.
War
Appropriations, 3277.
Expenditures, 102.
Supplies
Canvas shoes, 595, 673.
Field kitchens, 547.
Machine guns, 111, 595, 3522.
Orders for, securing of, 964.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
War, Supplies—*Con.*
Overshoes, 673, 886.
Rifles, 595, 3520, 4105, 4107.
Socks, 593, 887.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1888.
Western development, 2080.
Wheat. *See* Grain.
Woman suffrage, 1608.

Ontario Public works, 3179.

Orangemen in army service, 359.

Ottawa
Buildings
Customs, 1549.
Departmental, 667, 2830, 2874, 3135, 3612.
Height of, 2165.
New drill hall, 2832.
Recruiting offices, 3587.
Victoria Memorial Museum, 2331, 2343.
Military camp doctors, 1760.

Ottawa Separate School Commission, 2546.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Budget, 1095.
Canada and the war, 1095.
Government expenditure, 1095.
Quebec and the war, 1096.
Civil Service—appointments from Dorchester, 2921.

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Railway Act, consolidation of, 1276.
Soulanges canal, dredging, 1761.

Paquet, Mr. Eugene (L'Islet)
Agriculture, 1392.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 11.
Review of the war, 12.
Canada's part in the war, 13.
Extension of term of Parliament, 15.
Canada's economic conditions, 15.
Exhibitions, 3026.
Government employees, 3674.
Intercolonial railway—French speaking employees, 2788.
Mail service on the Transcontinental, 2050.
Quebec (city), Transcontinental railway employees at, 1436.
Dairy inspection, 852.
Live stock, 886.
Quebec (prov.)

Panama Canal, goods shipped to Canada via., 4092.

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 453.
Canada and the war, 453.

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
Problems after the war, 454.
War contracts, 455.
Titles, 457.
Bilingual question, the, 3794.
Civil Servants—separation allowances to wives of, 3232.
Dredging—launch Waldrondo, 3942.
Flax industry, 1292.
Frontier protection, 744.
Horses for war purposes, 1381.
Mail contracts, 2723.
National Transcontinental railway police commissioner, 2696.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1890.
Postage stamps, sale and use of, 2050.
Prince Rupert Militia quarters, 3352.
Separation allowances, 3232.
Shell Committee, the, advances by, 3528.
Shell contracts, 757, 2243.
Taxation of profits, 1847, 2652.
War contracts, 456, 2243.

Paris
Agency, 982.
Allied Economy Conference at, 2475, 2802.

Parks, Canadian National, 844, 846.
See also Dominion Lands and Parks; Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amendment Bill.

Parliament
Committees of. *See* House of Commons.
Extension of term of, 6, 15, 68, 97, 102, 181, 215, 413, 425, 437, 475, 492, 622, 636, 755, 1133, 3943, 4007, 4129. *See* Address to His Majesty the King.
Independence of—subscriptions to Dominion loan, 455.
Library of, 668, 755.
Members of in military service. *See* Army.
Railways, jurisdiction respecting, 947.

Parliament Buildings
Desks, purchase of, 1278.
Destruction of by fire, 578.
Alleged warning, 674.
Architect's report on, 888.
Commission of Inquiry into—appointment of, 582. Report of, 4006.
Messages of sympathy, 579, 587, 652, 669, 855, 885, 1276.
Report of Chief Commissioner of Police, 669.
Improvements to, 2833.
Light on, 739.

Parliament Buildings—*Con.*
Plans of, 1969, 4077.
Reconstruction of, 591, 663, 806, 2012, 3049.
Committee of Members on, 3049, 3613.
Fair wage clause in contract for, 3622, 3464.
Plans for, 1969, 4077.
See also Ottawa.

Parliamentary procedure
Amendments, 1712, 1714, 2238.
Answer to question, discussion of, out of order, 652.
Bills not to be introduced by resolution, 3617.
Committee of Supply, powers of, 3944.
Consent of the Crown, 2116.
Irrelevancy, 975, 1834.
Motion for Committee to rise not in order, 2453.
Point of order, discussion on, 3621.
Reading of unsigned letter not in order, 2743.
Subjects debatable by House, 3621, 3676.
See Deputy Speaker *and* Speaker.

Paspebiac wharf, 536.

Patenaude, Hon. Esioff L. (Hochelaga)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 521.
Quebec and the war, 521.
Attitude of the Liberal Party, 523, 525.
Views of the late Mr. Monk, 527.
Canada's part in the war, 527.
Haanel, Dr., 852.
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 661, 2157-2165.
Maple sugar adulteration, 2164.

Patents
Records, printing of, 1386.
Rights, extension of, 1157.

Patriotic Fund, Canadian, 109, 500, 1255.

Patronage. *See* Political.

Peat. *See* Mines.

Pelagic sealing investigation, 2918.

Penitentiaries
Industrial farms, 2841.
Insane patients, 2119.
Juveniles in, 2121.
Kingston, 2115.
Portsmouth, 541.
Prisons and reformatories, 2841.
See also Prisons and Reformatories Act Amendment Bill.
Prisoners from in military service, 2117.
Ross, Walter T., release of, 2301, 2302.
St. Vincent de Paul, 2118.
Ticket-of-leave system, 2117.

Pensions
European War, 3643.
Fenian Raid, 3642.
Intercolonial railway, 757.
Militiamen, 3642.
Pilots, 747-750.
Soldiers, 211, 236, 440, 1087, 1255, 1654, 1665, 1704, 1989.
Report of Special Committee on, 4131.
See Army, allowances.

Perley, Sir George. *See* High Commissioner.

Peterborough public building, 2810.

Pictou (county)
Mail service, 549, 955.
Recruiting officers, 1165.
Telephone service, 549.

Pictou (island) lifeboat station, 549.

Pictou (town)
Freight and coal, handling of, 952.
Troops at—supplies, 851, 1041, 1077.

Pilotage. *See* Marine.

Political patronage, 145, 217, 276, 294, 299, 303-312, 368, 416, 895, 907, 917, 1012, 1032, 1127, 1254, 1273, 1326, 1351, 1353, 1361, 1363, 1366, 1370-1374, 1875, 3248, 3252, 3256, 3261, 3266, 3275, 3288, 3542.

Pope, Sir Joseph, payments to, 2922.

Port Hood wharf, expenditure on, 560.

Port Howe mail service, 1076.

Pont Marcotte, 2171.

Port Nelson
Dock accommodation, 2692.
Harbour improvements, 1599, 2838.
Live stock for, 2692.
Navigation, 592.

Post Office
Advertising, 1164, 2739.
Censoring of mail matter, 2054, 2691, 2840, 2880, 3029, 3050.
Estimates, 663, 2016, 2716, 3534.
Expenditure, 1244, 1875, 1885, 2056, 2609.
Finances, 895.
Mail contracts, 2610, 2720.
Motor cars, purchase of, 1327, 1328.
Parcel post, 2736.
Postmasters and municipal elections, 1653.
Railway mail service, 2023, 2045, 2047, 2050,
Revenue, 2173.
Rural mail service, 2017, 2032, 2040, 2044, 2050, 2052, 2054, 2616, 2621, 2716.
Savings deposits, 543.
Soldiers' letters, 532, 2051, 2053.
Staff and salaries. *See* estimates.
Stamps, sale and use of, 532, 546, 2051, 2718.

Powder milk. *See* War Supplies.

Prince Albert—hydro-electric development, 842.

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 1597, 1704, 3391.
Dredging, 853.
Fishery inspectors, 2010.
Hillsborough bridge, guard on, 1433.
Horses, purchase of, 672.
Public works, 3152, 3635.
Steamship service, 2851.
Telegraph lines, 3187.
War supplies, purchases of, 3406.
Winter communication with, 1433.

Prince Edward Island railway, 1594, 3035, 3051, 3074.

Prince George, B.C., railway station, 637.

Prince Rupert militia quarters, 3352.

Printing, government, 668, 3095, 3099, 3785, 4152. *See also* advertising.

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2690. 2r., 2841-2845. Com., 2846. Rep., 2847. 3r., 2847.

Prison reform. *See* penitentiaries.

Private bills discussed.
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2663.
Brantford, City of, 947, 1625, 1648, 1726, 2663.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 1013.
Eastern Canadian Union Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, 2167.
Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada, 2907.
Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society, 3144.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2421, 2444.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1647, 1727, 1890.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1154, 1228.
Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, 1013.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2765, 2903.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1649, 1887.

Privilege, questions of
Boivin, Mr.—bilingual question, 1206.
Bureau, Mr.—Ontario hydro-radial scheme, 1432.
Burnham, Mr.—statement in Toronto Star, 555.
Carvell, Mr.—fraudulent questions, 1492; shell deliveries, 2240.
Clements, Mr.—graft charges, 2398.
Crothers, Hon. T. W.—Globe newspaper, 1811.

Privilege, questions of—*Con.*
Hepburn, Mr.—shell contracts, 154.
Hughes, Sir Sam—Lieut.-Colonel John Currie, M.P., 1045.
Kemp, Hon. A. E.—Sheet Metal Products Company, 1646.
Kyte, Mr.—shell contracts, 3296.
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—statement in Winnipeg Telegram, 2973.
Loggie, Mr.—St. John Daily Telegraph, 2113.
McCurdy, Mr.—statements of Ottawa Citizen, 2548.
Pugsley, Mr.—remarks of Solicitor General, 151; statement of Ottawa Journal, 806; correction of statement in Hansard, 2399.
Rogers, Hon. Robert—charges in Saskatchewan legislature, 1045.
Seguin, Mr.—statement of Ottawa Citizen, 2239.
Turriff, Mr.—statement of Peterborough Review, 414.

Prohibition of intoxicating liquors during the war. Res., 1441, 1918, 1949, 2210, 2351. Div., 2361. *See* also, 638, 2475, and Canada Temperance Act Amendment Bill.

Prohibition or Restriction of Intoxicating Liquors Bill. 1r., 1901. 2r., 2478. Com., 2479-2494, 2549-2569, 2696-2716, 2758-2765, 2882. Rep., 2885. 3r., 2946, 2956. Amendments proposed: Mr. Guthrie, 2953. Div., 2954. Mr. Sinclair, 2955. Mr. Hughes, 2956. Sen. Amdts., 4127.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 2012, 2476.
Bilingual question, the, 3798.
Cabinet Ministers, visit to New York of, 2012.
Carleton Drug Company, 2542.
Carson, General John, position of, 851.
Chute, Lieutenant A. H., 2476.
Civil Service—pay of lower grade employees, 4079.
Forbes, Dr. A. Mackenzie, 3528.
Foster, A. De W., 2175.
Lessard, Major General, position of, 547.
Marine and Fisheries law clerk, 2176.
Motor car, Packard—purchase of, 1328
O'Brien, Mr. A. H., superannuation of, 2131.
Peat, 2328.
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 2116.
Sentencing of children to, 2122.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2358, 2882.
Proof spirit purchase, 2176.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)—*Con.*
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4087.
Shouldis, Mrs., employment of, 1328.
64th Battalion—medical officer, 1077.
Sussex, N.B., Battalion—medical officer, 1161.
Tibbits, Archibald, 2176.
Tremain, Lieut.-Col., M.P., 1652.
Trenches, improvement of, 2922.
Wilson, Mr. Beckles, 1327.
Woman suffrage, 1196.

Public Accounts Committee. *See* House of Commons.

Public health, proposed department of, 1065.

Public printing. *See* Printing.

Public Service Loan ($75,000,000) Bill. Res., 1812, 1834. Rep., 1843. 1r., 1843. 2r., 1972. Com., 1972. 3r., 1972.

Public works
Applications for, 1807.
Buildings
Alberta, 2868.
Generally, 341.
Manitoba, 2818.
Nova Scotia, 2814.
Ontario, 2824. *See* Ottawa.
Quebec, 2818.
Saskatchewan, 3329.
Department
Architectural Branch, 3319.
Clerks, 3096.
Engineering Branch, 3319.
Estimates, 663, 2808-2838, 2868, 2148-3188, 3312-3344, 3556, 3612, 3621.
Staff and salaries, 663.
Dredging
British Columbia, 1078, 3942.
Dredge Port Nelson, 2692.
Maritime Provinces, 853.
Ontario and Quebec, 3186, 3627.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 722.
Victoria, B.C., 546.
Expenditures, 896, 2605, 2808, 2826, 3156, 3322, 3338.
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 3626.
Generally, 3152.
Manitoba, 3184.
Ontario, 3625.
New Brunswick, 3335, 3621.
Nova Scotia, 3149, 3615.
Ontario, 3179, 3338.
Prince Edward Island, 3635.
Quebec, 719, 3161, 3556, 3623.
St. Lawrence, 719.
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3313.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 67.
Extension of term of Parliament, 68.
Transportation requirements, 69.
Manufacture of munitions, 71-90.
Shell Committee, 71-92.
Shell contracts, 72-90.
Submarine investigation, 75.
Taxation of war profits, 85.
Contributions for machine guns, 92.
Advertising, Government, 2436.
Burleigh falls, lease of, 2582.
Canadian Northern Railway Company
Director, 2648.
Proposed loan to, 3581, 3940, 3944.
Canada Temperance Act, 3298.
Carnegie, Colonel, correspondence with, 1731.
Civil Service—enlistments, 818, 1844.
Coloured men, recruiting of, 235, 557, 2114.
Davidson Commission, report of, 3189.
Dominion Lands and Parks, 2865.
Economic and Development Commission, 1640, 2999.
Experimental farms, 2871.
Fish and fisheries
Transportation, 2418.
Trout fry, 2421.
German-Canadians in military service, 683.
Government expenditures, 973, 986, 1321, 3137.
Government railways—small claims, 3304.
Grain
Congestion, 1713.
Elevators, 3059, 3082.
Transportation, 2857.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3581, 3940.
Hansard—correction of statement, 2399.
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 963.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2912.
Immigration
Advertising, 2436.
Expenditure, 2093, 2099, 2436.
Indians
Kitsilano reserve, 2681.
St. Peter's reserve, 2063, 2937.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 1612, 2401.
Intercolonial railway—branch lines, 3434.
Interior Department expenditure, 2090, 2431, 2435.
International Joint Commission, 979.
Kingston harbour improvements, 3182.
Labour bureaus, national, 615.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*
Loans to farmers, 677.
Marine Department estimates, reduction of, 2362.
Motor boats, 2803.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3374.
National Transcontinental Railway, Government operation of, 2399, 2588, 3036-3089, 3605.
Naval service, 1683, 2888.
Niobe and Rainbow, 2890.
Ottawa Journal—correction of statement in, 806.
Parliament, extension of term of, 68.
Parliament Buildings, reconstruction of, 2013, 4077.
Pensions to soldiers, 4131.
Prison reform, 2846.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2486, 2551, 2561, 2697.
Public works expenditure, 2769, 2808, 3341.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3616, 3998, 4008, 4011, 4051.
Railways, location of, 2747.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2747.
Recruiting—coloured men, 235, 557, 2114.
Royal Academy of Arts, 3142.
Rural mail service, 2729.
St. John
Harbour improvements, 735-737, 3335.
Post office, 2817.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3356, 3500.
St. John Valley Railway, 1932.
Shell Committee, the, 71, 92.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4088.
Shipbuilding, 639, 701, 1616, 1643, 2892, 3001, 3110, 3336, 4056.
Soldiers relatives, payments to, 3560.
Solicitor General, remarks of, 151.
Steamship service, 2530.
Submarines, investigation into purchase of, 75, 152, 2890.
Supplementary estimates, 3137.
Surf Inlet harbour improvements, 3185.
Surveys, 2428, 2902.
Taxation of apples, 2305; profits, 85.
Technical education, 1642.
Trade and Commerce, 2996.
Transportation, ocean, 2857, 3110. *See* Shipbuilding.
Vancouver Harbour, 1604.
Vessels, Canadian, requisitioning of, 1969.
War
Expenditures, 39.
Supplies
Ammunition, 71-90.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*
War, Supplies—*Con.*
Binoculars, 1717.
Boots, 1716.
Fuses, 1735.
Horses, 1719.
Machine guns, 92.
Orders for, securing of, 963.
Ross rifle, 155.
Shells, 74, 79, 86, 154, 1714, 1725, 1727, 1731, 3842.
White Phosphorous matches, 1493.
Woman suffrage, 1044, 1185, 1204.
Yukon, the, 1312, 1316, 1320.

Quebec (City)
Bridge, 1596, 3434.
Customs officer and revenue, 2169.
Harbour, 743.
Post office, 672, 1651, 2823.
Employees, 1906, 2010, 2034, 2036.
Parcel post superintendent, 547.
Sewerage system, 3557.
Transcontinental railway employees at, 1436.

Quebec (province)
Agriculture, 1389.
Dairy inspection, 852.
Fisheries, 547, 638.
Highways, 3165.
Judges, 2692.
Live stock, 886.
Public works, 3161.
Recruiting in, 479, 491, 498, 3281.
Referee on butter and cheese, 2942.
Steamship service, 2852.

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2530, 3146, 3429. *See* Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill.

Quebec Harbour Commission, 2347.

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway. *See* Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill.

Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill. (Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix; Quebec and Saguenay; Lotbiniere and Megantic). 1r., 3616. 2r., 3990. Com., 4007. 3r., 4052. *See also* 4116.

Railways
Bond guarantees, 887.
Fires caused by, 3412.
Jurisdiction affecting, 947.
Oil for fuel on, 977, 1550.
Passenger service, 3418.
Port Nelson harbour improvements, 1599.
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 1597.
Public ownership of, 3826, 3871.
Quebec bridge, 1596.

Railways—*Con.*
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3979.
Stations, naming of, 2738.
Train service in the West, 518, 576.
Transportation. *See that title.*
For individual railways, see their titles.

Railway Act, consolidation of, 1276.

Railway Act Amendment Bills
Powers of Railway Commission. 1r., 2690. 2r., 2743. Com., 2743. 3r., 2802. *See also* 3410, 3629.
Transportation of Grain. 1r., 1207. 2r., 1306. Com., 1306. 3r., 1309.

Railways and Canals
Department estimates, 662, 1590, 2569-2599, 2769, 3035, 3051, 3074, 3375, 3410, 3445, 3593, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3933, 3943.
Staff and salaries, 662.

Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3297, 3943. *See* Niobe.

Regina
Army Service Corps—accommodation for, 1652.
Assistant Receiver General, 553.
Inland Revenue premises, 1439.
Military camp, 1808.

Reid, Jack, imprisonment of for seditiion, 2007.

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Antigonish station garden, 3593, 3603.
Brantford, City of, 1626, 1648.
Burleigh falls, 2583.
Canadian Pacific Railway—freight congestion, 2742.
Canals
Galops, 3609.
St. Peter's, 1601.
Trent, 1601, 3581.
Welland, 1600, 3454.
Customs
Agricultural implements, duty on, 4068.
Bonding privileges, 4097.
Department—staff and salaries, 3644.
Huntingdon preventive stations, 542.
Morrisburg—free entry of goods at, 3645.
Smuggling, 642, 4100.
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 3446.
Government railways—small claims, 2919, 3303, 3884.
Grain
Elevators, 3061, 3085, 3594, 3600, 3604.
Freight rates on, 3063, 3072-3089.
Transportation of, 1207, 1306, 3602, 3456.
Hudson Bay railway, 1598, 3990.
Intercolonial railway
Accident at Val Brillant, 2058.

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway—*Con.*
Branch lines, 2767.
Car shortage, 1705, 3091.
Coal
Alleged expropriation of, 1762.
Supply, 538, 2115, 2795.
Equipment, 2793, 3607, 3459.
Freight congestion, 2742.
North Sydney terminals, 3427.
Operation, 1591.
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 3783.
Passenger service, 3419.
Rates of pay, 2881.
Train service, 3395.
Montreal railway terminals, 3416.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3230, 3372.
National Transcontinental railway
Equipment, 2793.
Freight rates, 2795, 3058, 3066-3089.
Government operation of, 2584, 2593, 3036-3089, 3605, 3984.
Quebec terminals, 2584.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2466.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1647.
Panama Canal, shipment of goods to Canada via., 4097.
Port Nelson harbour improvements, 1599.
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 1597, 3391.
Quebec bridge, 1596, 3434.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3990, 4007, 4122.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3430.
Railways
Bridges, guards on, 1433.
Fires caused by, 3412.
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3983.
Train service in the West, 518, 556.
Railways and Canals Department
Estimates, 2767-2798, 3035, 3051, 3074, 3375-3404, 3410, 3445, 3593.
Expenditure, 2769.
Railway Commision, powers of, 2745-2758.
Railway Commissioners, 3411.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3052, 3352, 3501.
St. John elevator, 3594.
Shipbuilding, 3608.
Soldiers
Barbour, Private, death of, 3418.
Railway fares, single, for, 3594.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2904.
Toronto railway terminals, 3414.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1650.

Reindeer, experiments with, 839.

Rhodes, Mr. Edgar N. (Cumberland)
Amherst
Accommodation for troops, 3269.
Purchase of war supplies, 3267.
Deputy Speaker, appointment as, 531.
Political patronage, 3268.

Richards, T. M., services of, 1653.

Riding Mountain timber reserve, 640.

Rigaud mail service, 541, 595.

Rimouski
Customs officer, 546.
Harbour improvements, 3174.
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.

River John customs officer, 549.

Riverside Lumber Company, 2058.

Riviere du Loup
Dredging, 2477.
Wharf, 2543.

Riviere Ouelle wharf, 1164.

Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Animals, compensation for destruction of, 2961.
Bilingual question, the, 3771.
Civil Service, enlistment from, 824.
Dundee mail service, 2722.
Grain
Elevators, 3601.
Transportation, 2795, 3601.
Hay purchases, 2967.
Horses for war purposes, 1382, 2970.
Hudson Bay railway, 3387.
Huntingdon preventive stations, 641.
National Transcontinental railway—freight rates on grain, 2795.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4002.
Rural mail service, 2731.
Seed grain indebtedness, 516.
Shipbuilding, 3608.

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Advertising, 827.
Aliens, employment of, 850.
Alberta farmers, relief for, 532.
Astronomical observatory, western, 2430.
Buffalo, 845.
Civil service, enlistments from, 817, 820, 823.
Conscription, 592, 830.
Dominion Lands and Parks, 2865.
Farmers, western, relief for, 2860.
Forests
Protection, 836, 837.
Reforestation, 2089.
Reserves and Parks, 2496, 2663.
See Dominion Lands.
Grazing leases, 847.

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior) —*Con.*

Homestead
Inspectors, 828.
Regulations, 827.
Immigration
Agencies, 2096, 2435.
Chinese, 2441.
Inspection, boundary, 657.
Newfoundland, regulations affecting, 2441.
Statistics, 540.
Indian Land Commission, 2867.
Indians, 2059, 2665, 2866. *See that title.*
Interior Department
Enlistments, 2084.
Estimates, 655, 817-850, 2428, 2860.
Minister of in Chicago, 756, 830, 832.
Orders in Council approved, 3347.
Staff and salaries, 655, 817.
Irrigation, 842.
Keay, R. H., fraudulent operations of, 837.
Labourers, foreign, enlistment of, 2145.
Parks, Canadian National, 844.
Pre-emptions, payments on, 534.
Railways, western, 2084.
Reindeer herd, 839.
Rogers, Colonel Maynard, services of, 849.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2316.
Seed grain
Distribution, 2863.
Indebtedness, 507, 518, 760, 1607.
Spirit River Forest Reserve, 3883.
Surveys, 834, 836, 1320, 2428.
Taber irrigation district, 2806.
Taxation of land, 756, 2936.
Timber. *See* Forests.
Water-powers, development of, 840, 842.
Wetaskiwin settlers, grievances of, 2089.
Yukon, the, 1310, 1317.

Rogers, Colonel Maynard, 848.

Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Civil Service
Appointments, 4082.
Messengers, 2767.
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 3452.
Experimental farms, 2871.
House of Commons—Saturday sittings, 3409.
Judges' salaries, 2325.
Labour bureaus, national, 615.
Montreal island, bridge connection with, 3632.
Monument of His late Majesty King Edward VII, 3324.
Ottawa departmental buildings, 2874.

Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)—*Con.*

Parliament Buildings
Plans of, 4077.
Reconstruction of, 2012, 2833, 3049, 3613, 3622.
Public works
Department estimates, 2808-2838, 2868, 3148-3188, 3556, 3612, 3621.
Expenditure, 2811.
Dredging, 3186, 3627.
Harbours and rivers, 3152, 3156, 3313, 3556, 3615, 3621, 3623.
Roads and bridges, 3163.
Telegraph lines, 3187, 3312, 3318, 3326, 3634.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3431.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3616.
Ross rifle, 4108.
Royal Society of Canada, 2875.
Saskatchewan, charges in Legislature of, 1045.
St. John Valley Railway, 1922.
Shell contracts, 3405.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4082.
Soldiers
Disabled, provision for, 2873, 3334.
Medical examination of, 4072.
Technical education, 2208.
Wheat, free, 880, 1046-1052.
Woman suffrage, 1202.

Roseberg post office, 2474.

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Allowances to soldiers, 1021.
Beehan, J. J., 3408.
Budget, 1020.
Provision for soldiers, 1021.
The duty on apples, 1022.
Government war loans, 1023.
Taxation of profits, 1023.
Income taxation, 1025.
Rural credits, 1026.
Canadian ideals, 1028.
Middlesex county and the war, 1029.
Government administration and political partyism, 1037-1033.
The spirit of France, 1033.
Eggs, marketing of, 2961.
Farmers' credits, 1025.
Political patronage, 1032.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2480.
Rural credits, 1025.
Soldiers' allowances, 1021.
Taxation
Apples, 1022.
Income, 1025.
Profits, 1023.
War loans, 1023.

Ross, Captain William, employment of, 545.

Royal Academy of Arts, 3142,

Royal Assent, 1495, 2073, 2807.

Royal Military College—clothing contract, 3881.

Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, 2889, 2900.

Royal Naval College, 2889.

Royal Society of Canada, 2875.

Rural credits. *See* Farmers.

Rural mail service. *See* Post Office.

Sabourin, Lieut.-Col., rank of, 949.

Sackville
Public building, 2816.
Wharf accommodation, 3160.

Saguenay river improvements, 3674.

St. Alphonse de Caplan, mail service, 1654.

St. Amour, A. C., payments to, 3408.

St. John
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Freight exports, 3529.
Harbour improvements, 729, 3335.
Post office, 2817.
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036, 2039.
Revenues and salaries, 1651.
Terminals, 3593.

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill. Res., 3353. 1r., 3372. 2r., 3500. Com., 3500. 3r., 3502. *See also* 1433, 3051.

St. John Valley Railway, 757.

St. Leonard, N.B., soldiers at, 640.

St. Paul L'Ermite wharf, 2174.

St. Peter's canal, 1601.

St. Peter's Indian reserve. *See* Indians.

St. Peter's Indian Reserve Bill. Res., 2059. 1r., 2071. 2r., 2316. Com., 2316. 3r., 2925-2946.

St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries.

Saskatchewan
Charges in Legislature of, 1045.
Immigration—government co-operation in, 1277.
Judges' salaries, 2071.

Saskatchewan river water supply, 3189.

Scammell, J. K., position of, 1157.

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Grain
Congestion, 1712.
Freight rates, 3067.
Transportation, 2857.
Hudson Bay railway, 3384.
Mail contracts, 2615.

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)—*Con.*
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4153.
Rural mail service, 2055.
Sunnybrae mail service, 1549.
Taxation of apples, 2309.
Transportation, ocean, 2857.

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 171.
Imperial relationships, 172.
War contracts, 172, 175.
The tariff and trade, 173.
Public finances, 174.
Shell contracts, 175.
French-Canadians and the war, 177.
Shell Committee, the, 175.
Sealers, British Columbia, claims of, 595.
Secretary of State, department of—translators, 3231.
War contracts, 172, 175.

Seed grain
Advances for, 510, 532, 761.
Amounts required for, 2861.
Distribution of, 2862.
Impurity of, 432.
Indebtedness, 438, 761, 1607.
Liens for, 760.
Purchase of, 886.

Senate
Members of—military duties, 1328.

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Joliette
Government offices, 3562.
Post office, 3561.
L'Assomption
Mail service, 3881.
Wharf, 2174.
Ottawa Citizen—report of, 2239.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 228, 2239.
Rural mail service, 2726.
St. Paul L'Ermite mail service, 2174.

Select Standing Committee. *See* House of Commons.

Seventh Day Adventists. *See* Private Bills.

Sevigny, Hon. Albert (Dorchester). *See* Speaker.

Sharpe, Colonel Samuel, M.P., pay of, 2924.

Shelburne
Bell buoy, application for, 543.
Customs duties, 1762.
Fishery guardian, 545, 546.
Mail service, 594.
Port physician, 543.

Shell Committee, The, 71, 92, 95, 118, 126, 128, 140, 163, 171, 175, 194, 221-225, 238, 255, 295, 303, 366, 346-350, 420, 923, 1496, 1715, 1740, 2259, 2294.
Advances by, 3528.
Formal charges, 1715.
Formation of, 1500.
See Shell contracts.

Shell Fisheries Commision, 2368.

Shepherd, Mr. F. H. (Nanaimo)
Astronomical observatory, western, 2433.
Taxation of oil, 1800.

Sherbrooke
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Drill hall, 3089.
Mail service, 2173.
Postmaster, 1906, 2033.
Post office
Employees, 1906, 2010, 2036.
Revenues and salaries, 1651.

Shipbuilding. *See* Marine.

Shipping. *See* Marine *and* Transportation.

Shouldis, Mrs., employment of, 1328.

Shovel shields. *See* War Supplies.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 414.
The war, 414.
Political patronage, 416.
Purchase of horses, 418.
The Shell Committee, 420.
Advertising, government, 3095.
Amherst, Sydney and New Glasgow postal revenue, 3561.
Archibald, M. G., services of, 539.
Bonds, Government, negotiability of, 660.
British Columbia lighthouse service, 3352.
Canada Temperance Act Amendment, 3301.
Censors and decoders, employment of, 640, 851.
Civil Service appointments, 948, 4089.
Coin, American, 654.
Cole harbour wharf, 758, 3150.
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 1161, 1610.
Fenian Raid bounty, 593.
Fish and fisheries
Bounties, 2546.
Canadian troops, for, 1652.
Dogfish, 2406, 2409.
Fishing industry, 2369.
Herring industry, 2475.
Lobsters, 2388.
Marketing of, 2367.
Pickled fish, 1761.
Shipments to Great Britain, 2411.
Smelt fishing regulations, 673.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Fish and fisheries—*Con.*
Transportation and marketing of, 567, 636, 2364, 2420.
Government annuities, 1437.
Guysborough mail service, 2800.
Halifax
Exports and imports through, 3734.
Military hospital, 2114.
Hjort, Dr., 1552.
Horses for war purposes, 418, 1162, 1379.
Hospitals
Marine. 2918.
Military, 2114.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2911.
Hudson Bay railway, 636, 3384.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 850, 2468, 2774.
Pensions, 757.
Law, the late Mr. B. B., M.P., death of, 591.
Machine guns, private contributions for, 532.
Marine
Coasting privilege, 589, 1300.
Department estimates, reduction of, 2363.
Pilotage, 2805.
Sick Mariners Fund, 753.
Vessels, Canadian, net tonnage of, 1163.
Milford Haven Bridge postmaster, 2173.
Mines Department expenditure, 2335.
Minister of Munitions, 532.
Motor boats, 2804.
Naval service, 2545.
Navigation schools, 696.
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2849.
Oil, freight rates on, 3410.
Parliament buildings, reconstruction of, 2834.
Pensions, Intercolonial railway, 757.
Political patronage, 416.
Port Nelson navigation, 592.
Post office
Expenditure, 2056.
Parcel post, 2735.
Revenue, 532, 2173.
Rural mail service, 2019, 2041, 2048, 2732.
Printing, government, 3095.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2357, 2479, 2490, 2560, 2702, 2759, 2882, 2955.
Public works expenditure, 2815, 3155, 3322, 3338.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4040, 4049.
St. John freight exports, 3529.
Shell Committee, The, 420.
Sherbrooke mail service, 2173.
Shipbuilding, 709, 3122, 4058.
Shipping, total Canadian, 2175.
Soldiers
Letters, postage on, 532.
Punishment of, 3099.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Steamers, foreign trade licenses for, 2694.
Steamship service, 2537, 2540.
Taxation of profits, 2636, 2651.
Transportation, ocean, 3122.
Trawlers, steam, foreign, 640, 641.
Victoria, B.C., rifle range, 1549.
West Rochdale postmaster, 1551.
Whitehead, cold storage, 757.

Smith, Mr. Wm. (South Ontario)
Horses, 672.
Loans to farmers, 933.
War stamps, commission on sale of, 546.

Soldiers. *See* Army.

Soulanges canal
Dredge, 1761.
Employees—charges of partisanship, 3231.
Stone for, 1041, 1437, 1760.
Superintendent, 3408.

Souris rifle range, 2600.

Speaker (Hon. Albert Sevigny), rulings and statements of.
Amendments, 2238.
Consent of the Crown, 2316.
Election of officers, 3.
Explanations limited to a statement of the words actually used, 2241.
Expressions, withdrawal of, 77.
Point of order, discussion on, 3621.
Privilege, questions of, 556.
Reading of unsigned letter not in order, 2743.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4087.
Subjects debatable by House, 3621, 3676.

Spirit river proposed forest reserve, 3529, 3883.

Stamps. *See* Post Office.

Steamboats. *See* Marine.

Steamship service
Canada
British Columbia, 2541.
New Brunswick, 2538, 2540.
Nova Scotia, 2537, 2540, 2847, 3554.
Prince Edward Island, 536, 2851.
Quebec, 2852, 3100, 3134.
China and Japan, 2540.
Cuba, 2534.
Great Britain, 2530, 2537, 2538, 2540.
Newfoundland, 536, 2535, 2537.
South Africa, 2536.
United States, 2541.
West Indies and South America, 2535.
See also Transportation.

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Health, Public, suggested department of, 1065.

Stefansson, Expedition, 2914.

Stellarton, N.S., public building site, 1164.

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
British Columbia, resources of, 3842.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3839.
Capital punishment, 1965.
Enlistment of foreign labourers, 2145.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3839.
House of Commons—Saturday sittings, 3409.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 2683.
Mining industry, 1885.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1442, 2230, 2486.
Railways, public ownership of, 3826.
Trade and commerce, 3002.
Post Office Department expenditure, 1882.
Taxation
Apples, 1777.
Income, 1884.
Profits, 1882.
Vancouver Harbour, 1605.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1889.

Stewart, Mr. Dugald (Lunenburg)
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 570.
Yarmouth public works, 1905.

Stewart, J. H.—automobile seizure, 1438.

Stewart, Mr. Thos. J. (West Hamilton)
Ontario, Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1891.

Sheffington, George, employment of, 1431.

Submarines. *See* Naval service.

Summerside
Post office building, 2010.
Rifle range, 2010.

Sunnybrae, N.S., mail service, 1549.

Supply Bill (for 1917, $99,458,597.41). Res., 2664. 1r., 2r., Com., 3r., 2665.

Supply, Committee of, 653-669, 686-716, 716-739, 739-754, 817-850, 938-943, 956-989, 1309-1325, 1341-1385, 1386-1409, 1410-1432, 1590-1602, 1616-1646, 2016-2057, 2079-2111, 2115-2165, 2326-2346, 2361-2398, 2404-2421, 2428-2442, 2530-2542, 2569-2599, 2665-2690, 2716-2741, 2767-2798, 2808-2838, 2847-2878, 2885-2903, 2908-2919, 2956-2971, 3022-3023, 3035-3049, 3051-3074, 3074-3095, 3120-3143, 3147-3188, 3190-3214, 3214-3230, 3312-3344, 3375-3404, 3410-3463, 3502-3528,

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*

3534-3559, 3586-3616, 3021-3674, 3826-3863, 3863-3875, 3933-3942, 3943-3990, 4067-4074, 4079.

Surveys, 1320, 2428, 2901.

Sussex, N.B.—104th Battalion Military officer, 1161.

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Experimental farms, 1405.
Flax industry, 1291.
Hogs, American, 2923.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway, 2445.
Taxation of apples, 1772.
War supplies—Irish stew, 2014.

Swift Current post office site, 1041.

Sydney, C.B.
Pilotage Commission, 986.
Postal revenue, 3561.

Taber Irrigation District Bill. 1r., 2599. 2r., 2806. Com., 2806. 3r., 2841.

Talbot, Lieut.-Col. Onesiphore, duties of, 1325.

Tan bark, embargo on, 3022.

Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amendment Bill and Taxation.

Tar sand. *See* Mines.

Taxation, War.
Customs
Apples, 811, 899, 1008, 1016, 1022, 1092, 1130, 1217, 1227, 1764, 2305.
Farm implements, 4068.
Oil, 812, 899, 1009, 1018, 1227, 1796, 2303.
Pearls and diamonds, 641, 758.
Generally, 339, 1225, 1229.
Special
Income, 902, 908, 1025, 1086, 1884, 1982.
Land, 829, 200, 2934.
Profits, 168, 813, 899, 1009, 1023, 1038, 1103, 1127, 1136, 1248, 1330, 1843, 1862, 1891, 1972, 1990, 2601.
See Business Profits War Tax Bill *and* Customs Tariff Act Amendment Bill.

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 384.
Canadian expeditionary force, 384.
Canada's share in the war, 385.
Conditions of military service, 385.
Naval affairs, 386.
Purchase of submarines, 387.
British Columbia affairs, 389.
Labour bureaus, national, 621.
Naval service, 386.
Submarines, purchase of, 387.
Taxation—war profits, 85.

Technical education, 55, 370, 535, 648, 1618, 1626, 1642, 2177.

Telegraphs
Bay St. Lawrence office, 1551.
British Columbia, 3318.
Cable and wireless rates, 672.
Government lines, 548.
Magdalen islands cable service, 759.
Moosejaw, 3633.
Prince Edward Island, 3187.
Quebec, 3313.
Radiotelegraph service, 2888, 2908.
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3326, 3637.
Steamer Tyrian, 1437.
Vancouver, 3634.
Wireless stations, 2909, 2913.

Telephones. *See* Telegraphs.

Temiscouata mail service, 2477.

Temiskaming dam, 2546.

Terminal elevators. *See* Grain.

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Divorce, 779.
Shipbuilding, 4064.

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 5.
Extension of term of Parliament, 6.
Canada's productiveness in war time, 7.
Financial and trade conditions, 7.
Fortunes of the war, 9.
Principles at stake, 10.
Mining industry, 1878.
Ottawa military camp doctors, 1760.
Soldiers, insane, 1664.
Taxation of profits, 1878.
Trade and Commerce, 3023.
Yukon, the, 938-943, 1310.

Thompson, Mr. John K.C., 78, 316, 921. *See* Davidson Commission.

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 458.
Commandeering of wheat, 458-461.
Foster, A. De Wit, 4075.
Grain congestion, 1711.
Loans to farmers, 680.
Moosejaw military, 1651.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors. 1479, 2557, 2883.
Regina military camp, 1808.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 458-461.
Free, 1062.

Thornton, Mr. Chas. J. (Durham)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1482.

Three Rivers
Customs officers, 2169.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036.
Revenue and salaries, 1651.

Tibbits, Archibald, employment of, 1439, 2176.

Timber. *See* Dominion Lands.

Titles of honour, 457.

Tobacco. *See* Agriculture.

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond-Wolfe)
Bromptonville mail service, 3562.
D'Israeli government wharf, 3562.

Tonnage. *See* Transportation.

Toronto
American Club, wrecking of, 856.
Customs revenue and officers, 2169.
Military buildings, 2837.
Postal station A, 2836.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010.
Revenue and salaries, 1651.
Railway terminals, 3414.

Tracadie
Harbour improvements, 1438, 3149, 3160.
Lazaretto, 2800.

Trade and Commerce.
Agricultural products, export of, 345.
Balance of trade, 890, 903.
Central America, 1653.
China, 344.
Commissioners and agents, 1653, 3022, 3551.
Department
Estimates, 664, 2847, 3023, 3120, 3551.
Expenditure, 906.
Exports to United Kingdom, 592.
Publications, 2992.
Staff and salaries, 664, 3135.
South America, 1653.
Statements of Minister, 2989, 3100.
United States, 344, 2057.
West Indies, 1762, 1809, 1970.

Trade Commission, 4076.

Train service in the West. *See* Railways.

Transcona railway shops, 636.

Transportation
Ocean, 96, 232.
Admiralty transports, 1681.
Freight rates, 100, 116, 118, 1435, 2888.
Harbour facilities, 741, 3100-3134.
Ships, 181, 638, 700.
See also Marine.
Panama Canal route, 4092.
See Marine and Steamship service.
Railway, 1306, 3980. *See* Railways.
Troops, of. *See* Army.

Trawling. *See* Fish and Fisheries.

Tremain, Lieut.-Col., M.P., position of, 1652.

Trent canal, 1601, 2575.

Trousers, purchase of. *See* War Supplies.

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Hanover public building, 1439.

Tupper, the late Sir Charles, Bart.—resolution of condolence on death of, 39, 582.

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 178.
French-Canadians and the war, 179.
Patriotism of British Dominions, 180.
Conscription, 180.
Provision for wounded soldiers, 181.
Extension of term of Parliament, 181.
Bathurst harbour improvements, 3158.
Breakwaters, necessity for, 3623.
Conscription, 180.
Fish and fisheries
Dogfish, 2404.
Lobsters, 2369, 2378.
French-Canadians and the war, 179.
Hudson Bay railway, 3383.
Intercolonial railway
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 2783.
Passenger service, 3419.
Rolling stock, 2799.
Navigation schools, 696.
Parliament, extension of term of, 181.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2358.
St. John Valley Railway, 1944.
Soldiers provision for, 181.
Tracadie lazaretto—firewood for, 2800.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 436.
The Government and the war, 436.
Extension of term of Parliament, 437.
Seed grain indebtedness, 438.
Canada's war loans, 438.
Expenditure for soldiers rations, 440.
Medical examination of recruits, 440.
Pensions to soldiers, 440.
Shell contracts, 441.
Expenditure on public works, 444.
Commandeering and transportation of wheat, 445-452.
Agriculture Department clerks, 2801.
Agricultural implements, duty on, 4069.
Apple duty—Government official on, 1426.
Army
Allowances, separation, 2924, 3098.
Officers, training of, 3533.
Overseas forces, forwarding of, 3512.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
Army—*Con.*
Recruiting
Medical examination, 440.
Unfit men, 3253.
Soldiers
Pensions to, 440.
Rations for, 440.
Voting of, 3511.
Assistant Clerk of Routine and Records, 1161, 4079.
Banks, taxes payable by, 2478.
British Columbia, resources and progress of, 3847.
Budget, 1130.
The duty on apples, 1130.
The farmers and taxation, 1032.
Extension of term of Parliament, 1133.
Government taxation proposals, 1132, 1136.
Postal revenue, 1133.
Economy in public expenditure, 1134.
Naval policy, 1135.
The Opposition's attitude, 1136.
Taxation of profits, 1136.
The nickle industry, 1140, 1143.
Germans in government service, 1142.
Buffalo, 845.
Cadet service, 3502.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3579, 3657, 3847, 3941.
Snow blocade, 2647.
Canals, patrolling of, 3591.
Chief transport officer, 1903, 1969.
Civil Service
Appointments, 4079.
Deputy Ministers, salary of, 659.
Enlistments from, 821, 824, 888.
Customs—free entry of goods, 3646.
Dairy Commissioner, report of, 1421.
Flax industry, 1293.
Grain
Congestion, 1712.
Freight rates on, 3063, 3072.
Transportation of, 2857.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 445-452, 3214.
Free, 793-802.
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 961.
Home Guard, 3504.
Homestead inspectors, 829.
House of Commons
Sessional clerks, 2799.
Sherwood, H. C., appointment of, 4079.
Hudson Bay railway, 3376.
Immigration expenditure, 2109.
Indian Department clerks, 2800.
Inland Revenue Department clerks, 2544.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
Interior
Department expenditure, 2086.
Minister of, in Chicago, 756.
Justice Department clerks, 2801.
Lands, western, survey of, 835.
Loans to farmers, 929.
Macdonald, Rev. D. R., 3675.
Marine Department clerks, 2801.
Militia Department clerks, 2839.
Mines Department clerks, 2921.
National Transcontinental railway—Government operation of, 3985.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2463.
Nickel, exportation of, 1140, 1143, 1871.
Ores, refining of, 3031.
Panama canal, goods shipped to Canada via., 4092.
Parks, Canadian National, 845.
Parliament, extension of term of, 437, 1133.
Peterborough Review, statement of, 414.
Political patronage in military affairs, 3542.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2234, 2559, 2568, 2706.
Public Works
Applications for, 1807.
Department employees, 3155.
Expenditure, 2812.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4028, 4120.
Railways
Department
Clerks, 2839, 3096.
Estimates, 3056.
Locating of, 2747.
Mail service, 2023.
Situation in Canada, 3988.
Train service in the West, 518.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2747.
Ross, Walter T., release of, 2302.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2944.
Seed grain
Distribution, 2862.
Indebtedness, 438, 511.
Liens, 760.
Shipbuilding, 706, 708, 2894, 3017.
Taxation
Agricultural implements, 4069.
Apples, 1130, 1782, 2314.
Land, 756.
Profits, 550, 1136, 1870, 1976, 1984, 2649.
Timber protection, 838.
Trade and Commerce, 3015.
Transportation, 706, 708, 2857, 3118.
Vancouver munitions workers in England, 2743.
Victoria Transfer Company, 3144.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
War
Loans, 438.
Supplies
Clothing, 3592.
Orders for, securing of, 961.
Rifles, 3505, 3506.
Shells, 441.
Western farmers, assistance to, 3938.
Wheat. *See* Grain.
Woman suffrage, 1200.
Women voters in Manitoba, 2301.

Unemployment. *See* Labour.

Valcartier
Expropriations, 1300.
Removal of refuse from, 2174.

Vale railway, 3024.

Valleyfield breakwater, 2694.

Valley railway. *See* St. John.

Vancouver
Customs officers and revenue, 1651, 2169.
Post office employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036.

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1604. 1r., 1606. 2r., 2078. Com., 2078. 3r., 2079.

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Aubrey, Napoleon, appointment of, 2300.
Budget, 1083.
Jewish people, 1083.
The cost of living, 1084.
Taxation systems, 1086.
Soldiers' pensions, 1087.
Fair-wage boards, 1277, 1438.
Fair-wage clause in government contracts, 3622.
Feller, Camille, 2348.
Ice-breaker contract, 1440.
Labour bureaus, national, 608.
Labourers imported into British Columbia, 1329.
Lyons, John, employment of, 3881.
Mines Department reports, 2339.
Montreal customs building, 2175, 2476.
Pensions to soldiers, 1087.
Reid Jack, imprisonment of for sedition, 2007.
Soldiers
Medical examination of, 4069.
Pensions to, 1087.
Taxation systems, 1086.
Technical education, 2198.
Vickers-Maxim, Ltd.—strike at, 1079, 1763.

Vickers, Limited
Sale of ammunition to. *See* War Supplies, small arms ammunition.

Vickers-Maxim, Ltd. Strike of carpenters at, 1079, 1764.

Victoria, B.C.
Coal for dredges, 547.
Customs, 2169.
Dredging, 546.
Rifle range, 1549.
Post office employees, 1906, 2010, 2036.

Victoria (county) N.S., Government telegraph lines, 548, 758.

Victoria Memorial Museum. *See* Ottawa.

Victoria Transfer Company, 3144.

Voters' lists, printing of, 593, 668.

Wallace, Mr. Thomas G. (Centre York)
James, Mr. C. C.—question of appointment, 2477.
MacInnes, Mr. C. S., position of, 2923.

Wallace Shipyards, Limited, payments to, 1077.

War
British forces, 58.
British Navy, 58.
Canadian forces. *See* Army.
Censors and decoders. *See that title.*
Conscription. *See* Army.
Contracts
Letting of, 161-167.
Political patronage in. *See that title.*
See also Shells.
Expenditure, 35, 36, 39, 58, 102, 138, 807, 1167. *See* War Appropriation Bill, War Supplies *and* Budget.
Fair-wage clause in munitions contracts, 1277, 1969, 3555.
France, fighting in, 1118.
French Government, horses for, 761, 950, 1041.
Frontier protection, 744.
Hospitals. *See that title.*
Imperial Munitions Board, 594, 804.
Investigatins. *See* Shells *and* Small arms ammunition.
Inspectors of shells, appointment of, 143.
Loans. *See* Finance.
Patriotic Funds. *See that title.*
Patrolling of canals, 3591.
Pay and Record Office, Canadian, 3023.
Recruiting. *See* Army *and* Naval Service.
Remount depots, 30.
Shell Committee, the. *See that title.*
Transport, director of, 3096.
Trenches, methods for improving, 2922.
Trench warfare, 2696.
Vancouver munitions workers in England, 2743.
Vessels, commandeering of, 116.
See also Transportation.
See also Army *and* Militia.

War Appropriation ($250,000,000) Bill. Res., 3233. 1r., 3294. 2r., 3530. Com., 3533. 3r., 3534.

War Purchasing Commission, 1441, 1907, 2695, 2801.

War Supplies
Alberta purchases, 3232.
Amherst Barracks, for, 2600.
Ammunition, 28, 71, 90, 106. *See* Small arms.
Bandages, 1354.
Bayonets, 1761.
Binoculars, 1353, 1716.
Blankets, 1436.
Boots, 172, 175, 1716.
British Government for, 957, 968.
Canvas shoes, 166, 595, 673.
Clothing, 1356, 3527, 3592.
Director of, 3096.
40th Battalion for, 1043.
Field kitchens, 547.
Fish, 1652.
Free entry of into Canada, 3645.
French Government, for, 973.
Fuses, 252, 1345, 1502, 1546, 1552, 1735, 1741, 1749, 2274, 2514, 2979, 3097. *See* Shells.
Groceries—British Columbia, 3097, 3733.
Hay, 255-265, 320-335, 353, 392, 410, 530, 537, 1039, 1422, 2298, 2543, 2694, 2963.
Horses, 30, 267, 270, 353, 396, 418, 542, 652, 672, 685, 761, 950, 1041, 1124, 1162, 1326, 1379, 1717, 2968.
Irish stew, 2014.
Issues of to Canadian troops, 968.
Kits, 2167.
Lumber, 1354.
Machine guns, 92, 111, 289, 2275, 3522.
Private contributions for, 532, 2542, 3258, 3291.
Milk powder. *See* powder milk.
Motor trucks, 1345, 1358, 2978, 3676.
Munitions.
Contracts, 235, 1277, 1969, 3555.
Credit to Imperial Government, 1810.
Factories—labour in, 2549.
Imperial Munition Board. *See that title.*
Inspectors of, 544, 2006.
Minister of, 532.
United States, 495.
Works Commission, 2841.
See Shells.
Oats, 2298.
Ordnance, 2799.
Overshoes, 673, 886.
Petroleum, 2648.
Picric acid. *See* Shell contracts.
Pistols, 270-274, 290, 1343, 1346, 1358, 2276, 2290, 2510, 2977.

War Supplies—*Con.*
Powder milk, 850, 1043, 2175, 3262.
Prince Edward Island purchases, 3406.
Proof spirits, 2176.
Purchasing agents, 3528.
Remounts. *See* Horses.
Renfrew wool contracts, 1436.
Rifles
Lee-Enfield, 3562.
Magazines, purchase of, 1328.
Ross, 1347, 1359, 3505-3522, 4105, 4109.
Southern rifle deal, 2286, 2981.
Russian Government, for, 973.
Shells, 74, 79, 86, 90, 143, 152, 154, 161, 175, 194, 221, 238, 279, 295, 405, 409, 420, 441, 494, 751, 803, 805, 1123, 1505, 1556, 1572.
Advances for, 2979, 3097.
Boxes, 543, 2351, 2691.
Commission of inquiry
Appointment of, 2920.
Resolution for, 1714, 1727, 2242, 2264, 2349, 2442, 2496, 2515, 2529, 3296, 3404.
Scope of, 3404, 3464.
Statement by Minister of Militia, 2974.
Shovel shields, 156, 1123, 1347.
Small arms ammunition, 2168, 2302, 2543, 2546, 2881, 3297, 3884, 3943.
Socks, 593, 887.
Southern rifle deal, 2286, 2981.
Trousers, 165.
Water carts, 537.
Wheat. *See* Grain.
Windsor, N.S., purchases at, 3407.

Water-powers
Burleigh falls, 2583.
Control of, 556.
Investigation, 839.
Ownership of, 760.
Trent canal waterway, 2575.

Ways and Means, Committee of, 1275, 1230, 1764, 1843, 1862, 1891, 1990.
See Budget *and* Taxation.

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Political patronage, 1363.

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1470.

Weights and Measures, inspectors of, 2475.

Welland canal, 1600, 3454.

Wellington harbour improvements, 2169.

Wentworth, N.S., mail service, 3353.

West Gore-Clarksville mail service, 2695.

Western farmers. *See* Farmers.

West Indies—syrup shipment from, 1762, 1809, 1970.

Westover county telegraph offices, 2600.

West Rochdale postmaster, 1551.

Wetaskiwin settlers, grievances of, 2088.

Wheat. *See* Grain.

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Auditor General, salary of, 658.
Budget, 807.
Revenue and expenditure, 807.
War expenditure, 807.
Loan issues, 808.
Outcome of 1915-1916, 809.
Economic conditions, 809.
Fiscal year, 1916-17, 810.
Taxation and loans, 811.
Tariff proposals, 811.
Taxation of profits, 813.
Future borowings, 815.
Dominion debenture stock issue, 816.
Insurance companies—investments in Dominion securities, 815.
Bank loans to farmers. *See* Loans.
Bonds, Government, negotiability of, 660.
Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3638.
Canadian Associated Press, 3638.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3830, 3964.
Civil Service—salaries, 4079.
Coin, American, 654.
Debt of Canada—interest, 654.
Dominion notes
Advances to banks, 592.
Issue of, 1218.
Federal Plan Commission, 1603, 3136, 3641.
Finance Department salaries, 661.
Government expenditures, 39, 807, 2622, 3138, 4117.
Grain, transportation of, 3981.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3830.
Immigration
Department expenditure, 2628.
Inspection, boundary, 657.
Insurance companies
Extension of charters, 685, 937, 1610.
Investments of, 1611, 2400.
Live stock, advances on, 550.
Loans
Dominion, 659, 807, 811, 815, 1812, 1834, 2006.
See Budget *and* Finance.
Farmers, to, 674-681, 924-936, 1611, 3146.
Munitions credit for Imperial Government, 1810.
National Battlefields Commission, 3141, 3148.
Nickel industry, 1867.
Paper currency, issue of, 1837.
Pistols, 2290.

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)—*Con.*
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4117.
Railway situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3986.
Rural credits, 2401.
Seed grain indebtedness, 513.
Shell contracts, 2496.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4085.
Shipbuilding, 4061.
Taxation, war
Apples, 1764, 1791, 2312.
Income, 1982.
Land, 2001.
Oils, 812, 1796, 1806.
Profits, 813, 1330-1341, 1843-1862, 1864-1887, 1891-1900, 1972-1989, 1990-2006, 2469, 2646.
See Budget.
Transportation, railway, 3981.
Wheat, free, 861-874.
Zinc or spelter, bounty on, 2839, 3029.

White Phosphorus Matches Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 989. 2r., 1493. Com., 2r., 3r., 1616.

White slave traffic, 981.

Whitehead cold storage, 757.

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 93.
Extension of term of Parliament, 97.
Policy of Liberal party, 94.
Shell Committee, 95.
Transportation of crops, 96.
Gasolene, 885.
Naval Service, 1697.
Parliament, extension of term of, 97.
Shell Committee, the, 95.
Transportation of crops, 96.

Willson, Mr. Beckles, position of, 1326.

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Surveys, 1321.

Wilson, Mr. Fred. S., services of, 3353.

Winding-up Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1548. 2r., 1616. Com., 1616. 3r., 1616.

Windsor, N.S.—purchase of war supplies, 3407.

Winnipeg
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Disturbances at, 2548.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036.
Revenue and salaries, 1651.

Wireless stations. *See* Telegraphs.

Woman suffrage, 1044, 1185, 1608, 2301.

Wool. *See* Agriculture.

Wrecks. *See* Marine.

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Dredging, 550.
Flax industry, 1294.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1489.
Public works, 550, 1905.
Soldiers, medical examination of, 4073.
Wheat, commandeering of, 3206.

Yukon territory, 938, 1309, 1312.

Zinc Bounties Bill. Res., 3029. 1r., 3035. 2r., 3147. Com., 3147. 3r., 3353.